

Thursday, 23 April 2020

Democratic and Members' Services
Fiona McMillan
Monitoring Officer

10:00

Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

COVID-19

During the Covid-19 pandemic Council and Committee meetings will be held virtually for Committee members and for members of the public who wish to participate. These meetings will held via Zoom and Microsoft Teams (for confidential or exempt items). For more information please contact the clerk for the meeting (details provided below).

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

- 1. Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**
Guidance on declaring interests is available at
<http://tinyurl.com/cc-conduct-code>
- 2. Minutes 5th March 2020 Economy and Environment Committee** **3 - 28**
- 3. Minute Action Log update** **29 - 40**
- 4. Petitions and Public Questions**

KEY DECISIONS

- 5 Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure Scheme** **41 - 56**

Exclusion of Press and Public if discussion is required on the contents of the confidential appendix to the Kings Dyke Report

To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that appendix 1 of the Kings Dyke report contains exempt information under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

- 6. Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan and any outside body appointment requirements 15h April update 57 - 60**

The Economy and Environment Committee comprises the following members:

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements please contact

Councillor Ian Bates (Chairman) Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman) Councillor David Ambrose Smith Councillor Henry Batchelor Councillor David Connor Councillor Ryan Fuller Councillor Noel Kavanagh Councillor Peter McDonald Councillor Steven Tierney Councillor John Williams

Clerk Name:	Rob Sanderson
Clerk Telephone:	01223 699181
Clerk Email:	rob.sanderson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 5th March 2020

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 11.50 a.m.

Present: Councillors: H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, M Goldsack (substituting for Councillor Ambrose Smith), D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, T Sanderson, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman)

Apologies: Councillor D Ambrose Smith

307. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

308. MINUTES

With the addition of Councillor Tierney to the list of apologies, the minutes of the meeting held on 16th January 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

309. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

310. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

a) Petition to widen and provide overhead lighting for the DNA Cycleway

One Petition was received by the Constitution deadline presented by Mark Troll requesting that the DNA Cycle Path running from Shelford to Addenbrooke's Hospital be provided with overhead lighting. A slide presentation was used to help illustrate the points made and has been included as appendix 1 to the minutes.

He explained that the DNA path was quite dangerous at night with many cyclists avoiding it and referencing an accident which had caused serious injury along the cycleway a few months ago between two cyclists, as a result of one cyclist not having any lights. He suggested that the number of cycling accidents was underrepresented as most were not reported. He highlighted that the present path had been built to a narrower standard to the minimum national standard and that the guide lights currently provided on the path funnelled cyclists to the centre of the path but did not provide sufficient light to be able to see cyclists not using lights or wearing high visibility clothing. Since his original petition he had been informed that the current path would be removed and relocated. If this was the case, it would not now make sense to widen the existing pathway one of the two requests in the original petition, but that installing Solar-powered overhead lights presented an immediate solution to the hazard. These could be installed quickly and relatively inexpensively and could be relocated to any new

replacement path. His presentation gave an example of one company's product as a guide to potential costs.

It was resolved:

That as there was no relevant report on the agenda, officers were asked prepare a full, written response to the petition presenter on the issues raised to be sent no later than 10 working following this meeting.

b) Public questions Fendon Road roundabout

Two public questions were received from local residents regarding Fendon Road roundabout.

1) Speaker Sam Davies presented the following question:

"In November 2016, this committee approved the project to redesign Fendon Road roundabout and cycle provision on Queen Edith's Way at a cost of £1.425m. Subsequent documents indicate that £800k was allocated to the roundabout works. In February 2020, six months after the roundabout works had commenced, the County Council announced that the cost of the roundabout works alone had increased by 125% to £1.8m. Could the Committee please explain at what point members were made aware of the increased costs, and what the approvals process is for the excess, including decisions about which other S106 schemes will be scaled down or postponed?"

2) Doctor Barnali Ghosh had submitted the following question which was read out as she was unable to attend:

"Recent communication indicated that this project is delayed by three months. As an engineer myself, I am interested to know the cost over-run and how this will be procured. I am also interested to see the schedule of services planned and how the principal contractor is performing against the contract."

It was resolved:

That as there was no report on the agenda on the project, a written response would be provided to both questions no later than 10 working days from the date of the meeting.

311. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROPOSALS

This report provided details of the proposed allocation of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding for 2020-21. The Committee was reminded that since its establishment, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) passported the LTP capital grant funding to the County Council. The Committee report had been prepared on the basis that this arrangement would continue for 2020/21.

It was highlighted that in September 2013 the County Council Cabinet had agreed a

contribution of £25m over a maximum period of 25 years towards the A14 Improvement Scheme to be paid from a top slice of the ITB capital grant. At that time the ITB funding was much higher at around £10m per year. Currently its value had reduced to £3.19m per year. The first £1m contribution to the A14 was expected in 2020/21. Given that the ITB funding had reduced in recent years and taking it from here would reduce the ITB by a third, the report proposed to ask General Purposes Committee (GPC) to approve that it should be funded from Prudential Borrowing. The report also made the assumption that the full ITB funding would be available to allocate to schemes as before. If the prudential borrowing was not agreed by GPC, it would need to be funded from the ITB budget and as this would reduce the funding available for schemes in the programme, a decision on revised allocations would require a further report to the Committee.

Based on previous allocations, the ITB for 2020/21 was recommended to be allocated as follows:

Budget Category and Proposed 2020/21 allocation	
Air Quality Monitoring	£23K
Major Scheme Development	£200K
Strategy Development and Integrated Transport Schemes	£345k
Local Highway Improvement (LHI)	£607k
Other Local Infrastructure Improvements for accessibility and Rights of Way	£75k
Road Safety Schemes	£594k
Delivering Transport Strategy Aims	£1,346k
Total	£3,190k

In terms of progress on 2019-20 schemes, it was highlighted that there had been delays to some of the schemes approved for 2019/20 delivery. Funding for the delayed schemes from the 2019/20 budget would be carried forward as continued spend and would therefore not affect the allocation of the 2020/21 budget. Paragraph 3.3 of the report listed those schemes with committed funding for 2020/21

The report highlighted that a 2019/20 scheme to provide a cycling link between Rampton to Willingham had been found not be feasible within the budget allocated due to its proposed length and therefore it was proposed to reallocate the £100k funding as detailed in paragraph 3.4 of the report. The two parish councils were in further discussions regarding other options for the cycleway route.

Attention was drawn as part of the ongoing discussion to paragraph 3.5 providing the

details of the prioritisation methodology used to identify eligible schemes. Schemes with the highest Total Score were proposed for allocation up to the limit of available 2020/21 funding, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report with Scheme 897 Godmanchester to Hinchingsbrooke Park subject to match funding. If this scheme was not able to go ahead it was proposed to delegate to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to decide on a replacement scheme from the prioritised list to receive funding. Schemes scores were listed from highest to lowest in Appendix 3 of the report. Eligible schemes assessed, but not proposed for funding allocation in 2020/21, would remain in the Transport Investment Plan to be considered for other appropriate funding sources or for the next round of ITB funding.

One member of the public, Doctor Philip Trathan, the Chairman of the Storey's Way Residents Association had requested to speak in support of TIP scheme 894 'Review and re-design of traffic control measures in Storey's Way to improve the cycling route to link to the Ridgeway and Eddington Development ' designed to help improve the safety of cyclists. He had also for background information, provided a Residents Association report previously sent to their local Councillor, Councillor Claire Richards in November which had also been circulated to members of the Committee in advance of the meeting and is included as Appendix 2 to these Minutes. His full presentation was provided to Democratic Services and is included as Appendix 3 to these Minutes. He also tabled a map of the relevant roads for reference purposes. Councillor Richards who had also requested to speak as the local member, also spoke in support of the scheme.

Questions / issues raised on the report included:

- With reference to the allocation to the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) scheme a question was raised on how this compared to the previous year. In reply it was explained that it was at the same level as the previous year. The Chairman indicated that full Council, when recently agreeing the Budget, had allocated an additional £200k towards this budget.
- A similar query was raised on the allocation (£75K) to the 'Other Local Infrastructure Improvements for accessibility and Rights of Way' category which one member saw as rather low. It was explained that this budget was only for top up funding for measures that were already going to happen, and was not the main source of the funding.
- Concerns were raised by members and the Chairman regarding the length of time panels were expected to meet to make decisions, citing a panel meeting of over 11 hours which was not seen as being efficient. There was a request that this should be reviewed and improvements suggested. **Action: Richard Lumley**
- In terms of recommendation d) to request GPC to agree prudential borrowing for payment of the A14, one member could not agree to this and indicated he would be voting against the recommendation as the payment was foreseeable and should have been included in Council contingency budgets. In total a £100m had been collected from other districts and county councils as far away as Northamptonshire as they all recognised the importance of the A14 as a strategic route.
- With reference to Appendix 1, two members of the Committee representing Fenland electoral divisions highlighted the vast disparity of funds and schemes allocated between different districts in the County, noting that Fenland schemes

only totalled £8,800 while other areas of the County were receiving sums in excess of £300k to £500k. It was explained that the schemes were allocated according to the scoring system set out in section 3 of the report previously agreed by the Committee. There had been a number of Fenland schemes put forward but on scoring against the criteria had received low scores. Officers were asked to look into how a more equitable distribution of funding across the region could be achieved in the future. Officers agreed they would look further into what schemes had been included in the Cambridgeshire Transport Investment Plan (TIP), as inclusion in the latter, was fundamental. Further to this, the Committee requested that officers review the current criteria for ways to improve its equitability and come back initially to the Chairman and Vice Chairman with any proposed amendments. **Action: Elsa Evans / Andy Preston**

- There was broad agreement across the Committee that the A14 contribution should not be taken from the ITB, but some Members were opposed to it being financed from prudential borrowing.
- One Member asked about the appropriate route to obtain funding from the County Council for an improved road safety scheme for Sixteen Foot Bank on the B1098 having obtained funding from other partners. In reply it was explained that as a road safety scheme, this was within the remit of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee who were due to discuss road safety schemes at their meeting on 10th March.

Following separate votes on each of the recommendations:

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Support the allocation to the ITB budget categories as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report.
- b) Support the prioritised projects in Appendix 1 for allocation of ITB Delivering Transport Strategy Aims category funding in 2020/21, subject to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority passporting the funding to the County Council; and,
- c) Delegate authority to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to decide on amendments as described in paragraph 3.9.

While voting in favour of the above recommendations, Councillors Connor and Tierney requested that their dissatisfaction with the inequity in the current allocation of funding by region be placed on record.

It was resolved:

- d) To recommend to General Purposes Committee that the £1m A14 contribution for 2020/2021 is funded from Prudential Borrowing.

312. BIKEABILITY CONTRACT

This report sought approval to let a contract for Bikeability cycle training and agree to the funding allocation methodology.

It was highlighted that in 2009 the County Council had moved from volunteer-led cycle training (cycling proficiency), to Bikeability training, delivered in accordance with national standards, and managed by the Cycling Projects Team. Bikeability being offered free to all schools in the County with the provision of training funded entirely through a Department for Transport (DfT) grant.

The current contract for the training concluded at the end of March 2020. Due to the uncertainty of year on year funding from DfT, the report proposed to let a one year contract, with the option to add up to three additional years, which was both in line with procurement rules, but also gave enough flexibility to react to any change of funding. Details of the procurement process was set out in section 2 of the report.

In terms of continued DfT funding it had been confirmed that they would provide Cambridgeshire County Council with an additional £56,000 required to meet the additional demand for Level 2 Bikeability training in the current 2019/20 financial year.

Questions raised in discussion included:

- Whether the one year funding would cover the school calendar year. It was confirmed that was the case.
- The likelihood of Government funding being extended beyond the year to allow forward planning. In reply it was explained that the Government was aware that Bikeability demand was growing year on year nationally. In recognition of this, the Government had announced on the 7th February 2020 that all children in England would be taught the skills for a lifetime of cycling. The commitment would see an additional 400,000 training places offered on the Bikeability scheme each year, although what this implied for Cambridgeshire had yet to be confirmed. It was hoped that the current £213k funding allocation would be increased to at least match the annual demand for training across the County. However as this could not be confirmed, this was why there was flexibility built into the new contract.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree to let a one year contract for delivery of Bikeability training let a one year contract, with the option to add up to three additional years and the allocation of annual Department for Transport funding proportionally by district area.
- b) Delegate authority to award the contract to the Executive Director – Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

313. KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE – PROPOSED PROJECT GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

This Committee decided at its meeting held in Whittlesey on 15th August 2019, to invite tenders from the open market to construct the scheme, following the removal of the previous contractor from the project. This report updated the Committee on the project risks and requested approval of the introduction of revised project governance arrangements to safeguard the timetable as set out in the detail of the report.

