

Highways and Transport Committee: Minutes

Date: 12 July 2022

Time: 10:00am to 2.24pm

Present: Councillors Alex Beckett (Chair), Neil Shailer (Vice-Chair), Gerri Bird, Piers Coutts, Douglas Dew, Lorna Dupre, Ryan Fuller, Simon King, Peter McDonald, Mac McGuire, Brian Milnes, Tom Sanderson, Alan Sharp and Mandy Smith

Venue: New Shire Hall, Alconbury Weald, Huntingdon, PE28 4YE

83. Notification of Chair and Vice Chair

It was noted that Councillor Beckett was appointed as Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee, and Councillor Shailer as Vice- Chair, for the 2022/23 municipal year at the full Council meeting on 10th May 2022.

84. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillors Jan French and Derek Giles (substituted by Councillor Tom Sanderson).

The Chair and Vice Chair declared in relation minute number 89, 'Residents Parking', a non-statutory disclosable interest. Both had sought advice from the Monitoring Officer who had confirmed their ability to take part in the item.

85. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions were received. There were several public questions relating to various agenda items that can be found, together with the responses at Appendix A to these minutes.

86. Minutes – 26 April 2022 and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2022 were agreed as a correct record:

The Action Log was noted together with the following updates:

- Members noted that a further confidential briefing would likely be offered in the future as the matter had progressed.
- A further update was requested on the King's Parade Barrier

- Item 71 – highlighted 2 recent fatalities and requested that discussions take place with highways engineers regarding potential improvements.
- Wisbech Access Study – confirmed the funding was in place for the study and funding for the implementation would be sought separately and a report would be presented to the Committee

87. New Strategic Transport Model

The Committee received a report detailing an update regarding the procurement of a new strategic transport model that would replace the Cambridge Subregional model. Transport models needed to be acceptable to the Department of Transport and must therefore meet the current guidance set out in the Transport Assessment Guidance (TAG). One of the key components of TAG was the age of the data used, TAG states that models should be based on data that is less than 5 years old. This requirement meant that the existing models owned and managed by the County Council (CCC) would need to be revalidated using new data by the end of 2024.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Sought greater clarity regarding the distinguishing aspects of the model and the software. Officers explained that the model provided the processing side, and the second component was the data. It was essentially a suite of model tools and data, and the Council was seeking to ensure they communicated and were fully integrated. Members noted that the proposal sought integration with Peterborough which was a key requirement of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority that was keen to have a whole-Cambridgeshire model. Models included buffers into border locations so that definition was not lost in those areas.
- Confirmed that towns and large villages located in neighbouring counties, close to the Cambridgeshire border would be included within at least the transport elements of the model.

It was resolved unanimously/by a majority to:

- a) notes the progress made in the procurement of a new strategic transport model;
- b) delegates the decision to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to the Service Director of Highways and Transport; and
- c) grants approval to procure the delivery of a new strategic transport model, delegating the decision to Award and enter into Contract to the Service Director of Highways and Transport.

88. A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme

The Committee received a report that provided an update on the progress of the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and the A141 and St Ives Improvements Scheme. The report also sought approval of the revalidation of these schemes which would enable them to move into the Outline Business Case stage.

The Committee received comments from CamCycle and Ely Cycling Campaign, attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

It was resolved unanimously/by a majority to:

- a) notes and comments on the update report and the progress made with the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme;
- b) the Council agrees to accept in total £4M of funding (in total over 2022/23 and 2023/24) from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the revalidation of the Strategic Outline Business Case for the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and subsequently prepare to undertake the Outline Business Case;
- c) delegate the decision to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme to the Service Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the s151 officer;
- d) supports the establishment of a Member Working Group involving District Councils to run in parallel to scheme development and stakeholder engagement for A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme;
- e) the Council agrees to accept in total £6M of funding (£1.841M in 2022/23, £3.311M in 2023/24 and £0.848M in 2024/25) from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the revalidation of the Strategic Outline Business Case for the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme and subsequently prepare to undertake the Outline Business Case, subject to this level of funding being granted by the CPCA;
- f) delegate the decision to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme to the Service Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the s151 officer;
- g) supports the establishment of a Member Working Group involving District Councils to run in parallel to scheme development and stakeholder engagement for A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme.

