

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 8th February 2018

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 12.20 a.m.

Present: Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, N Harrison (Substituting for Cllr Adey), N Kavanagh, S Tierney, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman).

Apologies: D Adey and D Giles

82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

83. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th January 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

84. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The following updates since the agenda publication were reported:

Minute 16 - Bikeability Cycle Training local sponsorship – there was no update to that included in the report with it stated that the lead officer's view was that having pursued the issue with local firms, local sponsorship of the training scheme appeared to be unlikely.

Minute 57 - St Neots Master Plan– Appointment to Combined Authority Steering Group – As a follow up to the note and discussions that had been undertaken by the Chairman, Councillor David Wells was appointed as the County Council's representative and Councillor Ian Gardener as his substitute.

22nd September Committee Minute 40 land North of Cherry Hinton –request for a new developments seminar

A seminar on new developments would be scheduled later in the year.

Minute 57 - St Neots Master Plan - Steering Group - It was highlighted as an update at the January Committee meeting that a "Steering Group" to own the Masterplan had now been established with Huntingdonshire District Council being the lead delivery partner. It had been suggested by them that Councillor Ian Gardener be invited to sit on the Group as the County Council representative. However as this was an appropriate appointment to be made by the Committee or through the delegation already in place on outside bodies' appointments, the Chairman intended to discuss this further as he was aware of other local member interest. As an update the Chairman confirmed that he had now spoken to Councillor Wells who had previously expressed an interest and

was still keen to participate on this new Steering Group. Further to this, the Chairman proposed with the Vice Chairman seconding and the Committee confirming the following:

It was resolved:

To appoint Councillor Wells as the County Council representative on the St Neots Master Plan Steering Group and to appoint Councillor Gardener as his named substitute. Action: Democratic Services to inform Combined Authority.

The Minutes Action Log as updated at the meeting was noted.

85. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No petitions were received. A request from a member of the public Tom Clarke to speak in respect of the Queen Adelaide Report was taken under that item.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Due to the number of speakers for items 6 and 7, the Chairman agreed to alter the agenda running order to take them first.

86. QUEEN ADELAIDE TRAFFIC STUDY

This report was presented in order that the Committee could consider the results of the Queen Adelaide Traffic study and agree to recommend that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority fund more work on options to provide solutions to the issues identified. As background it was explained that five railway lines converge on Ely from Cambridge, Newmarket, Norwich, King's Lynn, and Peterborough. The lines to King's Lynn, and Norwich split from the Ely-Peterborough line at Ely North Junction. In the early 1990s the line from Cambridge to King's Lynn was electrified but to keep costs down, the junction layout was simplified. This limited the number of trains that could use the junction and with growing demand for both passenger and freight trains this was now a serious strategic constraint on the wider railway network in East Anglia. As a result, Network Rail had been considering a project to upgrade the rail junction and increase capacity for passenger and freight services.

It was highlighted that any increase in rail capacity at the Ely North Junction would have impacts on the level crossings in the area from increased train numbers and additional barrier down time. The report summarised the results of a traffic survey in this area, considered the existing situation, and the impact of any future proposal by Network Rail to change or close any level crossings. The report set out the benefits to Cambridgeshire of improving the junction which were both direct, through better train services, and indirect through fewer vehicles on the A10, and with any increase in rail freight services, fewer heavy goods vehicles on the A14. As north of the rail junction all three lines crossed the B1382 at Queen Adelaide, increasing train numbers would impact on traffic and safety at the level crossings, which Network Rail were required to consider and manage. In addition to the significant safety concerns from increasing train numbers, they had identified the substantial increased risk of substantial traffic blocking back from one crossing on to another and initially concluded that the current

half barrier crossings would need to be replaced with full barrier crossings, which would be closed for much longer, increasing barrier down time.

In 2015 the Network Rail Project was halted by the Hendy Review. Following this Network Rail approached the County Council to seek assistance with the Highways issues which related to the project which lead to the Commissioning of the Queen Adelaide Traffic Study included at Appendix 1 to the report. At a similar time to this the Ely Task Force was created to highlight the need for improvements to the Ely North Junction and to lobby central Government with membership made up of local MPs, Councillors, the two local enterprise partnerships Network Rail, Train operators and the Department for Transport (DfT). The two local enterprise partnerships plus the Strategic Freight Network agreed to fund a Network Rail Study into the Ely Area Rail Capacity Improvements including the Ely North Junction with a view to securing funding from the Department of Transport (DfT) for implementation in the next Network Rail five year Control Period starting in 2020. Network Rail would be required to have a rail scheme developed by the summer of 2019.

