

**A10 ELY TO KING'S LYNN STUDY(Revised corrected version all references to Appendicesdeleted)**

*To:* **Economy & Environment Committee**

*Meeting Date:* **14 September 2017**

*From:* **Graham Hughes**

*Electoral division(s):* **Ely South, Ely North, Littleport**

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

*Purpose:* **To consider the technical report on the A10 corridor between Ely and King's Lynn**

*Recommendation:* **It is recommended that Committee:**

**(a) note the report in response to the Full Council motion of 10 May 2016**  
**(b) note the Combined Authority proposals for the A10 corridor,**  
**(c) consider the schemes identified in the report for development**  
**(d) agree to expand the scope of the feasibility study at the A10/A142 junctions to consider a wider range of solutions.**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contacts:</i></b>	
Name:	<b>James Barwise</b>	Names:	Cllr Ian Bates
Post:	Lead Transport & Infrastructure Officer	Post:	Chair
Email:	<a href="mailto:James.Barwise@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">James.Barwise@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>

Tel: 01223 703522

Tel: 01223 706398

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. On 10 May 2016, Full Council considered the following motion from Cllr Anna Bailey concerning the evolution and priorities of study work along the A10 corridor, north of Ely:

*It has long been recognised that the A10 north of Cambridge suffers from high levels of congestion; with planned developments along its length this is set to worsen.*

*The ongoing A10 Corridor Study, funded by the County and District Councils, developers and the City Deal is due to report later this year. The scope of this study, however, ends at Ely and does not address the issues along the whole route.*

*This Council recognises the immediate and future capacity issues of the A10 as expressed in the draft Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire 2015, which, in summary, states:*

*“There are a number of areas on the strategic and primary route network that require measures to be introduced for capacity reasons, with a particular emphasis on longer distance trips. These include: the A10 connecting Cambridge, Ely, Littleport and Downham Market.”*

*This Council recognises that the development of Ely North and Waterbeach barracks will significantly increase the amount of traffic and welcomes the possibility of the City Deal to fund the South Cambridgeshire portion of the A10 between Milton and the border with East Cambridgeshire near the Lazy Otter.*

*This Council welcomes the statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he will “look closely” at the bid for upgrading the A10 between Ely and Cambridge.*

*This Council recognises the opportunities presented by the proposed East Anglia Devolution Agreement to support delivery of comprehensive improvements to the A10 between Cambridge and Kings Lynn in Norfolk.*

*This Council recognises the need to undertake further scoping and business case work and therefore instructs the Chief Executive to:*

- Commission a further high level economic and route options study for the A10 north of Cambridge to complement the existing A10 study for use in future bidding exercises*
- Work with Norfolk County Council to develop a case for whole route improvement from Cambridge to Kings Lynn*
- Work with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships to develop funding bids for the development and delivery of a scheme of improvement on the A10 north of Cambridge*
- Continue to lobby government for improvements to the whole of this vital route.*

- 1.2. The motion was passed by 65 votes to 4. In Autumn of last year, officers invited organisations to submit proposals for how they would develop a study as outlined in the motion. In November, following a bid evaluation process, consultants Mott MacDonald were appointed to undertake the study. Work on the study commenced in December and was completed in May.

## **2. MAIN ISSUES**

- 2.1. The study was developed in four stages. Stages 1 and 2 form the baseline study, analysing existing transport conditions. Stage 3 analysed the impact the future housing and employment growth is likely to have on the network, and Stage 4 considered an economic case for investment.
- 2.2. The report that addressed Stages 1 and 2 of the study identified existing issues in terms of demand and highway operation. The findings from this report are summarised as follows:
- The A10 between the A134 roundabout north of Watlington and King's Lynn is the worst performing section along the study corridor against the indicators assessed. This section lies wholly within Norfolk.
  - The route as a whole is not nearing capacity, and can accommodate an increase in trips. However, if traffic flows continue to increase on the route, the Watlington to King's Lynn section may soon be at capacity.
  - Localised queues and delays occur at a number of junctions (e.g. the two A10 / A142 junctions at Ely, A1122 roundabout at Downham Market, and A134 roundabout as noted above).
  - Travel demand and congestion levels are lower than in the Ely to Cambridge part of the A10(N) corridor.
  - Accident risk analysis using the European Risk Assessment Programme rating resulted in all the identified sections on the A10 being classified within the 'low' or 'low-medium' risk bands.
- 2.3. The report that addressed Stage 3 of the study built upon analysis undertaken in Stages 1 and 2, assessing future traffic conditions along the A10. This was undertaken by analysing historic traffic growth, planning data and by using specialist transport planning software. The findings from this report are summarised as follows:
- Based on these projections, dualling of the whole route is unlikely to offer value for money as levels of congestion, which are a key driver of transport business cases, do not appear to warrant this.
  - It is suggested that further work is undertaken focusing on improving link and junction capacity in Section 1 (Ely to Littleport) and Section 5 (around West Winch) of the A10.
  - There may be benefit in considering localised junction capacity and safety improvements elsewhere on the corridor, together with the potential role of non-highway measures.
  - It is recommended that a programme of traffic surveys be carried out to complement and corroborate the results obtained in this Stage and to provide a robust basis for scheme and business case development should the County Council decide to continue with the development of proposals for the route.
- 2.4. While the analysis has shown that the Ely-Kings Lynn route as a whole has accident rating of 'low', the recommendations of the study identify various safety improvements. This is primarily because certain links in the route have a higher accident rating (namely the A10/A142 (Witchford Road) roundabout, and the northernmost stretch of the route between Watlington and King's Lynn. Secondly the inclusion of safety improvements as part of a package of transport measures often adds added value and improves the business case for delivering schemes.