89. Resident Parking Scheme

The Committee received a report that sought approval of the Cambridge Resident Parking Scheme Delivery Plan set out for 2022, and set out proposed changes to permit limits and pricing mechanisms.

The Committee received comments and questions from Cambridge City Councillor Copely, Cambridge Living Streets and CamCycle that are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

During the course of discussion:

- A Member addressed wording within the report, suggesting that language had been selected carefully to avoid the explicit use of economic controls of supply and demand.
- Attention was drawn to Appendix 4 of the report; a Member questioned how the comparison list with other Councils was decided as they were all Labour or Liberal Democrat controlled and it did not include Conservative controlled Councils such as Peterborough that had not introduced controls.
- Concern was expressed regarding the removal of the 50% threshold on consultation responses and the board of senior officers and Members.
- Commented that the flaw with such schemes was the mistaken belief that residents could cycle or use public transport and that would cause isolation. It was essential that the impact on certain parts of society was properly considered.
- Noted that pavement parking would be debated as a motion at the forthcoming meeting of Full Council.
- Highlighted the varying mobility needs of residents and issues particularly regarding the storing of cargo bikes. There was a balance required that worked for the majority of residents. The removal of the 50% threshold was designed to remove unintended consequences when areas were divided into smaller zones.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the content of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Resident Parking Scheme update;
- b) Approve the Cambridge Resident Parking Scheme Delivery Plan 2022; and
- c) Agree in principle, to the proposed short-term changes and delegate the approval of the resident permit pricing mechanism and permit limits to the Executive Director of Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee

90. Elizabeth Way, Cambridge – Consider Objections to Making Experimental Bus Lane Order allowing use by Powered Two-Wheelers and Electric Vehicles Permanent

The Committee received a report relating to the Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) on Elizabeth Way, Cambridge, which sought a decision whether the ETO should be made permanent, in whole or in part, or it should be abandoned.

The Committee received comments from Friends of Elizabeth Way and CamCycle contained at Appendix A to these minutes. The Committee also received comments from Mr Alexander Nix who spoke in support of the TRO to allow access for powered 2 wheeled (PTWs), and zero-emission vehicles access to the bus lane. Mr Nix highlighted studies demonstrating the environmental and safety benefits of such vehicles. PTWs took up less road space, required less parking space and were lighter and therefore had less impact on road infrastructure. They provided an opportunity to reduce emissions as they were less polluting than cars and provided a cheap and accessible transport mode for citizens and could bridge a gap where walking and cycling was not practical and public transport was not in place. Many other local authorities allowed PTWs access to bus lanes including across London, Brighton, West Midlands and Northamptonshire. Mr Nix also highlighted the issues surrounding electric scooters that were not regulated. Commenting further Mr Nix, expressed the view that collating zero emission vehicles and PTWs was a mistake. Only 4 respondents to the consultation objected to PTW access and 5 respondents supported PTW access. Furthermore, the officer recommendation was based on negative feedback about zero emission vehicles, rather than PTWs. Motorcycle users were also vulnerable road users. Concluding, Mr Nix drew attention to the positive benefits of PTWs and why they should be allowed access to bus lanes.

