

A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE-SELECTION OF PREFERRED OPTION AND PROCUREMENT

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 3rd February 2015

From: Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment

Electoral division(s): Whittlesey North&Whittlesey South

Forward Plan ref: 2015/025 **Key decision:** Yes

Purpose: To note the response to a public consultation and select a preferred option to relieve congestion at the A605 level crossing at King's Dyke, Whittlesey; to undertake negotiation of land and rights required for the early delivery of the scheme; approval for the preparation of associated Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders, and to approve a procurement strategy. Note: The detailed appendices have been reproduced in hard copy for the Committee and lead officers only.

Recommendation: Committee is recommended to:

- a) Note the results of the public consultation;
- b) Approve the preparation and submission of a planning application for the recommended scheme at Location 3;
- c) Approve procurement of the planning application, detailed design and construction of the scheme at location 3 through an Early Contractor Involvement Design and Build Contract as detailed in Section 7 of the report; and
- d) Approve the negotiation of land and rights acquisition required for the early delivery of the scheme at location 3 and the preparation of Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders.

Officer contact:	
Name:	Brian Stinton
Post:	Team Leader Major Infrastructure Delivery (Highway)
Email:	brian.stinton@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 728330

1 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The A605 between Whittlesey and Peterborough carries over 12,000 vehicles per day and there are some 120 daily train movements across the level crossing. The resulting closure of the King's Dyke level crossing barrier causes significant delay to traffic. Future plans by the rail industry to increase the number of trains along the route would further increase delays.
- 1.2 The situation is exacerbated in wetter periods, when local flooding closes North Bank, an alternative route to Peterborough, for long periods of time. The additional 5,000 vehicles a day using the level crossing doubles the average delay per vehicle.
- 1.3 At its meeting on the 16th September 2014, Committee considered emerging proposals to relieve this congestion, based on the findings of an engineering feasibility report. The Engineering Feasibility Report investigated seven options for intervention. Of these, three (Options 3a, 4 and 5) were identified as being both deliverable and as meeting the aims of the scheme agreed by the Project Board. Committee approved public consultation on these options, which was undertaken in November and December 2014. Paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 of this report out-line the three options.
- 1.4 The results of the public consultation are summarised in Section 3 of this report with a detailed analysis attached as **Appendix A**. To avoid confusion during the public consultation, the deliverable options, 3a, 4 and 5 have been referred to as Location 1, 2 and 3 respectively. A plan of location 1, 2 and 3 is included in **Appendix A** and the location numbers will be referred to in this report.
- 1.5 An Options Assessment Report (OAR) has been completed which has informed the preparation of this report. The OAR considers the need for intervention, and evaluates how effectively each option achieves the project objectives of relieving congestion, improving accessibility both along the route and properties served by it, improving safety to both road and rail users and minimising the impact of any proposal.
- 1.6 In parallel with the technical work, further discussions have also taken place with key partners including the District and Town Councils, Network Rail and adjacent businesses to understand their concerns and requirements in developing the appraisal.

2. SCHEME OPTIONS AND CONSTRUCTION ISSUES

- 2.1 The options and construction issues are summarised overleaf.

Location 1

Scheme description

- 2.2 This option proposes a new road contiguous to the north of the existing route, partially within the existing highway boundary. To minimise land take from businesses to the north of the new route, vertical retaining walls are proposed, rather than earth embankments, on the approaches to the bridge structure. Access to the existing properties to the south west of the crossing would be via the existing A605. Access to Funtham's Lane and the neighbouring brickworks would be via T-junctions, as in the existing arrangement.
- 2.3 The bridge would be 7.6 metres above the existing road at its highest point, with minimum 1.5 metre high bridge parapets. It is anticipated that vehicles could be visible up to 2.5m above the parapets. Street lighting would not be required. The proposed 7.3 metre wide carriageway is the standard width for a high quality single carriageway road and matches the existing route. An overall bridge width of 13.2m has been assumed to allow for parapets, 1 metre wide hard strips on both sides, and a 2 metre wide footway and 0.6 metre verge on one side.

Construction issues

- 2.4 A detailed evaluation of construction and traffic management methodology has been undertaken. It shows that both lanes of traffic could be kept open for most of the construction period, but under restricted traffic management involving a temporary 30 mph speed limit, narrower traffic lanes and signal control. This would need to be carefully coordinated with the operation of the level crossing to ensure that safety is maintained. Congestion in the area will be exacerbated during the work. The construction programme is estimated to be 11 months.