Area	Scheme	Description	Cost Estimate
A10 from A142 Angel Drove junction to A142 Witchford Rd junction	Angel Drove Roundabout re- design	Increase capacity by widening approaches and exits to dual two lanes in all directions. General widening to circulatory carriageway. Creation of a bypass to the roundabout for traffic travelling on the A10 northbound.	£1.2m
	Witchford Roundabout re- design	General widening to circulatory carriageway including the creation of A10 westbound merges, flared lanes, and two exit lanes on each arm	£650,000
	Dual Carriageway	Upgrading this section of the route to dual carriageway, including associated re-designing of roundabouts	£4.5m
Access to the filling station and hand car wash near Chettisham	Safety Management Treatments	A package of low cost engineering countermeasures that could include but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve intersection visibility by the removal of obstacles (advertisements and signage) and possible installation of street lighting</li> <li>• Speed management by the installation of variable signs and information. Warning signs that become active when drivers exceed speed limit coupled with slow signs marked on pavement.</li> </ul>	£125,000
A10 / Grange Lane roundabout	Safety Management Treatments	Improved road marking and maintenance	£60,000
A10 / Bexwell Road roundabout (east of Downham Market)	Safety Management Treatments	Further improvement could be made through providing road markings on the circulatory carriageway, in order to improve drivers' lane discipline.	£2,000
A10 from A134 to A47 Hardwick Interchange	Relief road linking A10 to A47	Link road east of the Growth Area and joining the A47 at a new roundabout	<i>Not known</i>
	Traffic calming measures and network of pedestrian and cycling access	Creation of a network of safe and easy-to-use pedestrian and cycle routes along the last end of the A10. Installation of traffic calming measures along this stretch of road.	

2.5. The report that addressed Stage 4 recommends a series of interventions which can form the basis of further detailed study work. Certain interventions were identified to meet the

challenges listed above but ruled out due to practical constraints. The interventions recommended for further study work are listed in the table above.

- 2.6. It is acknowledged that the study represents an initial optioneering exercise rather than a technical exercise. If schemes are to be taken forward, further scheme development work will be required, and funding sources will need to be identified before schemes can be delivered. Work on a wider scheme development programme is currently ongoing; the above schemes will be considered as part of this programme.
- 2.7. A feasibility study has been commissioned to support emerging development in Ely, and design schemes which will mitigate the impact such development will have on the local transport network. This feasibility study will focus on specific junction improvements, specifically the A142/Lancaster Way, A142/A10 (Witchford Road) and A142/A10 (Angel Drove) roundabouts. Consequently, there is a significant alignment between the recommendations above and the objectives of the feasibility study.
- 2.8. As initially proposed the feasibility study noted would have been limited to identifying the interventions necessary to mitigate the impact of emerging development in Ely on the three roundabouts. It is proposed to extend the feasibility work to identify proposals over and above those needed to mitigate development impacts, and deliver a more holistic solution for the short and medium term capacity issues. It is anticipated that longer term solutions will be identified by the work on the A10 being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge partnership and the Combined Authority.
- 2.9. Certain of the interventions identified lie outside of the county boundary (specifically schemes concerning A10 / Bexwell Road roundabout [east of Downham Market] and A10 from A134 to A47 Hardwick Interchange). As such, these schemes could only be delivered through a mutual agreement with, or by Norfolk County Council. The report has been shared with officers at Norfolk County Council: members will be updated as to whether Norfolk County Council wish to progress any of the study's recommendations.
- 2.10. This report also acknowledges that the priorities of the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the Combined Authority include further extensive work on the A10 corridor, and exploring ways in which an improved M11 can accommodate additional traffic. A draft of this report has been shared with the Combined Authority with a view to maximising any potential for developing schemes in tandem.
- 2.11. It is proposed that all schemes which sit within the Cambridgeshire boundary should be considered for inclusion in the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire. Inclusion in the strategy will maximise the chances of schemes being developed and submitted for forthcoming funding bids.

### **3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

#### **3.1. Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

The report above sets out the implications for this priority in 1.2

#### **3.2. Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### **3.3. Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

### **4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

#### **4.1. Resource Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

#### **4.2. Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

#### **4.3. Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

*There are no significant implications within this category*

#### **4.4. Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category

#### **4.5. Engagement and Communications Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category

#### **4.6. Localism and Local Member Involvement**

There are no significant implications within this category

#### **4.7. Public Health Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Paul White
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	Awaiting Approval Name of Officer: Eleanor Bell
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

### **SOURCE DOCUMENTS GUIDANCE**

*It is a legal requirement for the following box to be completed by the report author.*

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
A10 Ely to King's Lynn Study Stage 1 & Stage 2: Baseline Report A10 Ely to King's Lynn Study Stage 3: Future Growth Report A10 Ely to King's Lynn Study Stage 4: The Case For Investment	Room 301 Shire Hall, Cambridge