A total of nine submissions were received from Contractors to the initial contract opportunity and evaluation of these resulted in six tenderers successfully passing the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) stage. Two had since opted out, leaving four remaining tenderers bidding for the construction contract.

Invitation to Tender (ITT) returns were due shortly and would be evaluated based on a 60% price, 40% quality split. Upon completion of tender evaluation and moderation, the results would be reported to the Committee seeking a decision to award the Contract and to make any further recommendation to General Purposes Committee, should additional funding be required. The report set out the statutory process that was to be followed.

In terms of project governance it was proposed that the Governance framework should consist of an officer Project Board to report to E&E Committee and a Member Advisory Group which would receive information from, and gives recommendations to, both the Committee and the Project Board with the proposed project governance and Terms of Reference were set in Appendix A of the report, detailing the nature of the Project Board's responsibilities and its general relationship with the Member Advisory Group.

The risk register for the project was contained in Appendix B. This was to be reviewed by the Project Board at each of its meetings and exceptions would be periodically reported to this Committee for awareness and a steer. Sections 2.16 to 2.17 set out details of the finance and funding.

The following issues were raised as part of the discussion:

- Officers were reminded by one Fenland Member that this project had been promised 10 years and three leaders ago.
- The Lead member for the Liberal Democrat Group suggested that the lessons from the Ely bypass project had not been learnt as there was no opposition party representation on the Member Advisory Group to provide critical friend input and so could not support the proposed governance arrangements. Other members highlighted that the councillors listed to be appointed included members representing Fenland divisions and they would ensure that there was robust challenge.

Having been put to the vote with seven members voting in favour, none against and three abstentions,

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the proposed project governance arrangements and membership of the Member Advisory Group and its Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A of the report.
- b) to note the key project risks and full risk register in Appendix B of the report.

314. MARCH AREA TRANSPORT STRATEGY

This report provided details of the progress on the March Area Transport Study. The Study had examined a wide range of options developed from officer led workshops which had then been reviewed by the Member Steering Group (MSG) set up by this Committee in July 2018, The options were assessed using bespoke transport models at a higher strategic and more detailed operational level, with Appendix A of the report providing the executive summary of the Options Assessment Report.

At the outset of the study and after discussions with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the MSG, the study was extended to cover all transport modes and the consideration of small, medium and large interventions relating to those junctions initially identified. MATS has identified various packages of interventions, some of which have been progressed to feasibility design with the further objective of ensuring these schemes would be ready for further development if, and when, any funding opportunities arise. None of the schemes assessed prejudiced options for reinstating the March – Wisbech rail line, which was a separate CPCA funded project.

A variety of smaller scale Quick Win (QW) schemes were identified early and had been progressed separately from the main study. These comprised measures such as signal improvements at junctions, better lighting and improvements for pedestrians and cyclists through new and upgraded crossings and pavements. A full list of the Quick Win measures was included at Appendix B to the report.

The report highlighted that in parallel to the MATS project, Fenland District Council had submitted a bid to the Future High Street Fund (FHSF) to fundamentally change the way in which March functioned as a Town Centre. This included improvements in Broad Street to improve pedestrian flow and footfall, changes to densification in use to support a 24-hour economy and support resilience, and public realm improvements which would open up underused and derelict areas for commercial development. There has been regular dialogue between the two projects to ensure that any proposals were consistent with the FHSF aspirations.

The report detailed the three stages of assessing schemes used to reach the findings of the MATS Options Assessment Report including assumptions made regarding the five main junctions and the options considered. Three March town centre package options were tested focussed on the area around the Broad St / Station Rd junction in the centre of town. The packaging assessment took the best performing schemes from the strategic and operational assessments and combined them into packages based on varying levels of intervention in March town centre, considering scenarios with and without the March Northern Industrial Link Road (NILR). High level construction costs were calculated and economic appraisals were run on the packages to produce benefit

to cost ratios (BCR) for each. Table 1 of the report listed the component schemes for each package and Table 2 summarised the respective benefit to cost ratios.

Public Consultation detailing options assessed in the study and seeking public opinion on the individual schemes was planned for a 6 week period commencing 28th March 2020 and would include four public drop-in events after 20 April to avoid the school Easter holidays. The Next steps for MATS were as follows:

- March 2020 – report study outcomes to CPCA Transport and Infrastructure (T&I) committee, FDC Cabinet and March Town Council (MTC)
- March to April 2020 – public consultation on individual schemes
- Summer 2020 – report consultation outcome to CCC Economy and Environment Committee, CPCA Transport and Infrastructure Committee, Fenland District Council (FDC) Cabinet and March Town Council, and seek support for the recommended next phase of work
- Apply for funding for the next phase of work and Quick Win schemes.

Issues raised / answers provided in the subsequent discussion included:

- The funding for the feasibility study provided by the CPCA included £1m in March 2018 with further funding to be made available in the region of £220k for quick wins. The Chairman highlighted that there was an item on the next day's Combined Authority agenda on the subject.
- Questions were raised regarding how the proposed strategy schemes integrated with district council market town strategies as they needed to complement each other, avoid duplication and ensure between them issues were not missed and needed to also be linked to economic growth plans e.g. business parks. It was explained that the study in the report was looking at congestion issues and had taken into account existing market town strategies. The master plan would be fully integrated in terms of proposed transport plans with officers from the County Council working closely with their colleagues in the Combined Authority and District Councils.

Having commented,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the emerging outcomes of the March Area Transport Study.
- b) Approve the study outcomes for consultation with the public.

315. GRANTS TO COMMUNITY PROVIDERS

Cambridgeshire County Council provides grant awards following procurement exercises to community transport operators to contribute to the cost of the provision of dial-a-ride services. The Council's Audit and Accounts Committee had asked for a report on the performance of the grant funded schemes to be presented to E&E Committee.

There were currently five grants awarded to operators covering the areas of Fenland (£40,265), Huntingdonshire (£12,095), Cambridge City (£27,280) villages in East Cambridgeshire around Newmarket (£18,071) and villages in East Cambridgeshire around Ely (£50,000). The current community transport operators in receipt of the grants were Fenland Association for Community Transport (Fenland), Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (Huntingdonshire), Cambridge Dial-a-ride (Cambridge), The Voluntary Network (Newmarket area) and Ely and Soham Association for Community Transport (Ely area).

Figure 1 of the report showed the number of passenger journeys per annum, the annual grant amounts and the resultant cost per passenger journey for each scheme, enabling a comparison between the schemes. It was highlighted that the cost per passenger varied between £0.95 and £10.38, with an average across all schemes of £2.21. As a comparison, the figures for traditional local bus services ranged from £0.49 to £42.27, with an average of £4.15. Overall the five schemes enabled 66,837 journeys to be made that might not otherwise have been possible. The current grant agreements ran until the end of April 2021 with the timescale giving the opportunity to review the current funding arrangement and consider whether there was an alternative method of allocating the funding available.

Issues raised / replies provided included:

- A member of the Committee who was also a South Cambridgeshire Councillor explained that South Cambridgeshire were not included as the district council funded its own Community Transport Provision
- In answer to a question on the funding arrangements, it was clarified that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CA) passed back the money that the County Council received as part of the core funding from central government and delegated its allocation functions to the County Council. If in the future the CA took over the allocation function, the County Council would still receive the core funding monies and then pass it over.
- The high cost of Ely and Soham Community Transport at £10.38 cost per passenger was seen as a concern to which the officers replied that was why the second report recommendation was suggesting that at the November Committee meeting there might be proposals to look at certain services in a different way. Councillor Goldsack indicated that he had not seen anything of this Service and asked what publicity measures were being undertaken to inform residents of the service's availability. As the Member for Soham North and Isleham he knew that residents were absolutely crying out for bus services to link Ely to the Soham area. **Action: Paul Nelson to investigate further the current publicity arrangements and consider how they might be improved.**

Having commented:

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the report; and

- b) To agree to consider proposals for allocating funding for 2021/22 at Committee in November 2020.

316. PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT – QUARTER 3 2019-20

The performance report provided information on the status of performance indicators the Committee has selected to monitor to understand performance of services overseen by the Committee. As previously requested by the Committee Indicator 32 – ‘Growth in Cycling from a 2004/05 average baseline’ now showed the increase in cycling journeys by both a percentage increase and the number of cycle journeys.

Current performance of indicators monitored by the Committee were as follows:

Status	Number of indicators	Percentage of total indicators with target
Red	2	29%
Amber	1	14%
Green	3	43%
Blue	1	14%
No target	5	

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the Performance Report.

317. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – JANUARY 2020

The Committee received a report outlining the Finance Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place & Economy Services as at the end of January 2020. The Strategic Finance Manager informed the Committee that a bottom line underspend of £2.9m was forecasted, £0.2m up from the previous report provided to the January Committee. The main areas of overspend / underspend were:-

- Bus Lane Enforcement and Parking Enforcement: forecasting of additional income in excess of budget had increased to £961K
- Winter Maintenance: a projected overspend of £239K reflecting the reduced number of runs due to the mild winter to date.
- Waste Management: The forecast underspend was now £2.3m due to the Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility (MBT) breaking down and the contractor being responsible for the landfill costs.

The revised capital budget for 2019/20 reflected the carry-forwards of funding from 2018/19 and the agreed re-phasing of schemes. Wisbech Town access Study was now reported as a new capital line as it had previously been reported under Combined Authority Schemes.

The Local Member for Queen Edith’s had requested to speak regarding issues that were affecting her electoral division and highlighted on page 138 under the heading

‘Operating the network” - Signals C233 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge (At Queen Edith’s Way / Robin Hood junction) – which stated that the work on the scheme had been delayed as a nearby cycle scheme had been pushed back. She made reference to delays to schemes in the Cherry Hinton / Queen Edith’s Way area including the severe delays to the Fendon Road roundabout due to cabling issues which had greatly increased the cost and was also having a knock on effect on the commencement of other local schemes in the area. She stated that what was needed was a report back to Committee to set out:

- How was the original cost estimated on the Fendon Road Roundabout / Robin Hood junction schemes
- How the Council could improve project estimating to avoid enormous variations
- How would money be re-allocated to the two other delayed cycling improvement schemes as a result of the Fendon Road Roundabout overspend.

The Chairman asked officers to provide a response to the issues raised. The Assistant Director Infrastructure and Growth explained where funding had been obtained for the area, including a £3m allocation from Section 106 monies and a £450k grant from the Department of Transport. The first delayed scheme would start once the Fendon Road Roundabout had been completed. There had been challenges with the scheme in respect of the utility providers and where their equipment was located which had led to the delays, A report would be coming back to Committee on the challenges faced on the construction of the Fendon Road Roundabout which could pick up on the other issues raised by the local member. In reply to a question it was indicated that it would be programmed to come to the May Committee meeting.

in discussion:

- The local member for Fulbourn highlighted that the knock on effect from the delay in constructing the Fendon Road roundabout was also delaying schemes in his division as there was currently a half finished cycleway and all the east side of Cambridge was being affected by the massive traffic congestion caused by blocking off parts of the main road during the construction period, not forgetting the disruption to local people in the area. He suggested that local members had not been informed regarding the construction delay and that he had obtained his information from Stagecoach. In reply the officer indicated that as soon as officers were certain of the delay, electoral division members were informed. The Local Member clarified that she had not been made aware of the overspend at the roundabout until about January.
- Linked to this a Member of the Committee raised the issue of how often it seemed that the Committee was being notified of capital project with overspends, while the Committee never saw details of projects that had come in below the original project estimate. In response the Officer explained that at the project development stage costs did often change, as more clarification was gained on potential problems. In reply to this, the same Member while accepting that it was difficult to judge the total cost of large scale projects, suggested that if officers were continually underestimating the total cost, the risk estimate balance was not right. As further clarification, the Strategic Finance Officer highlighted that there was now a Capital Project Board which met monthly chaired by the Chief Finance Officer which

provided robust challenge on all capital schemes and required a revised business case to reflect any cost increases. She also highlighted that some schemes came in over the original budget but that others came in under the original budget. The Service Director of Highways and Transport further clarified that most County Council projects did come in on budget as could be seen in the Finance Monitoring reports. Design cost estimates were undertaken on an Optimism Bias Factor basis but that sometimes this was not sufficient to take account of all the issues that could arise once construction begun.

