

## Highways and Transport Committee: Minutes

Date: 7 September 2021

Time: 10.00am to 13:01

Present: Councillors Alex Beckett, Steve Corney, Piers Coutts, Doug Dew, Ryan Fuller, Bryony Goodliffe, Simon King, Brian Milnes, Edna Murphy, Neil Shailer, Tom Sanderson, Alan Sharp, and Mandy Smith

Venue: The Burgess Hall, St Ives

### 26. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bird, Giles and McGuire.

There were no declarations of interest.

### 27. Minutes – 27 July 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 22nd June 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

### 28. Highways and Transport Committee Action Log

The Committee noted its Action Log. A Member raised actions that were agreed as part of the item presented to the June meeting of the Committee relating to the King's Parade barriers that did not appear on the action log. It was requested for these to be added. **ACTION**

An action relating to the A14 item that was presented to the July meeting of the Committee had been missed off. Representatives from Highways England had undertaken to provide their strategy for the disposal of derelict buildings along the route. **ACTION**

### 29. Petitions and Public Questions

Several public questions were received and taken during the relevant agenda item. The responses are contained at Appendix A to these minutes.

### 30. Integrated Block Transport Strategy Aims Funding Allocation

Members considered a report regarding the Integrated Block Transport Strategy Aims Funding Allocation that requested Members consider the allocation of funding. Funding was provided by the Department for Transport to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and that funding (£3.2m) was passed to Cambridgeshire County Council. The Highways and Transport Committee previously approved the use of the funding at its March 2021 meeting. Funding was allocated to different categories,

listed at paragraph 1.2 of the report. The presenting officer reported delay to many schemes that were unable to begin to the COVID-19 pandemic and drew attention to their progress listed in Appendix A of the report.

During discussion of the report, individual Members raised the following points:

- Drew attention to paths being created that did not meet the needs of equestrian users and sought assurance that all users were considered when developing routes. Officers explained that target users would largely depend on the scheme being developed and the location and assured the Committee that inclusivity was a key consideration when developing schemes.
- Noted that Local Access Fora contained representation from the equine community.
- Requested that a future report be presented to the Committee that set out a policy regarding the surfacing of paths for non-motorised users that would ensure clarity for officers and users. Officers informed the Committee that an Active Travel Strategy report would be presented to the Committee later in the year and surfacing policy requirements would form part of it.
- Sought clarity regarding the prioritisation and allocation of funding to the list of projects set out in the report and commented that the change in administration would affect the prioritisation of schemes. Officers explained that many of the schemes were for development and there would be opportunities for the schemes to change. If additional weight was given to air quality and climate change, the results would have been the same.
- Commented that the process was opaque and that it was difficult to understand how the priorities were arrived at. It was therefore imperative to have Member involvement in the setting of priorities. Attention was drawn to several schemes in the Wisbech area that were not contained within the report that should have at least been acknowledged within the report even if they were rejected.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the progress of the Carry Forward Schemes;
- b) Support the proposed allocation of the DTSA 2021-22 funding to projects.

## 31. Cambridge South Station

The Committee received a report relating to Cambridge South Station and comments collated from officers with different technical specialisations. This would be submitted to Network Rail Council was supportive of the scheme that was backed by several policies. However, a holding objection was in place to ensure that Council can secure Protective provision for the guided busway and work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to ensure provision for Cambridge South East Transport (CSET).

During the course of discussion Members:

- Expressed concern regarding the size of the station and potential for expansion as the predominantly laboratory-based work in the area would not experience the same level of home-working as other sectors. The forecast growth rate was too low and the only areas where expansion could take place would be within the Clay Farm green space and the green belt. The pick-up and drop-off points were limited and although active travel was key, it was important that expansion could be achieved in the future. There would also be many people using the station that would be attending Addenbrooke's Hospital that would be less able to get there by walking that also needed consideration. Onward travel and how the station interfaced with the cycling network also required more detailed consideration. When built it was essential that the station interacted successfully with the local area and that there was sufficient budget to improve links.
- Reinforced the capacity issue for current or future growth given the projected number of visitors to the Addenbrooke's site as connectivity for outpatients was key. 32k visitors to the site currently in plan. Want that reinforced. Connectivity to outpatients was key.
- Highlighted the impact of traffic on residential areas such as Red Cross, Nine Wells and Trumpington and the potential requirement for mitigation measures to reduce the impact.
- Highlighted connectivity with East West Rail (EWR) that was due to have an interface with the station. Officers commented that that EWR was progressing but was at a different stage of development. All stakeholders were communicating with one another to ensure a joint approach and to ensure that nothing during the development of the station would negatively impact on EWR. There were also no anticipated capacity issues when EWR was built.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Delegate to the Executive Director for Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Highways and Transport Committee approval of the submission of formal documents related to the Cambridge South Station and the related Inquiry;
- b) Review and approve the proposed comments as detailed in Appendix A of this report. Nothing that these are not part of a formal consultation process but comments on the TWA submitted by Network Rail for Cambridge South Station.