Location 2

Scheme Description

- 2.5 This option comprises an off-line alignment to the north with an earth embankment supporting the new road up to the bridge structure. Structural walls around the existing signal box will be necessary. This option encroaches on the 'Abbey' building and car park, but a steeper reinforced earth embankment or structural wall could be used in this area to minimise encroachment. Access to the properties to the south west would be via the existing A605 similar to the previous option. Access to Funtham's Lane and the brickworks would be as per the existing access.
- 2.6 The overall height and carriageway width of this option are the same as Location 1 above. However, using an earth embankment construction results

in a larger overall footprint and significant drainage requirements for the embankment.

Construction issues

- 2.7 A detailed evaluation of construction and traffic management methodology has been undertaken which shows that whilst similar traffic management measures to those mentioned for Location 1 will be required, their use would be for a more limited period, reducing the time that A605 traffic is affected. The construction programme is estimated to be 11 months.

Location 3

Scheme description

- 2.8 This option comprises an off line alignment to the south of the existing A605 and the adjacent properties. An earth embankment would be used to support the road up to a bridge structure. A significant proportion of the new road would be built within an area containing peat sub-soil and a number of engineering options are available to address such conditions. For the purpose of scheme evaluation, a traditional pre-loaded embankment method has been used.
- 2.9 New roundabouts are required at either end of the new road to ensure a safe horizontal alignment. They also provide access to Funtham's Lane and the brickworks. Access to the properties to the south west and the existing Network Rail track to the south of the railway would be via the existing A605 off the new western roundabout. Access to the existing Network Rail signal box and an electrical substation would be from the new roundabout at the brickworks entrance road.

Construction issues

- 2.10 The route will pass through the grounds of a local equestrian business, severing the main stable blocks site from paddocks and gallops to the south of the new road. Provision for horses to cross the new road will be required.
- 2.11 A detailed evaluation of construction and traffic management methodology has been undertaken. This shows that with the majority of construction work being undertaken off line, traffic impact is minimised. The majority of the traffic management impacts result from the construction of the two roundabouts. This impact is considered to be less than that for the other options under review. The construction programme is estimated to be 14 months.
- 2.12 The general arrangement of these options is shown on **Plan Nos 1-3** respectively.

3. CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 3.1 A public consultation exercise ran from 30th October to 15th December, 2014. 827 responses were received which included a significant number from local businesses.
- 3.2 The consultation information and the associated on-line questionnaires were used alongside more conventional printed media methods. The '*Discovering Whittlesea*' magazine, with a local distribution of 8,500 delivered to Whittlesey, Eastrea and Coates, also carried the details of the options and where local consultation events were being held. The District and Town Councils were also directly involved, displaying posters to highlight local consultation events. Questionnaires were made available at events and through libraries. Additional stakeholder specific meetings for the Town Council and at the Hanson's Brick Works were held. Copies of the consultation material will be circulated at the meeting and is available at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20051/transport_projects/520/kings_dyke_crossing
- 3.3 Of the 827 responses to the consultation, 95% supported intervention to enable the closure of the level crossing. The most popular option was Location 3, the route off-line to the south of the existing A605, supported by 58% of those responding. The Off-line option to the north of the existing A605 (Location 2) was supported by 23% and the part on-line to the north of the existing A605 (Location 1) was supported by 17%.
- 3.4 **Appendix A** summarises the key issues emerging from an analysis of the individual comments made at consultation. The strongest view being expressed was that delivery should be as soon as possible.

4. OPTIONS ASSESSMENT REPORT EVALUATION

- 4.1 The OAR provides a strategic review of the evidence available for and against each option and is attached as **Appendix B**. It is available publicly on the County Council web site.
- 4.2 The OAR does not provide a recommendation on which option to take forward but sets out the evidence for and against each option which has informed the project recommendations given in Section 6 of this report.
- 4.3 The OAR assesses the performance of the three deliverable options using national standards for major transport projects and Government's 'Five Cases Model'. Each option is assessed against criteria relating to Strategic, Value for Money, Financial, Delivery and Commercial themes. Included in this assessment is the impact of each option on the local environment. Given the location of the crossing and its proximity to local businesses, particular attention has been given to the effects of the options on local jobs. A full appraisal table for each option is shown in **Appendix B** (pages 42-52).

- 4.4 The evaluation considers the following criteria:
- Does the option alleviate the congestion on the A605 at King's Dyke?
 - Value for money - what is the cost to benefit ratio for each option?
 - What are the impacts on the environment and heritage?
 - Does the option provide any wider or additional benefits or dis-benefits to employment and industry?