The report and appendix detailed an engagement event with local residents and businesses held in September 2017 on their use of the local roads and the three level crossings. A full report was provided in chapter 4 of appendix 1. Summarising it highlighted that both the public and businesses had expressed significant concerns around the impacts of any potential level crossing closures and the effect of access to employment, customers, education and other key services as well as issues regarding emergency services access and the additional trip length both in time and fuel costs. Residents and businesses in Queen Adelaide and Prickwillow had serious concerns regarding any changes to the level crossings on the B1382 as the road provided a vital link to Ely for a variety of key services, employment and education as well as access for customers to businesses in the area and to fields and farm yards. The B1382 was also used by a wider population as the commuter route both into and out of Ely.

The completed baseline traffic study was summarised in section 2 of the report with the full Traffic Study included as appendix 1. The Study had considered eight initial options for reducing traffic over the Queen Adelaide level crossings as listed in paragraph 2.4 with Table 1 under paragraph 2.5 summarising their rail impact, benefits and the issues. Having set out the potential impact of increased frequency and duration of level crossing closures, the report proposed opposing any measures that restricted traffic flow across the level crossings to the detriment of residents / local business until alternative solutions were put in place. It was highlighted that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority were seeking to fund the options development for a road or bridge solution. (Option 7 - a Bridge over the Peterborough Line and option 8 constructing a bypass north of Queen Adelaide)

Paragraphs 2.10 to 2.16 set out a summary of the recommendations of the consultants' report which concluded that it was not possible to introduce full barrier level crossings in Queen Adelaide, without reducing the volume of traffic in some way and recommended that more work was undertaken on the initial options identified, but ruling out Option 2 for the reasons set out in the report.

The Chairman next invited Mr Tom Clarke an Ely resident, local farmer and member of the Ely Level Crossings Action Group to speak. In his presentation while welcoming the

report recommendations, he highlighted the need for further rail options which he suggested would be cheaper and would be the responsibility of Network Rail whose job it was to fix the bottleneck. To illustrate this he estimated the cost of a bridge at £40m questioning whether there was sufficient land and suggesting that its height would overshadow houses in the village. He estimated the cost of a bypass at £100m which would not connect the village to other routes. He suggested three new options:

- Option 9 Relocate the Peterborough Branch curve to the north and out of the village
- Option 9a Add Norwich crossing road bypass – providing a new southern route onto Queen Adelaide Way
- Option 10 Relocating both Peterborough and Norwich Branch lines.

The detail of the above options are included as appendix A to these minutes and copies were tabled at the meeting for all Members of the Committee to view.

He proposed an additional recommendation e) reading: Agrees to continue to work with the Combined authority , Network Rail and the Ely Area Task Force to develop a comprehensive road OR RAIL BASED solution that meets the needs of all Cambridgeshire residents and in particular the communities of Queen Adelaide, Prickwillow and Ely. The proposals to include a rail based solution met with widespread support from members of the Committee

Questions / issues raised by Members included:

- That Option 9 still had a level crossing and still had the same number of trains converging into one crossing.
- Clarifying that he was ruling out a bridge crossing.
- Questioning the cost on Option 10 of £20m and whether it included land purchase. Mr Clarke in reply indicated that his estimates had been based on rail track figures provided in the Railfuture East Anglia document which estimated the cost of new track into Wisbech at £15m 2 years ago, to which he had added an additional £5m. He also gave the example that a new railway in the Scottish borders was estimated at £11m per mile.

In subsequent related discussion another Member questioned to what extent council bodies could influence what options should be given more weight, to ensure there was an aligned view between Network Rail and residents. In reply it was indicated that there was a Programme Management Board which Bob Menzies attended in addition to the Taskforce, so assurance could be provided that the local authorities' views, which included Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk, would be strongly represented.