## 32. Road Safety Schemes 2021

The Committee received a report relating to road safety schemes proposed for 2021-22. The presenting officer drew attention to the annual road safety budget and explained that it was common for funding to be rolled over into future years to deliver schemes.

The Chair invited Mrs Margaret Lumb (Chairman St Ives area Road Safety Committee) to address the Committee. Mrs Lumb informed the Committee that the Wheatsheaf Crossroads featured at every meeting of the Road Safety Committee as it was considered the most important junction in the area. There were a significant number of minor collisions that occurred that were not reported to the Police and therefore were not included within the accident statistics. Mrs Lumb did not personally use the junction as she considered it too dangerous and drivers routinely ignored give-way signs. She was delighted that the money had been allocated for traffic lights and having canvassed opinion she expressed great disappointment that a staggered junction had now been proposed. A significant number of accidents were a result of driver error and therefore lighting should be improved at the junction as visibility was often poor during winter months and the 60mph was too high. Recent temporary traffic lights that were installed while new pipe works were installed worked well. Mrs Lumb concluded by pleading with the Committee that financial considerations did not come before saving lives and preventing accidents.

The Chair invited local Member, Councillor Steve Criswell to address the Committee. Councillor Criswell began by informing the Committee of the strength of feeling within the local community about Wheatsheaf Crossroads and it was the subject of many letters and emails to him as the local Member. Councillor Criswell welcomed the options appraisal. He informed the Committee that a traffic light solution was the preferred option when the work began and that position continued during subsequent meetings. Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) were approached for funding through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Prior to the bid being made, officers had sight of the Milestone report in March 2021 and a meeting was convened with the previous Chair of the Committee and Councillor Criswell at which it was proposed that staggered junctions would be preferred and questioned whether we would want to continue with lights. Councillor Criswell drew attention to Appendix D of the report that contained the pros and cons of the options. The con for the staggered crossing was that it did not improve opportunities for crossing the road which did not solve the two issues that were trying to be solved. A signalised crossing was the only way to force drivers to stop. While Councillor Criswell understood the methodology of the cost-benefit analysis, he was unable to support it due to the paramount importance of saving lives. A staggered junction could still result in accidents at the junction.

The Assistant Director – Highways advised that it was important to ensure that the implemented solution was the right one. The methodology used within the options appraisal was the industry standard. The driver did have to rely on their own judgement; however, the staggered junction significantly reduced the cognitive load on a driver and therefore made the manoeuvre easier. It was also important to note that delay to a journey could also impede decision making and increase risk taking. The report sought to identify the most appropriate and effective solution. Not necessarily the cheapest.

The Democratic Services Officer relayed comments from Milton Cycling Campaign to the Committee. The section of the A10 between Car Dyke Junction and Milton had recently been downgraded to 40 mph, but it had already been observed by many nearby residents that many vehicles were not adhering to this new speed limit with dangerous overtakes being reported. This behaviour increased the perceived risk on this road and depressed cycling and walking numbers.

The Milton Cycling Campaign requested that the following measures be considered for the A10:

- Road width should be reduced to reflect the width of a 40mph speed road.
- Lack of consistency with nearby and minor roads (for example, the A10 was 40mph and vehicles leaving the road to Ely Rd and that road being 50mph. Similarly, Butt Lane, with that road, being narrower and faster at 60mph). It was important to highlight that both roads had adjacent shared pavements which no longer met LTN 1/20 standards and were poorly maintained, in particular the Butt Lane path. For this reason, Milton Cycling Campaign suggested that the roads should have their speed limit downgraded to 40mph for pedestrian and cyclist safety.
- Traffic lights should be installed at the Humphries Way / Landbeach Rd junction to help people cross the road safely from Landbeach to Milton, and vice versa.
- Speed cameras should be installed.

Butt Lane (until Impington), Ely Rd (Milton) and the A10 from Butt Lane traffic lights to new 40mph speed limits should all have their speed limits reduced to 40mph.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Noted the significant disadvantage of a staggered junction in that it did not improve the junction for the driver as two turns had to be made. Officers explained that the disadvantages were objective and that traffic lights had their own disadvantages such as red-light blindness that could be equally dangerous.
- Drew attention to the area and the businesses located on and around the junction including Envar and the Cambridgeshire County Council Recycling Centre. The road was busy and there were hidden dips. Therefore, traffic lights represented the best solution.
- Emphasised that a staggered junction was not the preferred option for the local community.
- Noted the success of smart traffic lights that had been installed in the Fenland area and commented further that a staggered junction was not the right solution.
- Highlighted the role and knowledge of the area that local Members had. The Wheatsheaf Crossroads was the number one accident black spot in Huntingdonshire. It was essential that the Committee acknowledge the views of local people and that if a staggered junction did not work then it would weigh heavily on the Committee.
- Commented that drivers often misjudged the junction due to hidden dips and the blind crest of the hill. There was a risk that a staggered junction would create a different accident cluster further down the road. Attention was drawn to speeding

and the installation of a speed camera on the junction following a fatal road traffic accident several years ago.