Alleviation of congestion on the A605 at King's Dyke

- 4.5 Reducing the existing delays at the level crossing would be most effectively addressed by scheme at locations 1 and 2. A safe geometric layout for Location 3 requires the provision of two new roundabouts at the tie-in points with the existing road. These will introduce some delay in peak periods compared to Locations 1 and 2 but will still provide a reliable journey time along the A605. The detailed design would focus on minimising delays at the roundabouts whilst maintaining road safety requirements.

Value for money

- 4.6 The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of each option has been calculated. The BCR takes into account the benefits, assessed in monetary terms, of implementation of a project against the cost of delivery. A higher BCR is indicative of a better investment. The monetary benefit takes into account a range of factors including journey time savings, reliability benefits, vehicle operating costs and indirect tax benefits relating to spend on fuel.
- 4.7 The Department for Transport uses the following Value for Money (VfM) categories in relation to Benefit Cost Ratios:
- low value for money if BCR = 1.0 to 1.5
 - medium value for money if BCR = 1.5 to 2.0
 - high value for money if BCR = 2.0 to 4.0.

The BCR calculation does take into account the benefits and disadvantages resulting from the disruption to the A605 traffic during construction.

- 4.8 To provide comparative scheme costs for the early stage designs used to evaluate options, it is necessary to make a number of assumptions on factors such as land, design and construction that will affect final costs. These assumptions are reflected in the estimate by applying a contingency or Optimism Bias. At this stage of development the industry standard rate of 65% has been applied. These costs are shown in the table below. However, with further development of a preferred option there will be a reduction in optimism bias and opportunity to reduce overall costs.

- 4.9 Flooding on North Bank, resulting in additional vehicles using the A605 has been taken into account. The table below shows the current cost for each scheme and a BCR for three scenarios; one assuming that North Bank is open and the second with it closed. In reality the road is closed for some time each year and a BCR value based on available data on the actual length of time that North Bank has been closed between April 2012 and April 2013 is therefore given as the best indicator of the value offered by each scheme.

	Scheme Cost (£ million)	North Bank Open	North Bank Closed	BCR reflecting recorded closure data 2012-13.
Location 1 (Option 3a)	14.8	1.76 (Medium VfM)	15.76 (High VfM)	3.86 (High VfM)
Location 2 (Option 4)	12.6	2.07 (High VfM)	18.55 (High VfM)	4.54 (Very High VfM)
Location 3 (Option 5)	16.9	0.75 (does not represent VfM)	12.00 (High VfM)	2.43 (High VfM)

- 4.10 With all options reducing overall delays, the best value for money is simply provided by the lowest cost scheme. Although Location 3, at the highest cost, shows the lowest performance on economic grounds, this would still be considered to be High Value for Money. The additional construction cost of a longer route, the two roundabouts and the resultant delay in journey time from the roundabouts has resulted in this reduced BCR.

Environment and Heritage

- 4.11 A series of detailed environmental assessments covering noise, air quality, greenhouse gases, landscape, biodiversity / ecology and water environment are contained within the appendices of the OAR and can be found online at the project website.
http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20051/transport_projects/520/kings_dyke

A summary of each topic area is set out below.

- 4.12 In assessing the impact of noise, the effects of each option are set against the existing situation. Location 1 & 2 are expected to result in minimal change for local residents although the results for Location 2 do show a slight increase in road noise level due to the elevation of the road. Location 3 provides the highest benefits as some households are expected to experience a noise reduction as a result of the scheme.