The Chairman then invited Local Member submissions. For those from Councillor Every (who also spoke in person at the meeting) Councillor Hunt, Councillor Dupre and Councillor Raynes (the latter three being read out by Democratic Services) who all supported the main thrust of the report recommendations, these have been included as further appendices to the minutes. In respect of the submission from Councillor Dupre, as this included a list of questions, it was agreed officers would provide a response to them outside of the meeting to be copied to the Committee. **Action: Jack Eagle**

Councillor Bailey the Member for Ely South, while recognising the importance of the rail

upgrade for the region which she supported, was speaking on behalf of residents and farmers opposing the road closure at Queen Adelaide, highlighting the wider adverse impacts, including extra traffic affecting the new bypass at Ely, the effect on the wider Ely North, as well as likely gridlock in Ely city centre. In terms of timing and making reference to Network Rail's project timetable of late summer-early Autumn 2019, she highlighted the need for the road solution to be implemented at the same time as the rail junction upgrade.

In debate issues raised included:

- The view that any solution should deal with rail, resident and traffic requirements.
- Asking who had the influence on the Secretary of State for a final agreed scheme as there was concern that a Network Rail sponsored solution might not be the right solution for residents / traffic concerns. It was clarified that Network Rail had approached the local councils with the view of working in partnership to provide a solution, but as the project was of such national significance, in strictly legal terms, they could promote the scheme to shut the crossings or build a new road bridge which would lead to a public inquiry and a decision by the Secretary of State.
- When was the timescale for the separate provision of pedestrian / cycle provision? It was explained that while a detailed timescale could not be given at the current time, it was clarified that any crossing restrictions to cars would not apply to pedestrians and cyclists.

It was clear from the debate that proposals needed to address both the road and rail requirements and impacts, and that regional and national benefits should not be achieved by imposing unreasonable costs on local people. Flexibility on the options was important. The County Council welcomed the work being taken forward by the Combined Authority on the identified feasible options to be developed. These needed to take place in parallel with any development work for Network Rail's proposals for establishing a case for investment.

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor Ambrose Smith as amendments to the officer recommendations:

- Recommendation d) add on the third line after the words "for a road..." the words "and / or rail solution" and delete the word "bridge" to provide for a comprehensive solution not excluding road or rail and deleting the words "(Options 7 or 8 of the Traffic Study"
- in recommendation e) deleting the word "road" in the third line between the words "comprehensive" and "solution" for the same reasons.

Having voted on the proposed amendment,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the proposals for wider regional and national benefits, of increased rail capacity through Ely North Junction;

- b) Note the potential impact on the whole community, residents and local businesses of increased frequency and duration of level crossing closures;
- c) Agree to oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow across the level crossings to the detriment of residents and local businesses until alternative solutions are put in place;
- d) Note the intention to explore opportunities with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to fund the options development for a road and / or rail solution and;
- e) Agree to continue to work with the Combined Authority, Network Rail and the Ely Area Task Force to develop a comprehensive solution that meets the needs of all Cambridgeshire residents and in particular the communities of Queen Adelaide, Prickwillow and Ely.

87. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ELY-CAMBRIDGE TRANSPORT STUDY

This report sought the Committee's views on the recommendations from the above multi modal study on the transport schemes needed to accommodate the major development planned at a new town north of Waterbeach, Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) and the Cambridge Science Park (CSP). The study had three strands:

- Strand 1 looks at the overall transport requirements on the corridor
- Strand 2 looks at the specific requirements for growth at Waterbeach
- Strand 3 looks at the specific requirements for growth at CNFE/CSP.

The study was separate to, but linked with the A10 Ely to King's Lynn Study reported to the Committee in September and to the M11-A47 Extension Study commissioned by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority due to report in summer 2018. While that full route was outside the scope of the study, option 6 had been included to investigate the principle of an offline link which could give strategic traffic an alternative to the A10, thus freeing up capacity on the route between Ely and Cambridge. Such a link could potentially form the southern section of a longer M11-A47 link. More work was to be undertaken to establish whether there was a business case for both schemes.