During discussion of the report:

- A question was raised regarding the frequency of buses using the bus lane as only 2 were recorded during the survey that appeared inordinately low. Officers explained that the route had been significantly reduced / altered due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- A Member noted and understood the concerns raised regarding electric vehicles and motorcycles. Electric scooters, presented a national issue as they were effectively unregulated and used in the wrong place represented a danger. Continuing, the Member was minded to supporting option c) but desired further discussion on how all road users could be accommodated safely in bus lanes.
- A Member commented that the pavements were sufficiently wide and accommodated for dual use between cyclists and pedestrians.
- Highlighted the importance of keeping a watching brief on PTWs, however, there was an overriding importance to keeping the flow of busses continuous and unhindered.
- A Member commented that there were two separate issues. One relating specifically to Elizabeth Way and the other was the use of bus lanes in Cambridge more widely.

There were clear arguments that they should not be made available for use by zero emission vehicles. However, the arguments for prohibiting PTWs had been less well made. Significantly, there was a valid issue regarding the volume of cycles in Cambridge that therefore made it sensible to allow the experimental traffic order to lapse. Furthermore, the report was unclear on the wider implications for Cambridge if the ETRO was adopted.

It was resolved to:

- a) Allow the Experimental Traffic Order to lapse and return the bus lane to previous usage.
- b) Inform the objectors and others who submitted written representations of the decision.

91. Objections Relating to Proposed Traffic Regulation Order on Vinery Road and Vinery Way, Cambridge

The Committee received a report that sought a decision on whether the installation of a Pedestrian and Cycle Zone (School Street Scheme) in Vinery Road and Vinery Way, Cambridge to be made permanent.

The Committee received comments from CamCycle (attached at Appendix A) and Cambridge City Councillor Healey. Speaking in support of the proposed pedestrian and cycle zone and on behalf of City Councillor Pounds, Councillor Healey informed the Committee of the difference it has made in terms of school safety. Attention was drawn to the considerable community support for the scheme and Councillor Healey paid tribute to the work of the community in delivering the scheme.

During discussion:

- Attention was drawn to the comments of the local Cambridge City Councillors commenting that many "School Street Schemes" had failed due to a lack of volunteers.
- While supporting the principle of "School Street Schemes" it was important to note that such schemes would not be appropriate everywhere owing to the location of the schools.
- Highlighted the impact on Coldhams Lane and the need to be mindful of the wider area, that would also be relevant for the agenda item regarding Mill Road.
- Drew attention to the March meeting of the Strategy and Resources Committee where the Leader of the Council (Councillor Nethsingha) informed Members that the Joint Administration was carefully reviewing highways funding and encouraged the administration to fund "School Street Schemes" for places where the location of the school made it appropriate.

It was resolved unanimously/ by a majority to:

- a) Approve the proposed Pedestrian and Cycle Zone (School Street Scheme) as advertised in Vinery Road & Vinery Way, Cambridge.
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly

92. A505 Royston to Granta Park Study

The Committee considered a report providing an update on the progress of the A505 Royston to Granta Park Study, commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council with funding of £1m provided by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. The report proposed to take work forward through to a completed Strategic Outline Business Case.

During the course of discussion:

- The report was welcomed together with the progress the progress of the Working Group.
- It was noted that the A505 was still carried in excess of 28k vehicles a day. A recent incident at the McDonalds roundabout resulted in 10-mile tailbacks. Attention was drawn to the anticipated growth in the area and the urgency of required improvements was emphasised. Commenting further, it was suggested that the Council should not rule out approaching National Highways to allow J9 of the M11 to allow traffic to join northbound and southbound carriageways.

It was resolved majority to:

- a) notes the updated position on the A505 Royston to Granta Park study;
- b) endorses the County Council's proposal to submit a bid for funding to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and to carry out the work set out in this report;
- c) delegates the decision to enter into an appropriate Grant Funding Agreement with the CPCA to the Executive Director Place and Economy in consultation with Chair and Vice Chair of this committee; and
- d) nominates three members of the committee to sit on the Member Steering Group for the study

93. Greater Cambridge Partnership's Programme for the Review of Mill Road, Cambridge

The Committee considered a report detailing the recommendations of Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) review of Mill Road within the context of its City Access work. The Committee was reminded that in November last year the Committee requested that the GCP began work and the consultation began in February 2022.