- A Member stated that if there were capital over or under estimates in local projects, this would also be good for local members to be aware of. He suggested that the minutes of the Board should be made available so they were aware of the status of capital schemes in their electoral division in terms of overspending / underspending, in much the same way local members were provided with details of road repairs. The Chairman asked officers to raise with the Chief Finance Officer the question of the Minutes / notes of the Officer Capital Board being made available to all members of the Council. **Action Sarah Heywood / Graham Hughes**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the Finance Report.
- b) To receive progress a report at the May Committee meeting including a cost and financing update on the programme of works in the south of Cambridge in relation to Fendon Road, the Robin Hood roundabout and Queen Edith's Way.

318. AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) To note the agenda plan with the addition of a report at the May meeting on the on the progress and update on the cost of the programme of works in the south of Cambridge in relation to Fendon Road, the Robin Hood roundabout and Queen Edith's Way.
- b) To appoint the new local member for Duxford Councillor Peter McDonald to the following vacancies on E and E Committee outside bodies previously allocated to Cllr Topping as the local member:
 - Barrington Cement Works and Quarry Liaison Group
 - Barrington Light Railway Sub Group
 - Duxford Neighbours Forum

319. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 23rd APRIL 2020

**Chairman:
23RD April 2020**

Points about DNA path & collisions

Head-on collisions have higher relative velocity, are more damaging

Bicycle collisions are under-reported by a large factor

Head-on collisions are more likely on bicycle paths. 5 head-on bicycle collisions reported in newspapers within the last year all occurred on bike paths or trails

Of those, there was one fatality in Lexington, MA.

DNA path is heavily used, in part due to growth of the Addenbrookes campus

Bicyclists w/o lights preferentially use path – lower risk of being caught

Unintentionally, a real hazard has been created

Several companies make these, an example: Prolectric

“Integrated Passive Infra-Red (PIR) sensors switch lights to 100% brightness when vehicles or people enter a predefined area but save power and reduce light pollution when the area is unoccupied. This ensures the solar LED lasts from dusk until dawn.

With regards to battery life and the use of PIR's. All our lights have a backup ability of 4 - 5 days. Meaning you will get lights for 4 - 5 nights from one full charge of the batteries.

Cambridgeshire council have used our lighting in a few areas of Cambridge now, so should be fairly ofay with them. You can view our lights at Brookfields Hospital, Wentworth Travellers Site, Little Paxton Council.

Prices start at £995 per light and £189.00 for a column.”

Future path, after new Train station bus route has been planned

Solar overhead lights can be repositioned to any future path

Strong need for wider bicycle path in future plans for the area.

Storey's Way Residents' Association

28 Oct 2019

Dear Councillor Claire Richards

SWRA Chair's Report:

Improving safety for cyclists in Storey's Way

Storey's Way residents have become increasingly concerned about the safety in the road of cyclists and pedestrians. The Storey's Way Residents' Association (SWRA) is trying to address this.

Please would you: 1) consider this report; 2) advise us any next steps we should undertake, and; 3) forward this report to the relevant Highways Authorities, for their attention?

The SWRA looks forward to further discussions with you on ways to improve safety in the road.

1 The Problem

The problem areas are identified in the "Cycle Safety in Storey's Way" report (attached). Particular issues are the two bends in the road (Fitzwilliam corner and cul-de-sac corner). We hope the colleges will take a lead to improve the Fitzwilliam corner.

The SWRA is now trying to improve safety at the cul-de-sac corner, which is currently a problem due to the location of the width restriction. The danger here has grown in recent years, due to various changes, summarised in Table A (see Annex below).

Key amongst these was the opening in 2018 of the Ridgeway, the cycle path from Eddington, which opens into the cul-de-sac. The Ridgeway is shown on the Eddington maps as a key cycle route from Girton, through Eddington into town. As Eddington is being populated, cycle traffic is increasing. Eddington has been built as a cycle-safe environment, but both the University and the Highways Authority have ignored the safety of these cyclists as they leave Eddington. Parents with children attending the nursery at Eddington and the University of Cambridge primary school increasingly use this route, as do students from colleges in Storey's Way who we see on their way to shop at Eddington.

Cycle traffic in the cul-de-sac has also increased with the growth of the West Cambridge site. Cyclists increasingly commute from North Cambridge to the West Cambridge site along the route.

Navigating the current bollards has always been confusing for all users. However the problem is particularly acute for cyclists. Images of the problems are included in the attached "Cycle Safety in Storey's Way" report (page 4).

- i. Cyclists leaving the cul-de-sac turning left. This is a blind corner. Cars entering the cul-de-sac from Huntingdon Rd are frequently on the wrong side of the road, due to the location of the bollards.
- ii. Cyclists leaving the cul-de-sac heading straight on. This is the most complicated manoeuvre. It involves crossing to the right hand side of the road at the blind corner, cycling across the cobbles then crossing back across two lines of traffic. A site visit is needed to understand the confusion. It is so problematic that cyclists frequently cross over and cycle along the pavement, or go through the bollards in the wrong direction (images, page 2 of report attached). This is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.
- iii. Cyclists entering the cul-de-sac from Huntingdon Rd. The bollards encourage vehicles and cyclists towards the wrong side of the road at the blind corner bringing them head on into conflict with traffic.
- iv. Vehicles from Madingley Rd entering the cul-de-sac are forced onto the wrong side of the road at the blind corner, causing an obstacle for cyclists leaving the cul-de-sac.
- v. Lorries from Huntingdon Rd are unable to turn in the cul-de-sac without using private property (college and resident owned). They cause frequent blockages to cyclists, or resort to reversing to Huntingdon Rd, endangering cyclists in both directions. The SWRA has paid for "No through road for HGV" signs at the Huntingdon Rd end (one of which Fitzwilliam College kindly attached to their wall at the old hotel on the south side of Storey's Way). This has still not solved the problem for lorries, which continue to try to use the road as a shortcut, or are in the road of necessity and need to turn.

2 County Council Transport Strategy

The [Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire](#)** states the need to prioritise pedestrian and cycle use across the City and make these methods of transport more convenient than using a car.

In the light of this strategy, which is attempting to address the increasing problem of traffic in Cambridge and resulting pollution, and in the light of the problem at the cul-de-sac corner, residents have undertaken various efforts to find a solution. Residents' parking bays are due to be installed, but this will not help the problems at the corner/in the cul-de-sac.

3 Activities to address cycle safety in Storey's Way

3.1 Principles, Priorities and Opportunities for Change The SWRA Committee agreed its views of these issues; see Tables B and C in the Annex (below).

3.2 Meeting with Highways Authority Councillor Claire Richards (County Councillor responsible for Highways), has been involved in much of our work). Cllr Richards and an SWRA Committee member met Joshua Rutherford, a senior Highways Officer, at the bollards and he agreed that the current status is not acceptable.

3.3 Open Meeting on Cycle Safety in Storey’s Way In 2015 a group of residents organised this well-attended meeting, held in Fitzwilliam College and chaired by the then Master, Professor Padfield. The report, with links to relevant highways policy, is attached (Cycle Safety in Storey’s Way Final Report).

3.4 SWRA Consensus 2015 SWRA set up a sub-committee chaired by resident Marcus Smith QC to consider residents’ views on a solution to cycle safety. There was a consensus to close the road to through traffic, but the location of a closure was not specified. Closing the road to through traffic does not include emergency vehicles, dustbin lorries and cyclists, which would have access.

3.5 Traffic Consultant Report 2018 The SWRA employed a Traffic Consultant to obtain a professional view of the best location for a permanent barrier. He proposed that it should be north of Churchill Rd, before the Fitzwilliam Corner. We then consulted with the colleges, but they preferred to have access to Madingley Rd.

3.6 2019 Residents Survey This year we surveyed residents to see if they preferred a road closure near the current location, or to move the width restriction to somewhere near the Fitzwilliam College car park. The cul-de-sac corner could then be remodelled with a raised platform to limit speed.

The turnout and responses from our residents are summarised in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 Turnout of Storey’s Way residents		Number	Percent
1	Residents in Storey’s Way Residents’ Association*	72	100.0%
2	Residents who responded	64	88.9%

*Excludes college owned houses and privately owned houses, which are either rented (2); not SWRA members (2) or for sale (1).

Table 2 Summary of residents' preferences		Number	Percent
A	Residents who responded	64	100.0%
B	Residents who responded who did not support at least one of the proposed changes	7	10.9%
C	Residents who responded who preferred shutting the road to through traffic (other than emergency services and dustbin lorries)	34	53.2%
D	Residents who responded who preferred moving a width restriction to somewhere near Fitzwilliam College Car Park	23	35.9%
E	Residents who responded who want some form of change (row C + row D)	57	89.1%

We had a high turnout (88.9%). In total 89.1% supported some form of change. However, residents differed on how to tackle safety in the road.

Of the 57 who supported some form of change, 34 preferred to shut the road to through traffic and 23 preferred to move the width restriction somewhere near Fitzwilliam College car park.

There was a cluster of support to shut the road to through traffic from residents in the cul-de-sac/close to the bollards. These residents are the most aware of the problems that the bollards cause to cyclists.

We have discussed solutions with the Cambridge Cycle Campaign, who support road closure as the safest option for cyclists.

We have also briefed the colleges in the road (Churchill, Fitzwilliam, Murray Edwards and Trinity Hall), so that they are able to send their views to you, in the light of residents' concerns.

We look forward to hearing from the relevant authorities so that improvements can be made in the road to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians, in line with County Policy.

Yours sincerely

Harriet Gillett

Chair, Storey's Way Residents' Association

Email: harrietgillett@hotmail.co.uk

Annex**Table A Changes since the width restriction was built that impact traffic**

A Changes since the width restriction was built that impact traffic		
	Issue	Notes*
1	Growth of Cambridge & surroundings	More traffic generally.
2	Start of Eddington	More cyclists in SW to/from Eddington
3	The Ridgeway opened	Major cycle route from Eddington to town hence more cyclists exit cul-de-sac to MR, with dangerous conflict at cul-de-sac blind corner.
4	Eddington Avenue opened	Cars have a new route from HR to MR.
5	Growth of West Cambridge	Increasing cyclists from North Cambridge heading to West Cambridge site
6	20mph zone introduced	Measures need to enforce this
7	32A & 32B built. 34 occupied after years uninhabited.	More traffic uses cul-de-sac
8	Increase in College accommodation and access	New access to Fitzwilliam College in SW. Trinity Hall buildings new. Murray Edwards car park extended; Churchill College increased footprint. Møller Centre built.
9	Closing of Wychfield path between HR and SW	This has increased cycle traffic in SW in the north section.
10	New access to number 46 at bollards	Bollards make access to 46 problematic. Vehicles exiting 46 unable to turn left.
11	Residents parking due	Fewer parked cars will improve safety of cyclists in the road generally, with fewer parked cars to navigate, but will not help problem at cul-de-sac corner.

* SW=Storey's Way; HR = Huntingdon Rd; MR = Madingley Rd

Table B General principles/priorities

B General principles/priorities		Notes
1	Safety of pedestrians - cyclists to be discouraged from using pavement	If cyclists feel safe and are safe on the road they will be less likely to use the pavement.
2	Safety of cyclists – cyclists to have priority over cars at junctions	Redesign blind corner at cul-de-sac to give cyclists priority with clear route and prevent cyclists being forced into oncoming traffic.
3	Prevent lorries using SW as through road	Any barrier should be at least as narrow as the existing structure. Signage stressing no through road for HGVs should be improved [HR road done]. Add 6'6" triangles to the 20mph post at MR and HR junctions.
4	Lorries needing to access SW to be able to turn safely rather than reverse into HR/MR	Lorries cannot turn at the HR side of the bollards. They frequently do this with difficulty in the cul-de-sac creating a danger to pedestrians and cyclists, obstructing traffic and damaging property.
5	Discourage traffic from exceeding 20mph limit	Alter road at five locations to reduce speeding: MR junction; Fitzwilliam bend; Cul-de-sac junction; HR junction; location of barrier General points: 1) A barrier anywhere will slow traffic at that point. 2) Steeper road humps everywhere and raised platforms at the two corners (cul-de-sac and Fitzwilliam) would discourage speeding. 3) An electronic speed indicator telling motorists how fast they are going could be effective. 4) Narrowing junctions and changing curved bends into right angles will force vehicles to slow down.
9	Minimise pollution	Minimise through traffic and waiting vehicles. Encourage a safe cycle environment.