Section 2 of the report highlighted the technical work undertaken and the key issues that had informed the study recommendations. The following six mitigation packages had been modelled:

Option	Composition of package
Option 1 Mode shift	Significant investment in cycling / pedestrian routes Segregated public transport route between development north of Waterbeach and Cambridge

	Bus based Park and Ride at development north of Waterbeach Relocated railway station Parking restraint at CNFE / CSP.
Option 2 Junction Improvements	Option1 PLUS Improvements to eight junctions along the A10, including Milton Interchange.
Option 3 North Dual	Option 1 and 2 PLUS Dualling of A10 between Ely and development north of Waterbeach to encourage users to use new Park and Ride site.
Option 4 South Dual	Options 1 and 2 PLUS Dualling of A10 between development north of Waterbeach and Milton Interchange to provide additional capacity on most congested section of route.
Option 5 Full Dual	Options 1,2,3 and 4 Dualling of length of A10 between Ely and Milton Interchange.
Option 6 sensitivity test Offline alternative to A10	Options 1 and 2 PLUS New Offline route to remove strategic traffic from the A10 and potentially form the southern section of an M11-A47 link.

It was highlighted that the study:

- confirmed the existing policy position that a multi-modal package of measures would be needed for the whole corridor to include a package of measures to encourage a mode shift away from car.
- confirmed that smaller scale highway measures to discourage rat running would be required along parallel routes, as well as improvements to junctions along the A10 in the short term.
- recommended that to accommodate the significant proportion of strategic trips through the study area, major investment in additional highway capacity along the A10 was required.
- recognised that an offline alignment that potentially formed the southern part of an M11-A47 link had merit by providing an alternative route for the significant proportion of strategic traffic using the A10.

Members noted that with the formation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority that while the Greater Cambridge Partnership had substantially funded the study, given the geographic coverage of the recommendations, it was appropriate that going forward the Combined Authority should have the responsibility for approving the recommendations. Whilst the study did not recommend a specific option

regarding the provision of highway capacity, officers recommended that the Committee commend option 5 to the Combined Authority for approval and further development. This would enable the impacts of dualling the full length of the A10 between Ely and the Milton Interchange to be fully understood and considered, alongside an alternative route that potentially form the southern section of an M11-A47 link.

Councillor Bailey spoke as the Member for Ely South making the point that the Study held few surprises and highlighted that in respect of cycling provision, currently few people cycled from Littleport to Cambridge due to the dangers for cyclists. She expressed disappointment that the dualling proposals would not extend as far as Littleport. She asked for clarity regarding the proposals for the A10 as there were two pieces of work, the other being the A10 Angel Drove proposals. She also sought confirmation on whether the dualling would extend as far as the BP roundabout. She welcomed the modal shift measures proposed, as these were of equal importance, as well as the proposals for junction improvements and cycle paths.

Questions of clarification included:

- Councillor Ambrose Smith expressed his disappointment that issues relating to Littleport had not been addressed and that East Cambridgeshire had not been included in the study. Councillor Bailey explained in response that she would have liked to see the dualling go to the Littleport roundabout but that traffic data did not support it. She considered it ridiculous that proposals to upgrade always had to wait until the traffic became so heavy that it was then dealt with in a reactive manner. She was surprised that it stopped at the BP roundabout and believed it would be more appropriate to carry on to the Little Downham roundabout.
- Concern from one Member that any further investigation of the potential M11/A47 link might delay the A10 upgrade, as if modelling showed it would decrease traffic on the A10, it could result in a view being taken that the A10 dualling was not required. Councillor Bailey responded that in her view the A10 dualling was urgent and could not wait.

Councillor Hunt who was unable to attend provided the following comments which were read out at the meeting:

"I am very sorry that I cannot attend but please understand that I am passionate in my support of the proposed actions.

The A10 dualling will have a massive effect on my division as the A10 runs through Soham South and Haddenham for about 6 miles (Chittering north to just south of Ely).

Ely is expanding as are the villages that "feed" into the A10 (Wicken, Little Thetford, Stretham, Haddenham, Soham and Wilburton).

If Cambridge is to continue to expand then this is one key bit of infrastructure that is 100% essential.

I commend Cllr Bailey for introducing the first motion at Full Council in 2016 on this subject and I urge all members of all parties to give Item 5 (Full Dualling) full and complete support.

In addition, a written response from Councillor Dupre which was also submitted on behalf of herself and Councillors Bradman, Jenkins and Manning highlighted the need to prioritise the provision of accessible, affordable attractive convenient and reliable public transport with smart ticketing to encourage modal shift and minimize congestion on the A10. The full submission which was read out by Democratic Services at the meeting is included as appendix 4 to these minutes. In addition to the submission an oral update read out on behalf of Councillor Manning stated that:

“Modal shift should also include dutch class, segregated cycleways as standard - physically segregated from both motor traffic and pedestrians.