- 4.13 The expected differences in traffic flows between options are likely to be very small, and therefore the results of a detailed air quality assessment would be very similar and be of little influence in the selection of a single option. On this basis the air quality will be reviewed as part of the preliminary design of the preferred option and the results reported as part of the planning application submission.
- 4.14 Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the production of materials used in infrastructure (embedded carbon) as well as those from the use of transport fuels are considered in the assessment. For all options, the impact on greenhouse gas emissions is neutral.
- 4.15 All options would have an adverse effect on the visual landscape. Location 1 has the smallest land take but will have very little scope for incorporating landscaping measures to mitigate the visual impact, owing to the vertical walls of the proposed road and the bridge. The vertical walls will be prominent urban elements in the landscape, particularly when viewed adjacent to the structure and from Kings Dyke byway to the south. However, for the residents in properties on both sides of the A605 level crossing, this option would constitute a small change in view.
- 4.16 Location 2 with slightly larger land take for embankments, would allow landscaping to be incorporated into the scheme. This would help soften the overall appearance of the proposed structure in the landscape and help to blend with its surroundings in the long term. The embankments also allow some separation from the access roads to the south, reducing the visual dominance of the structure. As with Location 1, this option would result in a small change in views from the residential properties to the east and west of the existing level crossing.
- 4.17 The impact on visual amenity is evaluated 1 and 15 years after completion of the scheme, referred to as year 1 and year 15. For locations 1 & 2 the impact on the visual amenity from the south, for residents in property adjacent to the level crossing, is predicted to be “significant adverse” in both year 1 and year 15.
- 4.18 For location 3 in Year 1, there will be “significant adverse” effects in terms of the visual amenity of residents in the cottage on A605 / Peterborough Road to the north-east of the level crossing, the residents in two properties to the north of the A605 / Funtham’s Lane junction and for users of the byway along King’s Dyke Drain. However, as mitigation planting matures, the visual impacts will reduce to become insignificant by year 15. The two new roundabouts adjacent to the residential properties would be visually intrusive for the residents and the road alignment would encroach into the more rural setting of the fenland landscape.
- 4.19 Following a detailed survey of the area all options have been found to have a neutral impact on the majority of the biodiversity identified. However, there will

be a slight adverse impact on rough grassland and hedgerows which flank both the road and rail lines.

- 4.20 Following the choice of a single option, further detailed investigation will be undertaken specific to that option. This work will bring together the existing data and include a biodiversity mitigation strategy which will form part of the planning application. The strategy will include measures for Great Crested Newts (closest breeding pond is 320metres away), reptiles, such as grass snakes, common lizard, slow worm, and birds such as the Little Ringed Plover.
- 4.21 For locations 1 &2 the impact on the water environment would be neutral. However, there would be a slight increase in impermeablerun-off area which would require pollution controls to be put in place to prevent run-off water from contaminating ground water.
- 4.22 For location 3, where the majority of the route is located within Flood Zone 3, it is likely that there would be a significant adverse impact on the flood plain in terms of conveyance and storage capacity of flood water. However, there is unlikely to be any impact on water quality. Should this option be taken forward, detailed flood risk assessment will need to be undertaken and mitigation measures agreed with the local drainage authority (Middle Level Commissioners) and the Environment Agency.

Wider additional benefits and dis-benefits to employment and industry

- 4.23 All three options have an impact upon one or more businesses in the local area. The assessment criteria for impacts on business are set out below in Table 3. The full evaluation is contained on the OAR.

Table 3 – Employment effects

Effect	Criteria
Major Adverse	Renders a business, unworkable in its current form, such that it could not continue unchanged; the business would have to change the activities undertaken as well as seeking some form of alternative income.
Moderate Adverse	Changes the workability of a full-time business, but without preventing the business continuing largely as before; there would be reductions in income and changes in day-to-day management, such as longer journeys to access business.
Minor Adverse	Affects the workability of a full-time business, but with little change to the business continuing largely as before; there would be limited change in income and day-to-day management.
Neutral	No direct impact.
Beneficial	Improved access to businesses which may result in an increase in visitors and income.

- 4.24 Location 1 has the least land take as part of the scheme is within the existing highway boundary, however, there may be some minor land take to the north, where existing industrial units/ business park operate and this may have a moderate adverse impact on the operation of the businesses, notably for lorry parking, turning and hard standing areas. Access to Funtham's Lane and the brickworks would remain as per the existing arrangements.
- 4.25 Location 2 has the largest effect on the businesses to the north of the A605 and the land required would encroach onto the Abbey site impacting on companies operating from that site. The impact to the business would be major adverse and may require the provision of an alternative site. For the other businesses operating from Nene Lodge, it is likely to have a minor adverse as it is likely they will be able to continue to operate with minor changes. The access to Funtham's Lane and the brickworks would remain as per the existing arrangements.
- 4.26 Location 3 requires the most land and has the largest effect on the businesses lying to the south of the A605. This option would predominantly effect the livery stables and equestrian centre, severing the main stables from the paddocks and gallops to the south of the site and reducing on-site parking which is required for events. Whilst it is considered practical to provide an equine underpass to retain a connection between the two parts of the site, the impact on business, following mitigation, is still considered to be major. The access to Funtham's Lane and the brickworks would be via the proposed roundabouts.
- 4.27 All three options effect land to the northeast of the level crossing owned by Hanson. It is considered that locations 1 and 2 would constitute a neutral effect. Location 3, whilst needing some minor accommodation works, is considered a beneficial effect due to the improved access to the brick and block works.