The Committee received comments and questions from CamCycle and Mill Road for People (attached at Appendix A)

The Chair invited representatives from Mill Road Traders Association to address the Committee and began by highlighting the impact of the cost of living and the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic that had affected business along Mill Road. Attention was drawn to the Greater Cambridge Partnership website that stated it was essential transport was revitalised. Transport was the primary issue, and the closure of Mill Road would prevent people being able to travel easily. While clean air and reducing the carbon footprint was welcome, attention was drawn to the cutting of trees along Mill Road. The closure of Mill Road would cause the loss of community as it would be divided. In conclusion, concern was expressed that 92% of respondents to the consultation identified themselves as white British which was in no way an accurate reflection of the diverse ethnic population of Mill Road.

The Chair invited Cambridge City Councillor Healey to address the Committee. Councillor Healy Cllr Healey noted the recommendation for further consultation. However, residents had made their views clear, and the responses reflected discussions that had taken place with the public. There was a clear need for exemptions to ensure disability access and paid tribute to the work of Councillor Gerri Bird in that area. There was also further work on exemptions needed such as whether zero emissions delivery vehicles could be included. Councillor Healey was of the view that the work on Mill Road should form part of a wider programme to promote active travel and ensure children could travel to school safely. With regard to future consultation, Councillor Healey emphasised the need for inclusivity, and expressed concern that some of the consultation events organised excluded residents due to the timing of the events.

Commenting on the report, Members:

- Noted that it was almost a year since the Committee reached a decision and removed the restriction in place at that time. Commenting further, a Member stated that it was the right decision based on the representations made at that time. It was right to ask the GCP to undertake the work due to the impacts on the wider area. Hope was expressed that a decision would be reached in due course that would meet the needs of the majority and a solution installed that benefited all of Cambridge and not just one area.
- Drew attention to the network hierarchy review that was underway, and the context of that review was important. The responses to the consultation were quite clear in that the community was looking for a broadly similar solution to what was there previously. The impact of traffic on the community was severe, and while the views of traders should be considered, it was not acceptable for the present situation to continue.

- Commented that when the Committee decided to remove the scheme in July 2021, the Committee agreed that it could not take forward the scheme as it was, and something better had to be brought forward. Presented to the Committee was a much better set of representations and it was now possible to move to the next stage and develop a scheme that would work and take account of exemptions.
- Drew attention to traffic coming from the east of the city, the Newmarket Road bus lane consultation and Colhams Lane. There would also be an impact on Cherry Hinton Road and Hills Road. It was essential that modelling took place in order that a solution for Mill Road did not create problems elsewhere. The GCP's aim to improve public transport was essential to encouraging people out of their cars. The impact on residents on either side of the bridge had to be considered together with the impact on businesses. It was essential that there were no leading questions on the TRO. Concern was also expressed that only 5% of respondents to the consultation described themselves as Asian; it was vitally important that the whole community was reached during the consultation and their views considered accordingly.
- Emphasised the importance of improving the public realm, however, it was essential that problems were not created elsewhere.
- Welcomed the consultation and questioned why no Equalities Impact Assessment was contained within the report. Officers explained that an assessment was undertaken under the previous TRO and that a new one would be completed should the Committee approve the recommendations set out in the report.

It was resolved unanimously/ by a majority to:

- a) Note the review undertaken by the GCP of Mill Road;
- b) Agree to consult on a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to reinstate the modal filter on Mill Road;
- c) Agree to consult on exemptions to the TRO, including disabled residents and taxis;
- d) Agree to work with the Combined Authority and GCP to develop a public realm improvement scheme along Mill Road;
- e) Agree to monitor and review traffic levels in surrounding streets should the modal filter on Mill Road be reintroduced; and
- f) Continue to work with GCP on the Network Hierarchy Review of the Cambridge road network.