Improved bus services should include ensuring franchising is considered properly by the Mayor – as many bus services run commercially.”

Having been opened up for discussion, issues raised / point made included:

- One Member highlighting the need to not just concentrate on road improvements but to enhance public transport and cycling provision. To facilitate this would also require tough parking measure restrictions at the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe East and at new development sites, to encourage the move away from using private cars.
- On the discussion to extend dualling to the Little Downham roundabout, the point was made by a number of Members that the current criteria of not putting into place infrastructure until traffic flows exceeded the road capacity was short sighted planning and a half measure, as it was cheaper, using economies of scale to continue the dualling to future proof the road as one construction job, rather than to come back to it at a later date when the traffic position was at gridlock and the construction costs to remedy it would be far greater. The suggestion was made that the Combined Authority should be asked to review such criteria for cost effectiveness. Another Member of the Committee argued that this was not appropriate as there was simply not the money to finance the many schemes around the country that could reduce traffic jams, making the point that the Department for Transport (DfT) had to allocate money to projects using the strict evidence base criteria currently in place. As a response to this, the Member who had raised the issue made the point that the officer report was a tool and not the law and that the purpose of seeking local members' views was for them to highlight particular local issues that should be taken into consideration.
- A Member made the point that in terms of a multi modal approach, the A14 guided bus was a good example and sought clarity on whether what was being proposed was a high quality public transport system emanating from Ely and whether there was a plan by the Combined Authority to go to Ely with a Cam Metro.

The lead officer in responding to questions raised clarified that;

- A report on the A10 Ely North dualling had been received and agreed at the September meeting 2017 which supported dualling from the Angel Drove to the Witchford roundabouts. In making any decision as stated earlier by a Member in the discussion, the Department for Transport would consider volume of traffic and the value for money implications against other similar schemes.
- Regarding the M11 – A47 study, from work already carried out there might be merit in both schemes, as not all traffic would be taken off the A10 if it did go ahead. Further detailed work would establish whether there was a business case for both schemes.
- In terms of public transport options these would be looked at to Waterbeach, but with regard to Ely to Cambridge, heavy rail would always be the quicker option.
- In terms of current discussions taking place on the Cambridge to Ely A10 study in the Combined Authority arena and the future role of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the Vice Chairman who was a member of the Joint Assembly read out the following extract from the Joint Assembly meeting report from the 18th January meeting:
 - *The Joint Assembly provided a range of views upon viewing this report, with some of the members disappointed that it had been perceived as a road centric scheme that had not looked at all other available options, whilst other members welcomed the prospect of focusing more on the north of Cambridge and the opportunities that the scheme provided for long distance cycle ways.*
 - *The Joint Assembly also discussed how the success of the scheme in achieving modal shift was reliant on better Park and Ride facilities to the north of Cambridge, including Waterbeach train station, and that this needed to be carefully considered particularly the interplay between the public transport proposal in option one and rail.*
 - *The Joint Assembly endorsed the recommendation to the Executive Board to pass this scheme onto the Combined Authority to deliver but felt that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was well placed to deliver the modal shift opportunities that option 1 in section 5.1 could bring.*
 - *This discussion concluded in a suggestion that the Executive Board may wish to consider an additional recommendation to make this offer to the Combined Authority.*

An amendment was proposed to include an additional recommendation to dual the A10 from the BP roundabout to the Little Downham roundabout. During the discussion that followed, it was confirmed by a question to the officers that this section of the A10 was already covered by the previous report referred to earlier in the discussion. It was proposed for clarity that it should be referred to by including a further recommendation c). This was moved and seconded as an amendment by the Chairman and Vice Chairman and agreed on being put to the vote.

It was therefore resolved to:

- a) Endorse the recommendations set out in the study; and
- b) Commend the package which includes the full dualling of the A10 between Ely and the Milton Interchange (option 5) to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for approval and further development.
- c) Commend to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority the Council's previous recommendation dated 14th September to dual the section of the A10 between Angel Drove and Witchford Road Roundabouts.

88. TRANSPORT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT

This report set out the process for prioritising transport infrastructure schemes to be developed using budget allocated from the Business Plan. It sought approval to a list of schemes to be developed in 2018-19 and to the methodology process for sifting and prioritising schemes for 2019/20 going forward.