5 EVALUATION SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 5.1 All three options will fulfil the objectives of the scheme in terms of reducing congestion and providing reliable journey times between Peterborough and Whittlesey.
- 5.2 Locations 1 and 2 provide the best value for money cases, being the shortest routes without the necessity for roundabout junctions at both ends. However, considered in a wider context, neither help access to businesses adjacent to the route and both have the potential to have a negative impact on operation of businesses on the Abbey site and consequently jobs and the local economy. Construction of these will have a greater impact on traffic flows than location 3.
- 5.3 Location 3 was the most popular option with the public, despite its lower overall BCR. The roundabout junctions that contributed significantly to the

lower BCR were seen as beneficial to some respondents in respect of helping access to properties, controlling vehicle speed and improving safety. The relative limited disruption to the existing route during construction was also seen as a benefit by the public. This option too, has some potential to impact on local business.

- 5.4 Taking into account the results of the public consultation and considering the benefits and disadvantages as set out in the OAR, the officer recommendation is that Location 3 would be the preferred option for the Committee to approve for the development and submission of a planning application. This option, despite its lower BCR, will provide an effective solution in terms of relieving congestion at the crossing, still shows high value for money and is shown to have an overall neutral impact on the environment. Set against this is the impact on the equestrian centre which, whilst significant, is not considered to outweigh the wider benefits.
- 5.5 In arriving at a decision the Committee will need to consider the relative weight to be given to the benefits of Location 3 in comparison with the options for a solution north of the A605 and take into account the significant impact of location 3 on the equestrian centre and its owners, staff and users.
- 5.6 It should also be noted that the cost of Location 3 at £16.9m is in excess of the funding currently included in the Business Plan. The figure in the Business Plan is £13.5m which was the previously assumed maximum cost of the scheme. Most of this will be secured from external sources, meaning that the County Council contribution would be a maximum of £2m. However, Committee should note that with more recent information from our consultants, the cost of the favoured option is £16.9m. This means that should no additional funding be found, the County Council will need to contribute £5.4m to the scheme.
- 5.7 Given that this scheme cost includes Optimism Bias at the highest level, it is likely that the scheme cost will come down as greater certainty over the scheme emerges and value engineering can be undertaken, but at this stage it is not possible to guarantee this. Members should therefore be aware that in choosing Location 3, a greater call on County Council capital funding than currently assumed in the Business Plan may be required. However, negotiations are currently underway with Network Rail and it is likely that a contribution towards the scheme will be forthcoming from their Level Crossing Closure Programme, and this is likely to close any financial gap.

6 PROJECT BOARD COMMENTS

- 6.1 At the time of writing this report, the Project Board has yet to meet to consider the Options Assessment Report and officers' recommendation. The Board is due to meet on the 23rd of January 2015 and a verbal update will be given at the meeting.

7 PROCUREMENT

- 7.1 Following selection of an approved option, delivery will comprise of three key phases; preparation of a planning application (including preliminary design), detailed design and construction.
- 7.2 There are various contractual arrangements that could be used to deliver the scheme. When deciding on the form of procurement, it is important to take into account specific factors pertaining to a scheme. These include the type of infrastructure, the stage that the project is at in its development, the level of risk in the project and the appetite to accept risk or transfer it to a contractor. In some projects, where there may be high level risks in obtaining approval and in construction, early appointment of a contractor to undertake preliminary design for the planning process can be beneficial. However, from the work carried out at this stage there appear to be few process and construction risks in the project.
- 7.2 A review, by an independent expert consultant, of the form and management of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway contract was considered by the Economy and Environment Committee on the 16th of September 2014 and officers have taken expert advice from the reviewer in respect of the Ely Southern Bypass procurement. This has pointed strongly towards an Early Contractor Involvement, two-stage Design and Build contract.
- 7.3 An ECI Two stage Design and Build arrangement is a collaborative form of contract, which brings the contractor into the project team early, with the team working together through the design and construction phases. This provides benefits of ensuring that the contractor can use his experience in the design phase to reduce overall project risk and ensure buildability. There are some significant differences compared with the single stage approach, however, that provide a greater level of cost control and certainty.
- 7.4 Although an ECI contract would be awarded for design and construction, the process is divided into two parts, the first phase covering the detailed design and consents process, with construction as a second phase. There is a presumption that the scheme will be delivered as a single package, but there is no guarantee that the contractor will move directly from detailed design to construction. This would be conditional on satisfactory performance and agreement of a construction target price. The contract will give ownership of the design to the County Council, so that in the rare event that a target price cannot be agreed, it may be used to re-tender the construction.
- 7.5 The ECI two stage approach also mitigates against cost and programme overruns as there is much greater certainty over the design and understanding of the risks at the point the construction target price is agreed. Developing this understanding can result in a longer contract period, but one that is likely to be realistic. The situation encountered on the Busway where construction commenced before the design was sufficiently advanced would also be avoided. The reviewer of the Busway contract favours this Two