Table C Opportunities to discourage/slow traffic down in Storey's Way

C Opportunities to discourage/slow traffic down in Storey's Way		
Five locations in Storey's Way to discourage/slow traffic down: 1) Madingley Rd (MR) junction; 2) Fitzwilliam Corner; 3) Cul-de-sac corner; 4) Huntingdon Rd (HR) junction; 5) Future location of the barrier.		
Location & proposed structure		Notes
1	MADINGLEY RD JUNCTION	Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) is funding MR improvements for cyclists and pedestrians including MR junction
2	FITZWILLIAM CORNER	
	Reduce width, remove curved bend and create right angle corner with raised platform across entire corner. Consider red lines outside Fitzwilliam College near corner.	The Master of Fitzwilliam College noted the danger of crossing from the Master's house on the corner to the college. Prevent coaches/taxis waiting on the double yellow lines outside Fitzwilliam entrance.
3	CUL-DE-SAC CORNER	
	Create T-junction and raised platform with signs indicating direction to/from HR/MR. No through road sign for cul-de-sac. Islands either side of platform.	Removal of current bollards will remove existing problem of blind corner. New structure must discourage cars from travelling faster and allow lorries to turn.
4	HUNTINGDON RD JUNCTION	
	A cobbled entrance or raised platform would visually deter through traffic. An island in SW would deter lorries/traffic.	HR cycle lane re-done April 2019. "No through road for HGVs" sign funded by SWRA installed 2016.
5	BARRIER LOCATION	Conditions/Issues
	Could be relocated. Could allow or prevent through traffic	Barrier should be in central section of SW to enable large vehicles to turn without backing into HR or MR. Fitzwilliam and Churchill to have vehicle access to MR. Barrier should be far enough from corner to allow visibility for cars turning corner and to minimise traffic queuing round corner. Location near no. 70 is far enough from corner to give cars time to see queue in good time to stop.

END

Oral submission to the Economy and Environment Committee Meeting

Integrated Transport Block Funding Allocation Report

5 March 2020

My name is Philip Trathan and I am speaking as a resident of the spur, close to the point where Storey's Way merges with the Ridgeway Cycle Path.

Many residents, including myself, have become increasingly concerned about the safety of cyclists and pedestrians between the Ridgeway and the permeable traffic barriers on Storey's Way. In the past 12 months I know of three accidents involving cyclists. One occurred just after a cyclist had passed the barrier heading north to Huntingdon Road, this resulted in an ambulance being called. Two others involved cyclists avoiding other bicycles on the spur.

Residents concerned about this problem would be grateful if you would consider the Report prepared in November 2019 by the Chair of the local Residents Association.

The Ridgeway is a key cycle route from Girton through Eddington into the City. As Eddington becomes more populated, cycle traffic is increasing. Cycle traffic arises from commuters, shoppers using the new Sainsbury's supermarket, and parents with children attending either the nursery at Eddington or the University of Cambridge primary school. Many parents now use cargo-bikes to carry one or more children. With the growth of the West Cambridge site, cyclists also increasingly commute from North Cambridge to the West Cambridge site along this route.

The width restriction bollards have always been confusing for cyclists, cars and vans. In particular, cyclists often navigate through the wrong route, using the wrong side of the road. Medium sized vans regularly hit the bollards. Though there are width restriction signs at the entrance to Storey's Way, large lorries still attempt to use the road as a rat-run, and find they cannot pass through the barrier. When they attempt to turn, they often create major hazards for all other users.

A survey of residents in 2019 showed that there was strong feeling within the road. Approximately 89% of all residents (that is 64 of 72 houses) responded to the survey. Of these, 89% (that is 57 of 64 respondents) wanted some form of change. However, residents differed on how to tackle safety in the road. Professional re-design of the traffic flow in Storey's Way, including the structure and position of the width restriction, would now appear urgent.

We look forward to hearing from you and working with you so that improvements can be made in the road to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians, in line with County Policy.

Philip Trathan

32 Storey's Way

Cambridge

CB3 0DT

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**Minutes - Action Log**

This is the updated minutes action log and captures the actions arising from the most recent Economy and Environment Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

ACTIONS FROM THE 16TH JANUARY 2020 COMMITTEE**JANUARY 2020**

MINUTE NO.	REPORT TITLE	ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY	ACTION	COMMENTS	STATUS
304.	FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – NOVEMBER 2019				
	Expenditure Query on Cycling Schemes	Andy Preston	<p>The following issues were raised by the Council's Cycling Champion referencing page 142 regarding expenditure for a number of cycling schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fenstanton to the Busway - requesting more detail to be provided on what a Creation Order was. • Referencing the text on the Rampton and Willingham scheme 		

			<p>stating that it was not able to delivered as more than a £100k was required, requested more detail on the status of the scheme.</p> <p>Officers agreed to take the two issues raised away and provide a written answer outside of the meeting.</p>	<p>A response was sent on 24th March and is included as Appendix 1 to this Minute action Log.</p>	<p>ACTION COMPLETED</p>
ACTIONS FROM THE 5th MARCH 2020 COMMITTEE					
MINUTE NO.	REPORT TITLE	ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY	ACTION	COMMENTS	STATUS
310.	PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS				
	<p>a) Petition to widen and provide overhead lighting for the DNA Cycleway</p>	<p>Andy Preston / Grant Weller</p>	<p>Since the original petition the petitioner Mark Troll had been informed that the current path would be removed and relocated. He therefore concentrated his request at the meeting on installing Solar-powered overhead lights as being an immediate solution to the presentations highlighted hazards.</p>	<p>A written response was sent to the petitioner on 24th March and is included as Appendix 2 to this Minute Action Log.</p> <p>The CMIS e-petitions site was updated on 1st April so all petitioners who signed the petition were sent the response.</p>	<p>ACTION COMPLETED</p>

	<p>b) Public Question from Sam Davies regarding Fendon Road Rounabout</p>	<p>Andy Preston</p>	<p>"In November 2016, this committee approved the project to redesign Fendon Road roundabout and cycle provision on Queen Edith's Way at a cost of £1.425m. Subsequent documents indicate that £800k was allocated to the roundabout works. In February 2020, six months after the roundabout works had commenced, the County Council announced that the cost of the roundabout works alone had increased by 125% to £1.8m. Could the Committee please explain at what point members were made aware of the increased costs, and what the approvals process is for the excess, including decisions about which other S106 schemes will be scaled down or postponed?"</p>	<p>A written response was sent to Sam Davies on Friday 20th March as set out in Appendix 3 to this minute action log.</p>	<p>ACTION COMPLETED</p>
	<p>c) Public Question from Doctor Barnali Ghosh</p>	<p>Andy Preston</p>	<p>"Recent communication indicated that this project is delayed by three months. As an engineer myself, I am interested to know the cost over-run and how this will be procured. I am also interested to see the schedule of services planned and how the</p>	<p>A written response was sent to Doctor Ghosh on Friday 20th March and is set out in Appendix 4 to this minute action log.</p>	<p>ACTION COMPLETED</p>

			principal contractor is performing against the contract.”		
311.	INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROPOSALS				
	Reducing length of Panel meetings making decisions on individual schemes	Action: Richard Lumley	Concerns were raised by members and the Chairman regarding the length of time panels were expected to meet to make decisions, citing a panel meeting of over 11 hours which was not seen as being efficient. There was a request that this should be reviewed and improvements suggested initially for consideration by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.	An e-mail response was sent to the Committee on 25 th March explaining that ordinarily the LHI panel meetings are held over two days where there are large numbers of applications for the panel to review. This year there was an issue with Member availability in a couple of the areas, with members cancelling at short notice. This left a small window to rearrange the panels before the March Highways & Infrastructure Committee, at which the prioritisation lists were to be approved. Officers worked with local members to agree new dates and times, taking on board the member preference to hold panels in one sitting rather than across two days. The LHI process is being looked at and the concern around panel length will be included for consideration going forward.	ACTION ONGOING

	Review of scoring criteria to help review to achieve more equitable distribution of funding across the county.	Action: Elsa Evans / Andy Preston	There had been a number of Fenland schemes put forward but on scoring against the criteria they had received low scores. Officers were asked to look into how a more equitable distribution of funding across the region could be achieved in the future. This could include rural isolation weighting. Further to this, the Committee requested that officers review the current criteria for ways to improve its equitability and come back initially to the Chairman and Vice Chairman with any proposed amendments.	A response was sent on 26 th March 2020 explaining that officers' intention was to review the ITB prioritisation methodology in the summer in advance of prioritisation in the autumn for the 2021/22 funding allocation. Review would then be reported to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman later in the summer for their initial consideration, with any changes to the criteria to be the subject of a report back to Committee.	ACTION ONGOING
315.	GRANTS TO COMMUNITY PROVIDERS	Paul Nelson Public Transport Manager	The high cost of Ely and Soham Community Transport (ESACT) at £10.38 cost per passenger was seen as a concern. There was a request to investigate further the current publicity arrangements currently undertaken to inform the community of	An e-mail response from the Public Transport Manager was sent to the Committee on 25 th March explaining that the County Council includes information on all community transport and car schemes on our website at the following link: https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/community-transport	

			the Service and consider how they might be improved.	He further explained that as the community transport operators are independent organisations, they are responsible for promoting their activities. However officers had contacted ESACT to see what work they have done in this area. They have contacted outlets in East Cambridgeshire asking them to display leaflets, but at the date of the email only Soham library had responded. In view of this response, which echoed the concern of councillors at the meeting, officers will work with them to increase the availability of their information in the district.	ACTION ONGOING
317.	FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – JANUARY 2020	Sarah Heywood/ Graham Hughes	The Chairman asked officers to raise with the Chief Finance Officer the question of the Minutes / notes of the Officer Capital Board being made available to all members of the Council.	An e-mail response was sent to the Committee on 27 th March attaching the notes of the last two meetings further to the request that Members wanted to know about any capital overspends in their division at the earliest opportunity and before they were publicly declared. However, it was highlighted that the officer meeting notes would not provide this information, as issues only go to the Capital Programme Board and into the Finance Monitoring Report once they are quantified, rather than when they first appear as a potential issue. To ensure that local Members were made aware of potential issues and	

				actual issues at the earliest opportunity, Sarah Heywood the Strategic Finance Business Partner would ask the Capital Programme Board to write to all project leads to request when any potential issues or actual issues arise with a capital scheme the local Members were informed and kept up to date at the earliest opportunity.	ACTION COMPLETED
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

Appendix 1

Request for more detail at the January E and E Committee on two cycling schemes

Dear Councillor Kavanagh

At the January Economy and Environment Committee when considering the Finance Report for the period to the end of November you raised the following two issues from page 142 of the report which referenced expenditure for a number of cycling schemes:

- a) Fenstanton to the Busway – you asked for more detail on what a Creation Order was.
- b) Referencing the text on the Rampton and Willingham scheme stating that it was not able to be delivered as more than a £100k was required, you requested more detail on the status of the scheme.

Officers have more been able to provide the following additional information:

- a) **Fenstanton to the Busway** - Currently a footpath that links Fenstanton to the Busway. A Creation Order is being implemented to change the status from a Public Footpath to a bridleway which will then permit cyclists to use it legally. it's currently going through it's due process (advertisements etc) with support from the Parish Council. Funding to upgrade the surface is in place and works are scheduled to commence April/May 2020.
- b) **Rampton to Willingham Scheme** – this was allocated funding (£100k) for 2019/20 through the Integrated Transport Block. The original proposal included improving a quiet road, Iram Drove and adding signage. The March E&E report from Elsa Evans regarding the ITB funding made reference to this scheme not progressing due to the £100k budget not being feasible and the funding being reallocated within the overall pot. Officers looking into this indicate that this Drove is of concrete construction, in poor condition and would therefore require more than the

allotted £100K to improve and make it a viable link. I also recall Councillor Wotherspoon commenting at the meeting that the length of the road also added to its cost unviability. In the end, an alternative access to the Busway from Willingham was achieved through the Greenways Quick Win scheme which included widening the footpath on both sides of the road from the signalised junction in Willingham to Longstanton busway.