Upon the conclusion of the item, Councillors Dew, Fuller and McGuire left the meeting.

94. CPCA Local Transport and Connectivity Plan

The Committee received a report detailing the draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan which sought the delegation of the full technical response to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's consultation.

The Committee received comments from CamCycle, attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

During Discussion of the report:

- A Member drew attention to how Cambridge led in terms of cycling and expressed a vision where the Council was seen as an exemplar of active travel across the country.
- Attention was drawn to the HGV working group and welcomed the inclusion of overnight facilities for HGV drivers that was recognised as an issue by the working group.
- The reference to highway maintenance was welcomed as it was comparatively easy to build a road than to maintain it once constructed.
- A Member commented that that it was essential that connectivity was a key outcome as an effective transport plan and connectivity could help with isolation, particularly in rural areas.
- Although an improvement on previous iterations, a Member commented, there were still issues and omissions. For example, there was no reference to national grid capacity that if not address would thwart attempts to introduce electric buses. It was requested that reference be made within the consultation response.
- Concern was expressed by a Member that there was little reference to the Climate Commission, and it was requested that more be included within the document.
- Members requested a copy of the draft consultation be circulated to the Committee.
ACTION
- Emphasis was placed by a Member on the different issues facing rural areas when compared to urban areas, linking with earlier comments regarding rural isolation.
- A Member called for greater coordination with the Combined Authority and a greater strategic vision.
- It was noted that officers would provide feedback to request that road safety and net zero elements were strengthened within the plan. Transport accounted for 40% of emissions and a target of 2050 for net zero needed to be challenged.

It was resolved to:

- a) Considers the draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and the key areas of interest arising identified by officers and detailed in section 2 of this report; and
- b) Delegates to the Executive Director Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair the agreement on the Council's Response to the consultation

95. Road Safety Schemes 2022/23

The Committee received a report that sought the approval of the Road Safety Schemes planned to be delivered in 2022-23.

During the course of discussion Members:

- Were mindful of the accidents created by potholes and the disproportionate damage they caused to cyclists. Officers explained that the Highways Operational Standards were being reviewed in terms of active travel.
- Noted that improvements to the A1303 formed part of the previous years budget and were moving forward together with the Swaffham Health scheme that was progressing with regard to land-owner discussions.
- Drew attention to paragraph 2.8 of the report and the iRAP methodology that was used several years ago to assess the route between Chatteris and Ely. It identified £5m of improvements that should be made to the route and only have seen a fraction of that investment made. It was therefore concerning that the same methodology was proposed to be used and it was important not to use a methodology to then implement half the required improvements only. Officers explained that funding prioritisation was necessary owing to the amount of funding available. However, it was important to link wider road safety work such as the network hierarchy review and work with the Combined Authority and move away from implementing schemes on a piecemeal basis.

It was resolved to:

- a) To approve the capital programme of Safety schemes for 2022/23 outlined in Appendix A; and
- b) To note the schemes being delivered by GCP as set out in Appendix B

96. Traffic Management Update

The Committee considered a report detailing the Traffic Management update and sought approval of the principle of broadening the prioritisation criteria for the 20mph schemes.

During discussion of the report:

- Greater clarity was sought regarding the funding arrangements as it appeared there was inequity of funding between Fenland District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Officers explained that South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) received funding from the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and Fenland District Council (FDC) would receive funding from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). Assurance could not be provided that all district councils would be funded equally as negotiations were ongoing. Presently, funding provided by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) was under discussion, however there was no budget allocation made.
- It was noted that the GCP had offered funding to SCDC based on its proximity to Cambridge City and that SCDC had no car parks of its own. Funding had been offered for an initial 5 years, during which time cost-neutrality was aimed for.
- A Member commented that funding from the CPCA was received from the Major Towns budget and was to support the capital set-up costs rather than the continued running of the scheme. SCDC were advantaged by having funding for a 5 year period. It was explained that the SCDC scheme would run at a deficit for 5 years that the GPC would cover. After 5 years, SCDC would carry the same risk as the other district councils.
- Support was expressed for the 20mph schemes and the work of the working group. The removal of the 24mph criteria was welcomed. A Member commented that it was important that the proposed schemes were community driven.
- It was noted that the work of the Local Highway Initiative working group and the 20mph working group would report back to the Committee for an update.