- Noted the comments of the Assistant Director – Highways who informed the Committee that it was essential that the process was evidence led and that it was good practice to continually challenge whether a solution would result in the greatest benefit. Officers had worked throughout to achieve a solution that would provide the greatest reduction in accidents at the crossroads. Traffic lights were originally identified as the preferred solution however, the options assessment had resulted in a different outcome. Traffic lights were identified initially as the cheapest option as there was no land uptake required. However, as the scheme developed it became apparent that land uptake would be required, together with significant fibre optic cabling work. It was also highlighted to the Committee that traffic-light controlled junctions also experienced significant levels of accidents and rear-end shunt collisions would likely increase. A staggered junction would reduce the conflict points and reduce the decision making of the driver and was evidenced that it would reduce collisions.

The Chair, summing up the debate commented that the work he had seen officers undertake, it was clear that the primary concern was the effectiveness of the solution rather than cost. The Chair noted that there was not significant support for a staggered junction. It was also important for the community to understand that there would likely be delay to a traffic light solution and cost implications due to the land purchase requirements.

It was proposed by Councillor French and seconded by Councillor Smith to amend recommendation b) in order that a traffic light solution be implemented at the Wheatsheaf Crossroads. On being put to the vote the amendment was carried unanimously.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the capital programme of safety schemes for 2021/22 outlined in Appendix A; and
- b) Agree the preferred safety solution for Wheatsheaf Crossroads to be developed and work with partners to identify the required funding.

### 33. Civil Parking Enforcement

The Committee considered a report that sought Members' consideration of the application of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in the Fenland, Huntingdonshire, and South Cambridgeshire districts.

During discussion Members:

- Sought clarification regarding the timing of the agency agreements. The presenting officer explained that the drafting of the agreements would take place over the next few months. Although it was not a requirement for the agreements to be in place

before an application to the Secretary of State was lodged it was prudent for the Council to have the agreements in place.

- Highlighted illegal and inconsiderate parking in rural areas and questioned whether the scheme would apply to villages and towns. Officers confirmed that it would and there would likely be targeting of areas to offer the most effective enforcement.
- Noted the comments of Councillor French who had worked hard for the scheme to introduced at Fenland District Council and drew attention to the funding supplied by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. Concern was raised that applications could only be submitted in April or October and that October 2022 was considerable time away. The presenting officer confirmed that the timetable was indicative and the submission could be made earlier, then it would.
- Highlighted the seeming difference in process between what was followed by Huntingdonshire and Fenland District Councils when compared to South Cambridgeshire due to the involvement of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). Clarity was sought regarding the reference in paragraph 2.4 of the report relating to a time-limited element and a reference to Cambridgeshire County Council introducing on-street parking charges. It was essential that all districts were operating on an even basis in terms of funding. It appeared that South Cambridgeshire had not agreed to fund to the same level as the others and it was not clear how long the GCP funding would last or how a deficit would be handled.
- Questioned whether there was a point at which there would be a clearer view of the financial model and at what point resources were committed in earnest. The presenting officer explained that each District Council was slightly different and that South Cambridgeshire had not provided the financial information yet.
- Noted that East Cambridgeshire District Council was developing a scheme that was community based under Section 38 of the Police and Crime Act. Free parking in Ely was maintained to encourage tourists and visitors to the area.
- Noted that Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) were the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure they were correct. The TRO process was contained within the preparatory work within the capital set-up costs.
- Noted that Fenland District Council would fund any deficit regarding the scheme and would not be introducing car parking charges unless compelled to by the Government owing to the high levels of deprivation in the area.
- Noted that if Huntingdonshire and Fenland District Councils applications could be submitted ahead of South Cambridgeshire's if they were ready to do so. It was also confirmed that any surplus revenue from on-street parking charges would be returned to Cambridgeshire County Council.

It was proposed by the Chair with the unanimous agreement of the Committee that a report be presented to the November meeting that clarified the funding arrangements with the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

It was resolved to:

- a) Authorise Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to prepare a Civil Enforcement Area (CEA) or Special Enforcement Area (SEA) application to the Department for Transport for a Designation Order for the introduction of CPE in Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire;
- b) Delegate approval of Agency Agreements with Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, a funding agreement with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Department for Transport application to the Service Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee; and
- c) Request an update report including clarification of the funding of the schemes at the November Committee meeting.