With the creation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the additional investment it had available to it, it was considered timely for the County Council to develop a pipeline of transport schemes ready for implementation, either by the Combined Authority or to submit them as part of funding bids when opportunities arose. A budget of £1 million has been set aside for this as part of the Capital Budget in the Council's Business Plan, with the intention of bringing schemes to the point where they could be submitted for funding and the development costs reclaimed. The report proposed that this budget was used to develop schemes costing between £1m and £5m, filling a gap not currently covered by other budgets and that schemes should focus on addressing existing congestion issues on the road network.

Work to date had focussed on two areas:

- Projects that could be developed during 2018/19, and
- A sifting and prioritisation process for identifying schemes to be developed if further funding comes forward in future years

For 2018-19 officers had focused on schemes which could be delivered without planning permission and within the existing highway boundary or schemes where sufficient information was already available, in order for design work to commence. The long list of schemes identified was as follows:

<i>Scheme</i>	<i>District</i>
a) A142 Fordham to Soham	East Cambridgeshire
b) A10/A142 roundabouts, Ely	East Cambridgeshire
c) March junctions improvements package	Fenland
1) Phase 2 Industrial Northern Link Road, March	
2) A141/B1099 Wisbech Road – roundabout	
3) A141/Gaul Road	
4) A141/Burrowmoor Road	
5) B1101 Broad Street /B1101 Station Road /B1099 Dartford Road	

6) B1101 High Street/Burrowmoor Road – roundabout 7) B1101 High Street/St Peters Road 8) A141/Hostmoor Avenue 9) B1101 Elm Road/Twenty Foot Road	
d) A141 junctions Huntingdon: 1) A141 / St Peters industrial area roundabout 2) A141 / B1090 roundabout	Huntingdonshire
e) St Ives junctions 1. A1096 / Meadow Lane 2. A1123/B1040 and A1123/Harrison Way roundabouts 3. B1090/A1123	Huntingdonshire

It was highlighted that as schemes a) c) and d) above were now included on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority approved shortlist of feasibility studies and business cases for funding schemes where finance approval was expected in March. As a result, approval was sought for the following shortlist of schemes to be developed in 2018/19, on the basis that they were not supported by another high level authority:

<i>Scheme location</i>
St Ives Junctions:
A1096 / Meadow Lane roundabout, St Ives
A1123 / B1040 and A1123 / Harrison Way roundabouts
B1090 / A1123 Houghton Road, St Ives
A10/A142 roundabouts Ely

Approval was also sought to use the following Sifting and Prioritisation process if further scheme development funding was allocated for future years. This process would be used to develop a forward pipeline of schemes ready for delivery, focussing on schemes which tackled congestion, cost under £5 million, and were not already funded or part of a committed wider future scheme. The full proposed process was described below and illustrated in a diagram shown in Appendix 1 to the report.

- Stage 1 – Initial sift of schemes

The Transport Investment Plan has been used as the starting point for schemes and a sifting process had been developed based on the factors set out above.

- Stage 2 – second sift

To score the long list schemes solely against the congestion criteria of the National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) scoring system to produce a short list of schemes. The NPIF system is being utilised by the Combined Authority to develop its priority transport programme.

- Stage 3 - Prioritisation

to score the shortlist schemes against all the NPIF criteria to form a prioritised list of schemes that would become the scheme development programme.

It was proposed that a paper should be presented to the Committee each December to approve the following year's programme of schemes to be developed.

In discussion the following issues were raised:

- One Member highlighted the very extensive Public Health implications comments and that while the emphasis on tackling congestion in the criteria as set out in Appendix 1 had the potential for a positive impact on health, their last paragraph comment highlighted that exclusion of cycling and infrastructure projects from the criteria might reduce opportunities to improve health locally, particularly of this set a precedent for other Transport Policy decisions. As a balance to this, another Member made the point that while understanding the public health concept to encourage greater cycling and walking, some distances for more outlying towns, for example from St Ives, would never result in a large scale modal shift from using cars to cycling.
- With regard to recommendation c) concerns were raised by one Member who while fully supporting the proposed schemes strongly objected to the proposal to exclude Cambridge City schemes at sift stage 3 which she saw as being unfair and excluded a body of County tax payers. She argued that Cambridge schemes should be considered and evaluated in the same way as any other schemes from a different area of the County for equity purposes, in order to establish their relative need. It was explained to the Member that the intention for the Fund was to address gaps in funding in respect of looking to reduce congestion in market towns and to keep people moving around the County. Cambridge City issues were dealt with in other plans.