It was resolved to note the content of the update report and agree to the principle of broadening prioritisation criteria as set out in 2.15

97. Transport Strategy Update

The Committee received a report detailing an update on the Transport Strategy, including the development of district-based transport strategies for Fenland and Huntingdonshire, progress on the development of an Active travel strategy for Cambridgeshire. The report also set out the proposed timescales for the update of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and for East Cambridgeshire and advised the Committee of the 'Making Connections' project carried out by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the 2022 Transport Investment Plan list.

During the course of discussion, Members:

- Drew attention to transport strategies held by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and East Cambridgeshire District Council and the importance that they were viewed collectively in the round with total alignment between organisations.
- Welcomed the review of the Transport Infrastructure Plan (TIP). The TIP was now mapped on the 'My Cambridgeshire' website which was also welcomed.
- Requested that once the process was completed, a simple document be produced that demonstrated where all the different strategies fit and complemented one another.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note progress to date and the next steps for the development of the Fenland, Huntingdonshire and Active Travel strategies;
- b) Delegate approval of consultation in autumn 2022 on: - the draft Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy, - the updated draft Fenland and Active Travel Strategies and - the draft actions plans for the three strategies to the Executive Director of Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of this committee;
- c) Note the proposed timescales for the update of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire;
- d) Note the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board's will be reviewing next steps for the city access project in September, following the Making Connections consultation, which may include a recommendation to undertake consultation on proposals for transforming public transport, cycling and walking and reducing pollution and congestion;
- e) Endorse this consultation, if agreed by the GCP Executive Board being undertaken by the GCP on behalf of the County Council; and
- f) Note the updated Transport Investment Plan list.

98. Finance Monitoring Report – May 2022/23

The Committee received a report detailing the May 2022/23 financial position. Since 2022/23 BP was agreed a budget reset was done to change revenue budget. The presenting officer highlighted one forecast pressure relating to temporary fencing along the guided busway.

During discussion, Members:

- Confirmed that the Swaffham Health Cross Roads improvements scheme remained within the capital programme.
- Attention was drawn to a Local Highway Initiative listed as Sutton Road, Leverington Common. It should relate to Leverington Common only and it was requested that this be changed for future iterations of the report.
- Sought an update regarding the recruitment of interim staff that had been previously approved by the Committee. Officers explained that recruitment was progressing, and appointments had been made and backlogs were being addressed. The Committee was advised that a report would be presented in the future that would update more fully.
- Attention was drawn to the increasing costs for streetlighting given the inflation of energy prices and a Member requested an update be circulated on the LED lamp replacement programme. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously/ by a majority to:

- a) Review, note and comment upon the report, and
- b) Agree to accept the two Highways grants and agree to spend them as proposed within the report.

99. Finance Monitoring Report – Outturn 2021/22

The Committee received a report detailing the 2021/22 financial outturn position.

It was resolved to review, note, and comment upon the report.

100. Highways and Transport Committee Agenda Plan and Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

The Committee received a report that sought a decision regarding the Committee's agenda plan, and appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and the appointment of Member Champions to lead on specific subject areas.

The Wisbech Access Strategy Group has 2 Members listed when in fact it should be 3 and Councillor King to be added.

It was resolved unanimously/ by a majority to:

- a) review its agenda plan attached at Appendix 1;

- b) review the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 2;
- c) review the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels as detailed in Appendix 3; and
- d) note the appointment of Member Champions for Non-Motorised Users.

Chair
July 2022