#### 34. Winter Service Plan 2021-22

The Committee received the Winter Service Plan 2021-22 that sought the Committee's approval to provide a winter service (gritting) on part of the highway network, to ensure the winter service network was open to traffic during the winter season and to support the procurement plan of the gritting fleet to deliver that service.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Welcomed the drive to recruit volunteers and questioned how that would be achieved. The presenting officer explained that work had begun with the Communications Team and targeted media. Alternative means of engagement were being considered and welcomed the role that Councillors could play in delivering the message to Parish Council meetings they attended.
  - Requested that an update report be presented to the Committee in 12 months' time.
- ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Winter Service Plan for the 2021-2022 to 2024-2025 winter gritting season;
- b) Delegate any significant changes to the Plan to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee;
- c) Approve the Winter Gritting Vehicle Procurement Plan for the contract implementation on 1st June 2022; and
- d) Provide an annual update on the Winter Service Plan.



## 35. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee received the July 2021 iteration of the Finance Monitoring Report. Introducing the report, the presenting officer highlighted that there little change regarding the revenue position. There was a reported forecast underspend of £205k that was largely due to less than expected energy cost inflation for street lighting. There were also losses of income due to the Covid-19 pandemic, however, there was provision within the Business Plan for them to be offset. Attention was also drawn to Appendix B of the report that contained costs relating to the procurement of interim resources.

During discussion

- Noted the overall transformation programme that was running through the Place and Economy Directorate that had created a degree of staff churn. Interim staff had therefore been taken on to ensure continued delivery during the transformation period.
- Requested that Sutton Road was removed from the reference to Leverington Common within the report as they were not part of the same scheme as that the Parish Council was considering a LHI bid for Sutton Road. **ACTION**
- Drew attention to the HR report that was dated 31<sup>st</sup> January and questioned why the data was significantly out of date. The presenting officer explained that since LGSS ceased operation the reporting function passed to the Business Intelligence team. There had been some deterioration in the quality of the data and it was anticipated that up to date figure would be provided at the next Committee.

It was resolved to:

- a) Review, note and comment upon the report; and
- b) Endorse the procurement approach for interim resources in the Highways & Transport teams as set out in Appendix B to the report.

## 36. Recommendations from the Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study Stage 1

The Committee considered recommendations from the Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study Stage 1. The report sought the approval of Members to request that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) released funding for further development based on the recommendations from the Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study.

During discussion Members—

- Drew attention to the removal of option to consider junction 9. Local Members and the Steering Group had been clear that they wanted it as an option as the COVID-19 pandemic had changed things considerably. Attention was also drawn to a project

to improve Whittlesford Park Way commissioned by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). The Shelford and Whittlesford Rail User Group had expressed disappointment that there was a lack of ambition. The presenting officer commented that there were several different elements that required consideration, one of which was carbon and climate change. The intention was to provide options that allowed people to express a choice rather than just major road building.

- Requested that sight lines be considered when installing LED street-lighting. Officers responded by informing the Committee that savings resulted from the reduction in electricity usage and not street-light columns.

The Committee agreed unanimously to remove the word not from recommendation e) of the report.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Confirm the Council's continued support for the development and delivery of the A505 non-motorised user bridge by Greater Cambridge Partnership with Hertfordshire County Council;
- b) Recommend the outcomes of the study to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) for approval;
- c) Request that the CPCA reviews with the Council the scope and funding allocation for the Stage 2 of the study to ensure that they are appropriate to enable the work to satisfy the requirements of the next Gateway Point in the CPCA's Assurance Framework;
- d) Request the release of funding for Stage 2 of the study;
- e) Recommend to the Combined Authority that the M11 junction 9 all movements option should be included for consideration at the Strategic Outline Business Case stage; and
- f) Consider new appointments to the Member Steering Group for the next stage of development of the study, should the CPCA release funds for the study be taken forward.

### 37. Business Planning Proposals for 2022-27 – opening update and overview

Members received the initial introduction to the business planning proposals for 2022-27. Areas for development were contained within Appendix 4 of the report and officers would report back to the Committee in the Autumn with business cases for Members to consider.

Commenting on the report a Member drew attention to the list of savings, in particular regarding drainage maintenance and operation and emphasised that it was not an area that could be cut. The Interim Director: Highways, explained that it was an invest to

save proposal that involved using technology to monitor drains that alerted when attention was required.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the overview and context provided for the 2022-23 to 26-27 Business Plan; and
- b) Comment on the list of proposals (set out in section 5.2) and endorse their development

38. **Highways and Transport Committee Agenda Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies**

The Committee noted its agenda plan and the additions requested during the meeting.

Chair  
4<sup>th</sup> November 2021