In respect of the above concern, Councillor Harrison moved and seconded an amendment that Sift three should be removed from the criteria but was defeated after being put to the vote. However to recognise the issue that had been raised, a further amendment was suggested by the Chairman seconded by the Vice Chairman that the process proposed would be further reviewed after a period of operation to see whether any changes were required. This was accepted by all present. **Action: Karen Kitchener / Chris Poultney**

Councillor Connor requested that the officers keep him informed regarding progress on the A141 schemes listed. On being informed that a Steering Group was to be set up in March, he requested that he be considered to serve on it. **Action: Karen Kitchener / Chris Poultney**

Councillor Fuller requested that a briefing meeting be organised between officers and himself regarding the three St Ives junction improvement schemes. **Action: Karen Kitchener / Chris Poultney**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the scheme development work being undertaken by the Combined Authority;
- b) Approve the following list of schemes to be developed in 2018/2019 ; and

St Ives Junctions:

- A1096 / Meadow Lane roundabout, St Ives
- A1123 / B1040 and A1123 / Harrison Way roundabouts
- B1090 / A1123 Houghton Road, St Ives

A10/A142 roundabouts Ely

- c) Approve the process for sifting and prioritising transport schemes from 2019/20 onwards (as shown in Appendix 1 to the report), to be developed and designed ready to be implemented when funding opportunities arise.
- d) To receive a report back to the December meeting to approve developing the following year's programme of schemes.

89. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – DECEMBER 2017

Economy and Environment Committee received the latest Finance and Performance Report for the period to the end of December 2017 to enable them to both note and comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position.

The main issues highlighted were:

Revenue: The only change since the previous month related to Winter Maintenance which was outside the responsibility of the Economy and Environment Committee ETE was now forecasting an overspend of £143k a £124k increase from the November report.

Capital; The forecast spend on Huntingdon – West of Town Centre Link Road for 2017-18 had slipped by an additional £105k to £950k (£845k in the November Report) given the land cost claims were unlikely to be resolved until the new financial year and while Kings Dyke had slipped by £420k to reflect the latest planned profile of expenditure which was to do with ongoing land discussions and so would slip to the next year as the land would not be paid for before March. The expectation was that the scheme would still start in the autumn. A report on the Ely Southern bypass was due to come forward to the April Committee meeting.

Performance: on the twelve performance indicators: one was currently showing as red (the average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes) three were showing as amber, and eight green. At year-end the current forecast was that no performance indicators would be red, five would be amber and seven green.

One Member drew attention to how poorly Appendix 7 reproduced in black and white as currently it was colour shaded blue on the electronic copy. The request to officers was

to look at producing it as a black and white document for future meetings. **Action: Lou Gostling**

Having reviewed and commented on the report it was unanimously resolved to note the report.

90. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

On receiving the details of the Plan

It was resolved;

- a) To note the Training Plan.
- b) To ask Democratic Services to confirm the date of the Waterbeach site visit outside of the meeting. **Action**
- c) To request that invites are sent out for training sessions rather than just via e-mail. **Action**

91. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FORWARD AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Having received the forward agenda plan as set out in the agenda:

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan with the following additions / changes since the version published on the agenda:

- the Connecting Cambridgeshire Report will be rescheduled from 8th March to 12th April E&E Committee and will be a key decision,
- The Wisbech Access Strategy report to be removed from Committee on 8th March as there were currently ongoing discussions with Fenland District Council, with the report to be re-programmed once completed.

As this was also the appropriate agenda item for service committees to consider any changes to outside bodies where a separate report slot had not been provided, the Committee noted that Councillor Giles earlier in the week informed Democratic Services that he wished to resign from being the County Council's appointee to the Huntingdon Bid Board and that Councillor Sanderson had expressed an interest to be appointed in his place. As there were no other expressions of interest

It was resolved:

to appoint Councillor Sanderson to replace Councillor Giles as the County Council's appointment to the Huntingdon Bid Board. **Action Democratic Services to inform the contact officer**

92. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 8th MARCH 2018

**Chairman:
8th March 2018**