I hope this additional information is of assistance. Should you require any further detail, please contact Grant Weller whose contact information is included below and who has also been copied into this e-mail.

Grant Weller

Interim Team Leader - Cycling Infrastructure

Tel : 01223 706121

Mobile : 07769 362889

Kind regards

Rob Sanderson

Democratic Services Officer

Telephone 01223 699181

Email: Rob.Sanderson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Appendix 2

RESPONSE TO PETITION ON THE REQUEST TO PROVIDE OVERHEAD LIGHTING AT THE DNA CYCLE PATH

Dear Mark

Many thanks for taking the time to attend and present the above petition regarding the request to provide overhead lighting at the DNA cycle path.

Cambridgeshire County Council is aware that the DNA path has become increasingly popular since it was installed. Given the proposals surrounding the new Cambridge South Station the path will now be looked at as part of this development, which will itself further increase demand for cycling capacity. We will therefore be looking at all aspects of the path including its width and alignment to ensure it looks to provide the necessary standard of infrastructure to cater for current and future growth.

Illumination of rural cycle ways is a more challenging issue with numerous factors that need to be considered and balanced against the benefit it provides. Consideration of the risk of injury to cyclists and pedestrians is clearly of utmost importance. This should be based on injury data and the

severity of those injuries to ensure that funding is prioritised to the highest risk areas. As you have highlighted, this data is not always readily available, so it does make quantifying the risk less straight forward, but the Council is not aware of a significant ongoing issue along the DNA path.

There are also sensitivities around lighting rural paths of this nature, as it is widely recognised to have a significant impact on the environment, including wildlife habitat and it's ecological dependence on darkness.

Your suggestion of solar powered lights is an interesting one, given the progression and development in recent years. As you highlighted at Committee however, they still remain a very expensive option in comparison to standard units. Our experience of a handful of units that exist across the County is that they have been fraught with maintenance difficulties. This has included battery capacity that doesn't allow for all night lighting capabilities and there have also been instances of theft of the lighting units. The lack of major manufacturers mass producing such lighting units does also make it very onerous to maintain this kind of lighting.

Taking all of the above into account and given the future review of this path as part of the Cambridge South Station development, considering the implementation of temporary solar lighting is not recommended at this time.

Councillor Ian Bates
Chairman, Economy & Environment Committee

Appendix 3

Delayed Works to Fendon Way Roundabout –response to a public question from Sam Davies

Dear Sam,

Thank you for taking the time to attend and submit a question to the 5th March 2020 Economy and Environment Committee. In response to the following question that you raised:

"In November 2016, this committee approved the project to redesign Fendon Road roundabout and cycle provision on Queen Edith's Way at a cost of £1.425m. Subsequent documents indicate that £800k was allocated to the roundabout works. In February 2020, six months after the roundabout works had commenced, the County Council announced that the cost of the roundabout works alone had increased by 125% to £1.8m. Could the Committee please explain at what point members were made aware of the increased costs, and what the approvals process is for the excess, including decisions about which other S106 schemes will be scaled down or postponed?"

The work to Fendon Road Roundabout is part of a wider programme of cycling schemes with approved funding from developer contributions totalling £3 million. An estimated cost of £1.425M within this budget was identified for the Queen Edith's Way scheme, with the Fendon Rd roundabout

improvements the only current measures approved for delivery. Since then further site specific developer contributions have been received, alongside an additional £550k that was successfully secured towards the roundabout from the Department for Transport in 2018. The £800k cost is not a figure that has been included in reports to Committee, but was an early estimate of the Fendon Rd works before the scheme had been fully developed back in 2018. It was however mistakenly used in the media release that was issued prior to construction starting, which we can only apologise for and a review of how this happened is underway. The project is not yet finished, but it is estimated the final cost of the roundabout will be around £1.8m. Members were first made aware of the delay and likely forecast cost increase throughout January and February this year, as the implications became clearer. This was on the basis that a full detailed report outlining the position would be presented to Economy & Environment Committee at the earliest opportunity. This is currently scheduled for May and will also recommend a way forward with the wider programme of cycling schemes in the south of the city.

Councillor Ian Bates
Chairman, Economy & Environment Committee

Appendix 4

Delayed Works to Fendon Way Roundabout –response to a public question from Doctor Ghosh

Dear Dr Ghosh,

Thank you for submitting the following question below which was considered by the Economy and Environment Committee on the 5th March 2020. As there was no report on the Agenda officers were asked to consider further this question and provide a written response.

“Recent communication indicated that this project is delayed by three months. As an engineer myself, I am interested to know the cost over-run and how this will be procured. I am also interested to see the schedule of services planned and how the principal contractor is performing against the contract.”

The project has been procured through the County Council's Highways Term Maintenance Contract under the New Engineering Contract (NEC) Option C terms and conditions. The work to divert utility apparatus is not included within this contract, this has to be arranged with each utility company on an individual basis. Whilst the Council's Contractor cannot physically move or work on utility apparatus, some preparatory work is included within contract. Any delays or issues with diverting or working around utility apparatus therefore has the potential to have an impact on our Contractor and requires close collaborative working between all parties. Before the scheme started we worked with utility companies to identify a lot of work, however, there is always the risk that the full extent of what is required is often not known until work starts. The additional work has involved re-routing and diverting cables away from the centre of the roundabout and building new chambers. In total, almost 700m of new ducting has been installed, a new telegraph pole built, more than 200m of ducting moved, new chambers constructed and six new water valves/fire hydrants built on the edges of the scheme.

The additional required diversionary work that was uncovered has therefore required further significant work by utility companies, as well as our Contractor. This required new agreements with the utility companies involved, as well as instructed changes to the contract with our own Contractor, which are priced in accordance with the contract and associated additional time added to the contract programme.

The Council and its Contractor has worked hard with the utility companies to ensure they were on site at the same time to carry out the work quicker than normal. However, their presence on site has reduced the amount of work our Contractor has been able to do, but if it had been done separately it would have had the potential to add a further five months to the programme.

The project is progressing well and is not yet finished, but it is estimated the final cost of the roundabout will be around £1.8m. A full detailed report will be present to Economy and Environment Committee in May, where a decision on the way forward with the £3m programme of cycle schemes in the south of the city will be agreed.

Councillor Ian Bates
Chairman, Economy & Environment Committee

King's Dyke Level Crossing Closure Scheme

To: **Economy and Environment Committee**

Meeting Date: **23rd April 2020**

From: **Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place & Economy**

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

Forward Plan ref: **2020/002** *Key decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **To inform the Committee of the outcome of the procurement process for the Design and Construction contract for the Kings Dyke Level Crossing closure scheme, and to seek Committee's approval to award the contract to the preferred bidder subject to the approval of further funding by General Purposes Committee.**

Recommendation: **The Economy and Environment Committee is recommended to:**

- a) Note the procurement process which, subject to approval, will reduce the budget required for the scheme by almost £10 million when compared to the previous construction contract price;**
- b) Approve the award of the Design and Construction contract to the preferred bidder as detailed in section 2.8 of this report, subject to approval of further funding by General Purposes Committee;**
- c) Support the recommendation to General Purposes Committee that additional funding of £2.018 million be allocated to the scheme;**
- d) Support the recommendation to General Purposes Committee that a £1.5 million Covid-19 risk contingency be created;**
- e) Delegate authority to the Executive Director - Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the relevant Committee to use the Covid-19 contingency in relation to risks directly related to the Covid 19 pandemic to aid to project delivery.**

Officer contact:		Member contacts:	
Name:	Andrew Preston	Names:	Cllr. Ian Bates/Cllr Tim Wotherspoon
Post:	Assistant Director, Infrastructure & Growth	Post:	Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	andrew.preston@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Tim.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715664	Tel:	01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 15th August 2019, the Economy and Environment (E&E) Committee approved the procurement of a new Design and Construction contract for the Kings Dyke scheme. This decision followed a significant increase in the proposed construction contract price from the previous contractor. A link to the report that informed this decision can be found at the end of this report.
- 1.2 At the time this meant that the budget required would have needed to increase to £41.6 million, almost £12 million more than the approved budget of £29.98 million. This was on the basis that the construction target price had increased from £15.9 million to £26.2 million plus associated contingencies. The breakdown can be found in the confidential appendix of this report.
- 1.3 The August 2019 E&E Committee agreed that the procurement of the new Design and Construction contract should proceed as an open market tender. This had to be conducted as a European Union (EU) tender as the estimated contract value was above the European Procurement threshold. A restricted two stage tender process was followed.

2. MAIN ISSUES

Procurement

- 2.1 The first stage of the procurement process was publication of a contract notice in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) on 1st October 2019 and the issue of Selection Questionnaires (SQ). The SQ invites an interested provider to make a submission which is evaluated for financial and safety suitability, along with capacity and relevant experience, particularly with respect to some of the likely risks involved in delivering the project. The SQ received an excellent response with nine contractors expressing interest in the Design and Construction contract.
- 2.2 All nine SQ submissions were evaluated and the highest scoring contractors were invited to tender. The Invitation to Tender (ITT) was issued on 19th November 2019 to the six contractors considered most suitable.
- 2.3 A four month tender period then followed, which included 83 tender clarifications to questions from bidders and two specific opportunities for bidders to check design assumptions with the Council.
- 2.4 Independent specialist planning advice was also provided to bidders by the Local Planning Authority in response to the potential impact of any proposed design changes. This was on

the basis that the design must comply with the current planning consent and only non-material amendments were permitted.

- 2.5 This tender period closed on 13th March 2020 and three of the six contractors submitted a final tender. Unfortunately one of the tenders was deemed to be non-compliant and therefore subsequently had to be rejected from the process. This was on the basis that the proposed design was outside the planning permission red line boundary. The ITT contained a fundamental requirement that all proposals must remain inside this boundary, otherwise a new planning permission would be required, which was not acceptable.
- 2.6 The tender required a quality submission to demonstrate how the contractors proposed to build a high quality product to meet the requirements of the County Council, along with a target cost for the design and construction of the scheme. The tenders were submitted on the LGSS e-tendering system and the cost and quality submissions were evaluated by independent teams. No cost information was shared with the quality evaluation team until the evaluations had been completed. The scores for each component were then combined to give an overall score. The overall score was calculated on a ratio 60% price to 40% quality to identify the preferred bidder. The evaluation was undertaken by officers and consultants and independently moderated by LGSS Procurement Officers.
- 2.7 At this stage in the procurement process information on the bidders and details of the tendered prices are confidential. The overall result of the evaluation is set out in Table 1 below, with further details in the confidential Appendix 1.

Table 1 - Tender evaluation scores

Bidder	Financial Score (Max 60%)	Quality Score (Max 40%)	Total Score %
Bidder 1	60.00	23.00	83.00
Bidder 2	47.93	17.50	65.43

- 2.8 From the table it can be seen that Bidder 1 has provided the most economically advantageous tender and also scored highest in both financial and quality assessments. It is therefore recommended that the contract for the design and construction of the Kings Dyke Level Crossing closure scheme is awarded to Bidder 1. Details of the bidders' tendered prices are shown in the confidential Appendix 1 that will be circulated to committee members.
- 2.9 Subject to approval of the recommendations in this report and those to General Purposes Committee, the formal notification of the intention to award the contract will be immediately issued to all shortlisted contractors, which will trigger the stand still period. When undertaking a procurement exercise that is above the EU thresholds, a standstill period must be held before awarding the contract. The mandatory standstill period gives

unsuccessful bidders at least ten calendar days after being notified of an award decision to challenge the decision before the contract is signed with the successful bidder.

- 2.10 At the end of the stand still period the details of the contract award can be made publicly available, including the name of the bidder and tender price. This information will be included within the contract award notice in the OJEU and the Council will actively communicate this information.