Stage, ECI form of contract for the delivery for most major transport infrastructure projects.

- 7.6 Therefore, it is recommended that a current contract is used to develop a planning application and that a two stage ECI contract is used to procure the detailed design and construction. The preparation of the ECI contract will run in parallel with the development of the planning application.

8 LAND ACQUISITION

- 8.1 All of the options will require the acquisition of land. Whilst every reasonable effort will be made to acquire the necessary land and rights by negotiation, a Compulsory Purchase Order and a Side Roads Order are proposed to ensure the necessary land and powers are available to deliver the scheme. The Orders would be made under the 1980 Highways Act. Committee is requested to approve in principle, the acquisition of the land required for the recommended option.

9 NEXT STEPS

- 9.1 Preliminary design of the preferred option will be prepared alongside the preparation of a planning application. It is anticipated that the planning application would be submitted in the summer.
- 9.2 The planning application would be considered by the County Council's Development Control Committee under Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning Act. Fenland District Council will be consulted during the development of the scheme and consulted as part of the planning process.
- 9.3 A preliminary timescale for delivery, based on a straight forward approval process without a Public Inquiry would see construction commencing in spring 2016.

10 ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

10.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The following bullet point sets out details of implications identified by officers:

- The scheme will provide significant benefits to road users by reducing delays to road traffic, including commercial vehicles.
- It will facilitate increased use of the railway line, especially freight traffic.

10.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

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

- The removal of the need to cross the railway line may encourage more people to walk and cycle along the route.

10.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

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

- There are no significant implications.

11. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Resource Implications

- Members are asked to note that the current estimated cost of £16.9million for the recommended option including Optimism Bias at 65%, is now higher than the Business Plan allocation of £13.5million.
- At this stage of development an industry standard rate of 65% has been applied. However, with further development of a preferred option there will be a reduction in optimism bias and opportunity to reduce overall costs. In the event that this is not the case, additional borrowing may be required or additional funding sources identified.
- Funding for the scheme is being provided from a range of contributions. These include; Growth Deal Funding, £5m; Local Transport Body, £3m; County Council residual capital £3.5m. Negotiations with Network Rail will progress following the selection of a preferred option and a contribution is expected to narrow the funding gap.
- Additional funding sources will continue to be investigated

11.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

The following bullet point sets out details of implications identified by officers:

- The cost of the scheme will be affected by a number of factors, which will be fully identified as the design and construction progress. These are captured and managed in the project risk register and will be carefully monitored as the scheme progresses. Issues will be reported through the Project Board to this Committee. It is important that officer resource allocated to the project reflects these requirements.
- All of the options outlined above require land and rights to be acquired. Each option has an impact on one or more business as indicated in Section 4. The acquisition of land and rights carries with it risk and

increased opportunity for legal change. These risks are identified in the project risk register and are being managed by the project manager and monitored by the Project Board.

- In seeking to construct a bridge over the rail lines the Council will need to enter into a set of agreements with Network Rail both for the development and construction of the project. These agreements can be difficult to obtain and early engagement will be started upon selection of a single option.

11.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications.

11.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

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

- Public consultation has been a key factor in the identifying a recommendation for a preferred option.
- Further public consultation and community engagement will be undertaken as part of the planning process.
- Updates for stakeholders and the public will be provided during the next stages of the scheme.
- In addition to the consultation and key stakeholder engagement a number of site meetings have taken place with members at their request for clarification of detail. The Project Board draws upon local members both for steering the project and local knowledge of issues.

11.5 Public Health Implications

- There are no significant implications

Source Documents	Location
Kings Dyke Level Crossing Replacement - Initial Investigation Report -Engineering Options Feasibility Report -Consultation Response summary -Options Assessment Report Economy and Environment Committee 16 th September	Rm 308 Shire Hall Cambridge .

2014- Reports on Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Contract Review and King's Dyke Level Crossing Replacement	
--	--