Financial Implications

- 2.11 Whilst the confidential Appendix 1 shows the overall estimated budget now required to deliver the scheme has reduced by almost £10 million from the previous tender exercise, a further £2.018 million more than the currently allocated budget is still required to deliver the scheme when all expected expenditure and contingencies are included. With these, the total cost of the scheme and budget required is expected to be £32m compared to the previous figure of £41.6m
- 2.12 The breakdown included in the confidential Appendix 1 shows that this is based on the significant reduction in the preferred bidders' tender price over the Council's previous contractor in August 2019, despite the additional forecast costs associated with re-tendering and re-negotiation of land licenses.
- 2.13 The current approved scheme budget of £29.98 million is made up of £5.58 million from the County Council (Local Transport Bodies and residual capital), £8 million Growth Deal funding approved by the former Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and £16.4 million from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) Transforming Cities Fund.
- 2.14 The Growth Deal funding has now been fully spent and a funding agreement between the County Council and the CPCA formalises further expenditure of the £16.4 million Transforming Cities funding. The funding agreement also contains provision for any further costs above or below the current budget figure to be apportioned on the basis of 60% from/to the CPCA and 40% from/to the County Council.
- 2.15 The County Council's General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 23rd April 2020 will be asked to fund the additional £2.018 million required for this scheme. However, this is on the understanding that a £1.21 million contribution towards this cost will be sought from the CPCA, in accordance with the funding agreement. Whilst all further monies need to be fully quantified and secured, the full amount of additional funding is being sought from GPC to allow a contract for the scheme to be signed as soon as possible and not be delayed.
- 2.16 The business case for allocating further funding to this project remains very strong. As reported previously, the independently reviewed Major Schemes Business Case (MSBC) prepared in line with the Department for Transport (DfT) WebTag guidelines demonstrated very high levels of benefits from the scheme compared to its cost.
- 2.17 In fact the economic and transport user benefits were valued to be 8.37 times greater than the estimated cost to deliver this scheme. This is an exceptionally high benefit to cost ratio (BCR) with a figure in excess of 2 usually deemed to represent excellent value for money by the DfT.

2.18 The change in estimated scheme cost is unlikely to have a meaningful impact on a BCR of 8.37, however, the exercise to update it needs to be completed and is underway. This will be reported verbally to both Economy & Environment and General Purposes Committees.

Programme

2.19 The current timeline for project completion and the initial realisation of benefits is as follows, subject to successfully securing approvals for additional funding;

May 2020	Sign contract with preferred contractor
June 2020	Work to finalise design commences
December 2020	Construction commences
December 2022	Construction complete

2.20 It should be noted that there are risks that could potentially impact on this timeline and the revised and updated costed risk register can be found in Appendix 2 of this report. It is this list of risks that, when added together, set the value of the risk contingency that has been allowed for within the total estimated budget required. The more significant key programme risks from this register are listed below;

- agreement of final construction contract terms.
- completion of utility diversions. Ideally need to be carried out before construction commences. (May be carried out alongside construction but this brings some additional risk).
- Agreement of Network Rail possessions which need to be coordinated with the revised construction programme.
- Delays in gaining necessary Network Rail approvals
- Significant adverse weather
- Unforeseen ground conditions.

2.21 All red rated risks will be reported to E&E Committee on a monthly basis alongside financial and programme information within the monthly finance monitoring report.

Coronavirus (Covid-19) Pandemic

2.22 The outbreak of the Coronavirus pandemic has the potential to have a significant impact on this project. However, given the rapidly changing position with the virus and government responses, it is difficult to accurately quantify the risks. This is made even more challenging by it not being possible to discuss the impact with the preferred bidder until the notification of award has been issued following Committee approval.

2.23 The risk of impact on the design and construction contract is a Council owned risk and has the potential to lead to significant cost and programme increases. These could be caused by a range of issues, from materials not being available from suppliers to loss of capacity or productivity due to the availability of resources or required changes to working practices.

- 2.24 When discussions can take place with the chosen contractor, these risks can be more fully considered and potential options available to mitigate them identified. However, even at that stage, the nature of the risk will be uncertain and will depend on the course of the pandemic and actions to contain it throughout the year and outside of the Council and contractors control. Therefore, it is recommended that a specific Covid-19 project contingency budget be created to allow the project to proceed as quickly as possible and without the need for a further Committee cycle as long as the risks identified are within this contingency budget.
- 2.25 Committee is therefore asked to recommend to General Purposes Committee that a specific Covid-19 contingency budget of £1.5 million be created to fund any additional costs directly associated with the project caused by the impact of Covid-19. This budget would only be required where the impact cannot be reasonably avoided and closely managed risk mitigation controls will be in place to minimise the impact, in collaboration with the contractor.
- 2.26 It is proposed that all requests for use of this contingency be reviewed and approved by the Executive Director, Place & Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee. These decisions will be reported to E&E Committee on a monthly basis within the Finance Monitoring report and spending against the main project budget and the Covid-19 contingency will be clearly identified separately.
- 2.27 Whilst GPC is being asked to allocate the full amount of this additional Covid-19 contingency, it is proposed that discussions take place with the Combined Authority to fund this on a 60:40 basis as with the additional project funding noted in paragraph 2.15.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Eliminating the delays at the level crossing will help to promote growth in the local area. This will help to promote jobs, business and housing.
- Both roundabouts have been sized to allow the 4th arm to be constructed which will open up development potential to the south.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

- This transport scheme is aimed at reducing vehicle delays and congestion thereby reducing emissions from slower moving traffic or idling engines.
- The closure of the level crossing will facilitate an increase in train paths for both freight and passenger use of the rail network, reducing Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) and car movements.
- The assessed quality submissions showed that the Contractor's design seeks to minimise carbon emitted in construction by reducing vehicle movements and selecting materials with low carbon embodiment.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

- The report above sets out details of significant resource implications in Section 2.16 onwards. Committee is asked to note the increased costs of £2.018m and request General Purposes Committee to approve the additional funding from Prudential Borrowing. This will reduce to £807,200 if the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority approves its 60% share of this increase, in accordance with the funding agreement. The annual cost of this £807k additional prudential borrowing will start at £40k per annum and decrease each year thereafter over 40 years.
- A Target Cost Contract has been selected, therefore actual costs will be paid (but subject to a pain/gain mechanism). The Target Price will vary to reflect any increase or decrease in the scope of the work required. In construction projects where unpredictable issues may arise, costs will almost certainly vary from the agreed Target Cost. At the end of the contract, any variance between the final target price and actual cost is apportioned between the contractor and the employer, allowing the contractor to share any savings made or to contribute towards overspend. This mechanism incentivises all parties to work collaboratively to deliver the project as economically as possible as underspends (gain) or overspends (pain) are shared in an agreed proportion.
- The contract is being managed and supervised in accordance with New Engineering Contract (NEC) requirements. All claimed costs and adjustments to the target price will be assessed by the NEC Project Manager, including specialist cost consultants, in negotiation with the contractor to ensure that they are justified, evidenced and demonstrate value for money.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- A restricted OJEU process has been completed in accordance with contract procedure rules.
- Contract implications relating to Covid-19 are included in section 2.22 to 2.30 above.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

Risks are detailed in the Risk Register presented to this Committee 5th March 2020 and updated in the Appendix. The register will be monitored throughout the project and mitigation agreed with relevant parties.

All red rated risks will be reported to E&E Committee on a monthly basis alongside financial and programme information within the monthly finance monitoring report.

The following bullet points set out significant implications identified by Officers:

- Risk categories include project funding, governance and technical risks such as coordinating work with Network Rail and Statutory Undertakers, unforeseen ground conditions, contaminated material and construction in Star Pit
- Additionally, there is a risk with Network Rail possessions not being available when required. It will be the responsibility of the successful contractor to organise and book the required possessions to suit its programme.
- The preferred bidder has not allowed what is thought to be an adequate risk allowance within their tender price. There is therefore a risk that the actual cost of the project may exceed the target price at completion. Under the pain/gain share percentage mechanism within the contract, the Council would be liable for a share of these additional costs above the target price. An appropriately priced risk has therefore been incorporated into the priced risk contingency.
- Challenges from unsuccessful tenderers.
- Health and Safety on the scheme will be managed in accordance with all relevant legislation, including the Construction Design and Management Regulations 2015 and all other relevant legislation.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category. An Equalities Impact Assessment screening has been undertaken for the project previously.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The following sets out significant implications identified by Officers:

- A public engagement event on 12th August 2019 reaffirmed the preferred scheme option and was successfully followed up on 30th October 2019 with a more detailed discussion from a group of residents around 250-260 Peterborough Road.
- Further engagement will be undertaken in-line with the Communications Plan that will be overseen by the Project Board and Member Advisory Group.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The following sets out significant implications identified by Officers:

- As set out above, local County, Town and District members will be engaged in the project via a Local Liaison Group. The first meeting was held on 19th February 2020 and further meetings will be arranged as and when required.

- This group may refer any concerns it may have to the King’s Dyke Project Board or to the Member Advisory Group.

4.7 Public Health Implications

- The removal of the significant amount of traffic congestion currently caused by the level crossing will have a positive impact on air and noise pollution, which cause a wide range of health problems.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Jon Collyns
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council’s Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Elsa Evans
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Andrew Preston
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	No Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
<p>Kings Dyke Economy and Environment Committee Report, Decision Summary and Minutes from 15th August 2019</p> <p>General project documentation including Major Schemes Business Case.</p>	<p>https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1048/Committee/5/Default.aspx</p> <p>https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-projects/kings-dyke-crossing</p>

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.		Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	
Risk/Opportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	—	1.01	Contractor becomes insolvent (at, or after, signed contract; or during works)	Delay to scheme delivery and increase of costs due to re-procurement for a new contractor. Potential for members to overturn the decision to proceed	Start of works date	3	3	9	Manage. A parent company guarantee and surety bond is required as part of the contract. Full OJEU process has been carried out. Investigate NEC Force Majeure clauses, pertinent to Coronavirus. Tenderers all passed finance checks in SQ.	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	—	1.02	Major event e.g. CCC Business Continuity Plan enacted	Unable to receive deliverables when required delaying scheme delivery. Staff shortages or inefficiency thro Social Distancing. Loss of MID support during BCP event	Cost increase	5	4	20	Monitor. Risk mitigation within BCP reduces risk. Plan for any alternate methods of deliver of materials. Social Distancing and increased PPE/special measures onsite.	4	3	12
Risk	LIVE	—	1.03	Ongoing works disrupted/paused owing to major event e.g. environmental or political protest.	Delay to scheme delivery caused by the event e.g. access to site is impeded. Potential damage to the sites or site establishment	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Ensure site is secure. Discuss elements of work possible under Social Distancing.	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	1.04	Market forces causes significant unforeseen costs/delays e.g. materials shortages or delay, cost of borrowing, parent company insolvency	Potential increase in costs and delays. Loss of productivity due to reduced availability of plant/labour/materials	Cost increase	3	4	12	Monitor. Regular communication with the contractor to assess any Brexit impacts on the organisation or the scheme. Review possibility of stockpiling materials. Purchase long lead items from Europe as early as possible	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▲	1.05	Major IT outage or virus attack causes loss of data or denial of service	Loss of data could jeopardise programme dates and lead to reputational impact. Risk of GDPR breaches and possible fines	Cost increase	2	4	8	Manage. Use cloud-based software. Keep security settings up-to-date. Ensure CCC network receives updates	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	1.06	Staffing - lack of capacity/skillsets, incapacitated/illness or retention risk (CCC, contractor & its consultants)	Potential for deadlines to be missed, including contractual timelines which would lead to CE's. Inadequate provision to make timely decisions would also delay programme	Start of works date	4	2	8	Manage. Ensure CCC resources in place before contract starts. Review Social Distancing arrangements. Fallback plan for recruiting at short notice. Ensure consultants have adequate resources assigned and a succession plan	3	2	6
Risk	LIVE	▼	1.07	Staffing - LGSS gets changed / disbanded	Loss of continuity of staff. Potential need to procure legal and procurement services thus delaying the project	Start of works date	2	3	6	Monitor. Hold suitable reassurance from LGSS regarding continuity of service. Can key staff members be employed directly?	1	2	2
Risk	LIVE	—	1.08	Additional E&E decisions required when in contract	Delay to project delivery, potential additional costs or E&E calls a halt to the scheme if a CE is too large for the scheme to continue	Start of works date	2	4	8	Monitor. Early engagement with Exec Director	1	3	3
Risk	LIVE	▲	1.09	Coronavirus, Government rules and Social Distancing	Reduction in resources may delay signed contract, start of work and materials deliveries, or cost more	Completion of works date	5	3	15	Manage. Implement Government advice, monitor and implement as the situation progresses. BCP enacted. Log direct cost impacts for future reimbursement from Government.	4	2	8
Risk	LIVE	▲	2.01	Insufficient additional funding available (above currently agreed amount) to commence the construction phase. Or increased need for contingency budget.	Delay to scheme delivery while the shortfall is addressed. Officer time.	Start of works date	3	4	12	Monitor. Funding agreement signed. Request additional funding. Undertake cost challenge exercise. Retender to try and achieve a more competitive price.	2	3	6
Risk	CLOSED	▲	2.02	Insufficient funding available to complete the construction phase becoming apparent once construction has already commenced	Delay to scheme delivery or potential non-delivery of the project. An effective overspend. Political & reputational fallout. Poor public perception of CCC	Cost increase	4	4	16	Manage expenditure proactively. Early warning of expenditure exceeding its forecast profile. Agree parameters of any potential overspend (i.e written agreement of 60:40 cost split with the CA). Contingency budget with control measures in place.	4	3	12

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.		Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	
Risk/Oppportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	▲	2.03	Risk of Pain Share	Increased budget may be required which may impact on programme	Cost increase	4	3	12	Contingency budget with control measures in place. Potential descopeing. Early warnings to senior management. Robust NEC contract mangement in place, incl. Force Majeure	3	3	9
Risk	CLOSED	▲	2.04	Inability to agree a funding agreement with the CA by Committee & Board dates	Delay to signing contract with the contractor. Poor publicity. Delay to starting on site	Start of works date	4	3	12	Negotiate a funding agreement with the CA before CA and Committee dates. Find alternative "bridging" budget. Put in application for Earmarked Reserves budget.	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	—	2.05	Funding not released to CCC in a timely fashion after funding agreement has been signed. Expenditure accrues in the meantime.	Potential delay to delivery if funding is not available. Increased financial/risk exposure to CCC	Start of works date	2	3	6	Submit monthly payment claims to the CA to reduce CCC financial exposure. Escalate at earliest sign of an issue arising. Provide profiled forecast to CA.	1	2	2
Risk	CLOSED	▼	2.06	Major underspend causing reputational damage	Reputational impact on CCC from public perception of the council failing its published targets		2	2	4	Early comms regarding underspend as a positive outcome, due to good management of the contractor	1	1	1
Risk	LIVE	—	2.07	Damages claims by members of the public or businesses, and/or part 1 claims	Additional costs. Potential legal action and need for CCC legal Counsel	Cost increase	3	3	9	Continue comms. Promptly resolve issues, preventing future problems	2	2	4
Risk	LIVE	—	2.08	Committed sums cost more than budgeted for	Additional funding required	Cost increase	3	2	6	Identify as early as possible. Try to push back on the claims	3	2	6
Risk	CLOSED	▲	3.01	CA removes, reduces or postpones funding	Insufficient funding to construct the scheme and the project becomes unviable	Start of works date	3	4	12	Negotiate a funding agreement with the CA early. Review other funding streams. Review CCC's global position on funding	3	3	9
Risk	CLOSED	—	3.02	Change in political leadership, resulting in a change of strategic priorities	Kings Dyke may no longer be a priority for Members increasing the potential for it to be shelved or postponed	Start of works date	2	4	8	Monitor. Engage early with any new Members, briefing them on the legacy for KD as needed. Reiterate the positive BCR from the Business Case	1	4	4
Risk	LIVE	▼	3.03	Stakeholders change their requirements and / or support (e.g. landowners)	Will be more difficult to meet project timescales and there will be delays to delivery. Potential for increased costs due to additional mitigation of objections from stakeholders. Potential legal battle	Cost increase	3	4	12	Monitor. Continue communications with all stakeholders. Prompt liaison with all parties to resolve issues preventing future problems.	2	3	6
Risk	CLOSED	▼	3.04	E&E Committee removes or reduces CCC funding contribution	Insufficient funding and the project becomes unviable	Start of works date	2	4	8	Monitor. Seek approval for any additional funding at the subsequent committee. Agree timescales and mechanism for drawdown of funds	2	4	8
Risk	CLOSED	▲	4.01	CA board date missed due to agenda papers being delayed or not signed off on time	Delay to starting works	Start of works date	4	3	12	Monitor. Project decision to be made by E&E committee independantly of the CA board. CCC to draft first version of the CA Board paper. Communicate progress through the Project Board papers	1	3	3
Risk	CLOSED	▲	4.02	Governance process changes - timelines	Committee dates missed or put back meaning delay to scheme progress	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Check Member services for up-to-date committee dates.	1	3	3
Risk	CLOSED	▼	4.03	CCC Business Case not agreed by CA (as advised by SDG) as a result of revised BCR. Programme delay caused.	Without an approved Business Case the project cannot achieve CCC committee & CA board approval, therefore scheme will be on hold	Start of works date	2	4	8	Monitor. Business Case update following tender moderation. Keep CA informed and liaise with their consultant to resolve queries	1	4	4
Risk	LIVE	▲	4.04	April E&E Committee date missed due to paper taking longer getting through sign off or delay in writing	Delay to scheme progress	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Check Member services for the up-to-date committee dates. Target a date which upholds project timescales	1	3	3
Risk	LIVE	—	5.01	Challenge from marketplace over validity of procurement of the contract	Delay whilst the challenge is being contested. If the challenge is successful then potentially the procurement exercise would need to be re-run	Start of works date	4	3	12	Monitor. Robust procurement carried out overseen by LGSS colleagues. Prompt response to any challenge received.	3	3	9
Risk	CLOSED	▼	5.02	Lack of interest from bidders when retendering for the construction phase.	This could invalidate the competitiveness of the tender and could increase the budget requirements for the project.	Cost increase	2	4	8	Monitor. Supplier engagement event to generate marketplace interest. Carry out restricted OJEU process to reduce chance of contractors declining to bid (i.e. lower chances of success).	2	3	6

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.			Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula
Risk/Oppportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	▼	6.01	Re-tendering could lead to the newly appointed Contractor having to make significant design changes.	This could cause delay, additional design costs and may require additional third party approvals.	Start of works date	3	4	12	Monitor. Robust tender, and contract, to limit design changes which can be undertaken by Contractor	2	3	6
Risk	CLOSED	▼	6.02	Bidders might submit a tender with a design which would be a material change. This would have to be disallowed as a non-compliant bid	Fewer acceptable bids, less innovation and less favourable prices	Start of works date	3	4	12	Manage. Insert pro-forma into tender which bidders submit during the tender. Ensure bidders seek pre-app advice before submitting their bid	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	▼	6.03	Design period takes longer than envisaged	Delay to commencement on site. Poor publicity if start of work is later than December 2020	Start of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Ideal start date inserted into the works information. Chase TAA comment / sign off changes swiftly. Review programme for efficiencies	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	6.04	TAA fails to meet required timescales	Delay to scheme progress and potential CE from contractor	Start of works date	4	3	12	Monitor. Prior agreement with TAA to uphold timescales. Ensure time-critical information is registered and chased by CCC before the deadline	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	6.05	Poor contractor performance causes redesign	Redesign would need to be carried out delaying the scheme and causing additional cost. Abortive costs if the error is discovered during construction.	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Ensure qualified personnel carrying out technical reviews. Ensure correct approval procedures carried out	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.01	Long stop dates on existing temporary land agreements & Licences cost more than forecast	Could lead to further costs if renegotiation needs to take place	Cost increase	5	3	15	Manage. Robust programme, ensure all aware of key dates and risks. Ensure timely key decisions to allow project stages to progress efficiently. Investigate opportunities to condense the programme to avoid passing long-stop dates. Early engagement with landowners and CCC Legal. Revise winning contractor's programme to avoid works processes which depend on affected land.	4	3	12
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.02	Carrying out early Statutory Undertaker apparatus diversionary works, abortive work or the need for further relocation	Additional visits or moving apparatus more than once. Potential delay and additional costs	Start of works date	4	3	12	Manage. Defer work to School Holidays or absorb in mainline works programme. Ensure setting out is carried out Have a supervisor on site during the works to ensure stats are put in the correct place	4	3	12
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.03	Approval of Non-Material Amendment may take longer than planned; especially if pre-commencement planning conditions require discharging as well	Delay to start of works	Start of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Early engagement with CCC Planning colleagues	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.04	Signing a new BAPA with Network Rail might take longer than envisaged	Delay to start of bridge works	Start of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Early engagement with Network Rail. Escalate when necessary	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.05	Unexpected contaminated land discovered during construction	Need to assess scope and nature of the issue, establish remedial work required. Additional cost and delay to works.	Cost increase	3	4	12	Manage. Survey, mitigation and remediation measures to be agreed	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.06	NR - possessions curtailed by Network Rail for operational reasons	Possessions reduced due to operational requirements on network	Completion of works date	3	4	12	Book contingent possessions, cancel if not required (costs associated with this).	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.07	NR - possessions cancelled by Network Rail	Possessions cancelled due to operational requirements on network	Completion of works date	3	4	12	Monitor. Book additional possessions, delay to programme	3	4	12
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.08	Statutory Undertakers (SUs) fail to deliver their works to the agreed programme	Delay to works, additional cost	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Early liaison with SUs, agreed programme of works and resource levels Carry out advanced utility diversion works before construction starts on site	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.09	Unknown services discovered during works	Delay to works - unable to support/divert service if unidentified	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Early engagement with SUs - trail holes & further investigation in Phase 1	2	3	6

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.		Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	
Risk/Opportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.10	Strike underground apparatus during excavations, due to unknown services.	Safety issue, possible investigatory works, delay to project, loss of services	Completion of works date	2	4	8	Manage. Early engagement with SUs. Services apparatus plan for reference during construction. Include 3D model so areas can be investigated prior to excavation. Trail holes to confirm	1	4	4
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.11	Working adjacent to operational railway	Operation of railway is endangered or stopped by the works (collapse of plant, loads, excavations or piling)	Completion of works date	2	4	8	Manage. Works to be agreed with NwR in advance. Submissions made in accordance with NR requirements. Methodology to reflect KD works, relative to the railway.	1	4	4
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.12	Archaeological finds during earthworks, need investigation thus delaying works	Delays to works, additional costs	Completion of works date	2	4	8	Monitor. Liaison with Archaeological team during design period - carry out advance investigations	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.13	Slope instability; through conducting works adjacent to deep water in Star pit	Safety issue, incident/accident involving personnel and/or plant, investigation required	Completion of works date	3	4	12	Manage. Barriers, safety equipment, to be provided	2	4	8
Risk	CLOSED	▼	7.14	Construction works increase local traffic delays	Increased delays on already congested local roads. Public anger and poor publicity	Cost increase	4	3	12	Manage. Understand local road network - where are the problem areas; how can we avoid making them worse? Approved TM schemes & alternate routes	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.15	New Network Rail approvals required if the contractor changes the bridge design	Delay and additional cost from Network Rail	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Early engagement with Network Rail. Escalate when necessary	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.16	Second or third-tier suppliers don't perform adequately (or become insolvent) and primary Contractor does not manage impacts properly	Delay to completion of the scheme. Potential increase in cost	Completion of works date	2	3	6	Monitor. Progress meetings with the main contractor; subcontractors an agenda item. Integrated meetings	1	3	3
Risk	CLOSED	▲	7.17	Major marketplace event e.g. supply of materials disrupted such as bitumen, steel or an increase in cost causes Compensation Events	Additional cost and delay to scheme delivery	Cost increase	4	4	16	Monitor. Review materials and specification for more widely-available, or local, alternatives. Discuss with contractor. Descope project.	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.18	Contractor withholds work or does not uphold programme commitments	Delay to project completion. Poor publicity	Completion of works date	4	4	16	Monitor working relationship with contractor including Social Distances and Government rules. Ensure good comms. Robust contract. Enact Liquidated Damages only if required	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.19	Roadspace or diversion route clashes or Emergency works conflicting with roadspace	Nuisance to the local public, delay in getting material to the site, poor publicity	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Meet streetworks colleagues and contractor. Attend HAUC meeting	2	2	4
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.20	Unforeseen ground conditions	Additional costs and delays to scheme delivery.	Cost increase	3	4	12	Monitor. Ground investigation carried out, reducing likelihood. Carry out additional investigation in pre-construction	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.21	Construction contract takes longer than planned to sign (excluding Covid19)	Delay to commencement of work	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Contract ready to send out once Key Decision made. Dialogue with the contractor to get contract signed promptly	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.22	Contractor not adhering to the terms of the contract leading to arbitration	Potential delay to completion of the scheme and additional costs. Depending on the breach, the contract may need to be terminated leading to reprocurement to complete the construction	Cost increase	2	4	8	Monitor. Ensure terms agreed before contract signed. Use dispute resolution channels before arbitration or termination of contract	1	3	3
Risk	CLOSED	▲	7.23	Contractor submits programme which is longer than dates publicly announced	Poor publicity for CCC and loss in reputation of the council's ability to deliver schemes	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Programme is part of tender evaluation, longer programme will be marked down. If the contractor wins but does not uphold the programme, challenge this robustly. Discuss corrections back to CCC's timescales.	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.24	Remaining planning conditions take longer to discharge than planned	Delay in completion of the scheme. Potential for additional costs	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Early discussion with contractor to make sure condition discharge is programmed with adequate time	2	3	6

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.			Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula
Risk/Oppportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.25	SU apparatus diversions cost more than forecast	Additional costs to the scheme	Cost increase	4	3	12	Monitor. Regular cost updates. Challenge requirements of the diversions. Communicate any additional costs to senior management	4	2	8
Risk	CLOSED	▲	7.26	Premature failure of newly-diverted Statutory Undertaker apparatus leads to programme delays	Apparatus need repairs which could delay the programme	Completion of works date	2	3	6	Monitor. Competent companies and personnel following a quality plan. Sign off each element of work completed. Ensure all apparatus is communicated to the contractor so they are aware	1	3	3
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.27	Version control of documents means it is unclear what the works information, site information and contract data is	Potential delay to scheme and additional costs if different parties are working to different documents	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Ensure comms between NEC PM and the contractor. Use cloud-based software to access the same up-to-date works information	1	2	2
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.28	NR approvals taking longer than the agreed timescales	Delay to approval means a delay to start of works	Start of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Service Agreement with NwR to uphold timescales. Comms, applying pressure to uphold time scales. Escalate promptly if is an issue	3	2	6
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.29	3rd parties add constraint or new requirements (e.g MLC & EA)	Additional cost and delay	Completion of works date	4	3	12	Monitor. Challenge any additional requirements, negotiate with 3rd parties, escalate where necessary	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	7.30	Existing assets requiring repair (e.g tie in details, drainage, barriers, signage etc)	Additional cost and delay	Cost increase	4	3	12	Monitor. Early surveys to identify requirements. Seek funding from maintenance budget, discuss wholelife cost (ie. investing capital to save future revenue maintenance)	3	2	6
Risk	LIVE	—	7.31	Insufficient availability of earthworks materials	If there is limited supply or availability in the area this may increase cost	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Check with contractor as early as possible their source of materials. Ensure contractor safeguards material as soon as they are in contract. Discuss with contractor a backup plan for sourcing local material	2	3	6
Risk	CLOSED	—	7.32	Ground stabilisation is ineffective	Further remedial work required and potential additional design and alternative proposals	Cost increase	2	4	8	Monitor. Ensure robust detailed design has been carried out and is implemented correctly with relevant site checks. Ensure bearing capacity checks are carried out	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	—	7.33	Network Rail require additional approvals over and above their standard requirements	Delay to progress of the scheme whilst the additional approvals / requirements are met	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Monitor. Continue communication with NR and ensure documents are sent as early as possible for sign off	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	—	7.34	Existing carriageway has Tar content	Will increase any disposal costs	Cost increase	2	2	4	Monitor. Carry out cores and test for Tar content prior to construction of the tie in's	2	2	4
Risk	LIVE	—	7.35	Existing carriageway has depth greater than expected	Increase excavation times and cost	Cost increase	3	3	9	Monitor. Carry out cores to identify depth. Look into overlay option of carriageway has sufficient capacity	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.36	If NwR staff costs are waived their performance may decrease	Delay to sign off of documentation leading to delay on site with potential costs from Contractor	Completion of works date	4	3	12	Monitor. Escalate performance issues to senior management. Refer NR to timescales in the BAPA and NR guidance	3	3	9
Risk	CLOSED	▲	7.37	UXO Risk assessment may identify further investigations required on site	Increase costs and potential delay to commencing on site	Start of works date	2	3	6	Manage. Investigations now complete and will be passed to winning contractor before start of works	2	2	4
Risk	LIVE	▲	7.38	Sign off delay if illustrative design does not meet DMRB requirements at time of sign off. Due to clause 305.6.1 of the works information	Delay to completion of the design and potential delay in starting construction	Completion of design works	3	3	9	Manage. Discuss with Contractor throughout design period and instruct early any changes CCC require	3	2	6
Risk	LIVE	▼	8.01	Discovery of unforeseen protected species causes programme delay	Delays to scheme delivery	Completion of works date	4	4	16	Monitor. Carry out ecological mitigation before works start. Ensure surveys in the correct periods and mitigation is in the correct season	3	3	9
Risk	LIVE	▼	8.02	Flood risks delays and damage during construction due to Kings Dyke bursting banks.	Delay to scheme delivery	Completion of works date	2	5	10	Monitor. Contractor's method statement for mitigation. Flood information for sufficient planning. Regular meetings	1	5	5

Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Sequential Reference Number. Use to Group as B	A clear description of the Risk. The drafter should describe the risk e.g. 'The Risk is that...' It is important that the description is carefully worded, to define the scope of that risk.		Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	Brief description of what measures could be taken to reduce or minimise the risk. Could be used to help evaluate.	Select from Dropdown menu	Select from Dropdown menu	Calculated by formula	
Risk/Oppportunity	Current Status	Impact Trend	Ref No.	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Primary impact (time/cost):	Inherent Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating		
							Likelihood	Impact	Score		Likelihood	Impact	Score
Risk	LIVE	▼	8.03	Pollution of local watercourses or groundwater during works	Additional cost for remediation, potential for fines, reputational damage	Cost increase	3	4	12	Monitor. Control measures - silt tanks, spill kits, protection of watercourses	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	—	8.04	Noise, dust, odour and vibration caused by the works	Complaints from residents which may result in programme delays, financial implications and adverse publicity. Vibration in particular could affect Network Rail infrastructure so will need to be monitored	Cost increase	3	3	9	Monitor. Contractor's mitigation measures to reduce construction N&V levels i.e. BPM, barriers, enclosures. Community awareness campaign	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	—	8.05	Damage to existing hedgerows / vegetation during construction	Loss of habitat & cost for making good.	Cost increase	2	3	6	Manage. Understand which hedges are to be kept. Manage construction to limit interaction Consider time of year that construction takes place.	1	3	3
Risk	CLOSED	—	8.06	Discovery of any additional protected species (those not already dealt with e.g. badgers) requires additional survey and relocating work prior to construction	Programme delays while species are relocated as necessary. Newt surveys to be carried out in March-June, delay to construction	Completion of works date	3	4	12	Monitor. Ensure relevant surveys carried out at correct times. Relocation carried out as early as practicable. Consider use of project-wide licence.	2	4	8
Risk	LIVE	—	8.07	Inclement weather, above NEC weather event e.g. flood, drought, freeze or heatwave, winds	Reduced productivity on site, thus delaying scheme delivery	Completion of works date	1	3	3	Monitor. Check weather forecasts. Accelerate works during summer. Carry out as much off-site works as practicable (i.e. precast / steel elements)	1	3	3
Risk	LIVE	—	8.08	Heave or shrinkage of soil due to inclement weather	Further ground stabilisation may be required. Additional cost and delay to completion	Completion of works date	3	3	9	Manage. Plan soil stabilisation works for the most suitable time of year. Embankment construction once stabilisation is complete	2	3	6
Risk	LIVE	▲	9.01	Level of media interest causes a pressure on Officer time, leading to a programme delay.	Priority of workload has been diverted from the construction to managing comms which in turn leads to delays on the project	Cost increase	3	3	9	Monitor. Ensure continued support from specialist comms. Line management to assist with comms activities	2	2	4
Risk	LIVE	▼	9.02	Increased level of public objection, driven by Social Media posts.	CCC may be delayed by the volume of public enquiries making it more difficult to complete tasks to the required timescales. There could also be negative publicity towards CCC	Cost increase	2	3	6	Monitor. Regular comms updates. Keep residents engaged. Respond promptly to queries	1	2	2
Risk	LIVE	▼	9.03	Public opinion drives a change in Member support.	Members may become less supportive of the scheme or may want changes to the scope which are currently outside the design.	Cost increase	2	3	6	Monitor. Currently high support, unlikely to drop. Regular updates to keep the public engaged and supportive	1	2	2
Risk	LIVE	▲	9.04	Improved comms may drive up the level of damages claims	Legal action and additional scheme costs. CCC reputation adversely affected	Cost increase	2	3	6	Monitor. Carry out condition surveys before work commences	1	2	2
Risk	LIVE	▲	9.05	Scheme programme delayed through public disruption or events	Site deliveries may temporarily need to be closed until the disruption has ceased	Cost increase	2	3	6	Monitor. Potential stockpiling of material may mitigate this. Contingency plan to minimise disruption	1	3	3
Risk	LIVE	▲	9.06	Inappropriate release of information to the press	Reputational damage	Cost increase	2	3	6	Manage. Control the flow of information outside the project team. Ensure members are aware of exactly what can be released to the public	1	2	2
Opportunity	LIVE	▲	Opp1.01	Funding contribution from DfT PinchPoint award						NA			
Opportunity	LIVE	▲	Opp1.02	Availability of NwR fill material as a quid/pro/quo for use as fill in the Star Pit						NA			
Opportunity	LIVE	▲	Opp1.03	Potential for NwR to waive their staff costs for the scheme						NA			

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND ANY OUTSIDE BODY APPOINTMENTS	Published 1st April 2020 Updated 15 th April 2020	AGENDA ITEM: 6
---	---	-----------------------

Notes

Committee dates shown in bold are confirmed.
 Committee dates shown in brackets and italics are reserve dates.

The definition of a key decision is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 2, Article 12.

* indicates items expected to be recommended for determination by full Council.

+ indicates items expected to be confidential, which would exclude the press and public.

Draft reports are due with the Democratic Services Officer by 10.00 a.m. eight clear working days before the meeting.
 The agenda dispatch date is six clear working days before the meeting.

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
23/04/20 Virtual meeting	Kings Dyke award of contract (Will include a confidential appendix)	Lee Baldry	2020/002	08/04/20	14/04/20
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
28/05/20 Likely to be a virtual meeting	Covid-19 Issues Report	S Cox	Not applicable	15/05/20	19/05/20
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
25/06/20 Possibly a virtual meeting	Environment Fund Business case to draw down finance from the environment fund for the low carbon heating solutions for the council's buildings.	Sheryl French	2020/030	12/06/20	16/06/20
	Approach to Fens Flood Tactical Plan	J Beeden	Not applicable		
	Wisbech MV Medworth Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power Proposal	E Fitch	Not applicable		
	St Neots Foot and Cycle Bridge	Stuart Rushby	Not applicable		
	South Cambridge Cycling Improvement Programme	Dorothy Higginson / Grant Weller	Not applicable		
	Covid-19 Issues Report	S Cox	Not applicable		
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		
	Performance Report	Matthew Tullet	Not applicable		
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
09/07/20	Approval of Flood Risk Management Data	Julia Beeden	Not applicable	26/06/20	30/06/20
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		
	Covid-19 Issues Report	S Cox	Not applicable		

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
13/08/20 (reserve)	Covid-19 Issues Report	S Cox	Not applicable	01/08/20	04/08/20
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
17/09/20	North East Cambridge PPA Consultation Response	David Carford	Not applicable	04/09/20	08/09/20
	Highways Response to West Cambridge Master Planning Report	David Allatt / Andy Preston	Not applicable		
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		
	Performance Report	Business Intelligence Matthew Tullet	Not applicable		
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
15/10/20	Annual Report of the Shared Trading Standards Service	Peter Gell	Not applicable	02/10/20	06/10/20
	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable		

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	Business Planning	Steve Cox	Not applicable		
	Risk Register Review	Steve Cox	Not applicable		
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
19/11/20	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable	06/11/20	10/11/20
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
10/12/20	Finance Report	Sarah Heywood / David Parcell	Not applicable	27/11/20	01/12/20
	Business Planning	Steve Cox	Not applicable		
	Performance Report	Business Intelligence Tom Barden	Not applicable		
	Economy and Environment Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Outside Appointments	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services	Not applicable		
14/01/21				04/01/21	06/01/21
11/02/21 (reserve)				29/01/21	02/02/21
11/03/21				26/02/21	02/03/21
08/04/21 (reserve)				26/03/21	30/03/21
10/06/21				28/05/21	01/06/21