

TRANSPORT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 23 May 2019

From: Graham Hughes - Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s):

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

Purpose: To update the Committee on the review of sifting criteria for the scheme development programme

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to:

- a) approve the updated Transport Scheme Development Sifting Criteria.
- b) approve the additional £125,000 in funding allocations identified in section 2.8 of the report.
- c) appoint five County Councillors to the HGV Diamond Area Steering Group and agree that appointed Members may nominate their own substitutes.

Officer contact:	Member contacts:
Name: Karen Kitchener	Names: Councillors Bates and Wotherspoon
Post: Principal Transport Officer	Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email: Karen.kitchener@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email: Ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Timothy.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 715486	Tel: 01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 In 2018/19 a budget of £1 million was set aside for transport scheme development as part of the Capital Budget in the Council's Business Plan, with the intention of bringing schemes to the point where they can be submitted for funding and the development costs reclaimed. It is expected that this investment could unlock significant future funding in transport from successful funding bids to deliver projects.

1.2 At its meeting on 8 February 2018, this Committee approved a list of transport schemes to be developed in 2018/19 and also approved a process for sifting and prioritising transport schemes from 2019/2020 onwards, to be developed and designed ready to be implemented when funding opportunities arise. The previously agreed criteria are shown in Appendix 1. The schemes approved for development using this budget allocation were:

- Improvements to junctions in St Ives
 - A1096 Harrison Way / Meadow Lane
 - A1123 / B1040
 - A1123 / A1096 Harrison Way roundabout
 - B1090 / A1123 junction
- Improvements to the two A10 / A142 roundabouts in Ely.

1.3 The total expenditure committed to these projects is as follows:

St Ives Transport Study work	£400,000
A10 / A142 roundabout	£20,000

1.4 On 6 December 2018 this Committee received a progress update regarding the areas mentioned above. At this meeting, the Committee agreed to update the sifting criteria to include safety and also to review other criteria such as scheme location.

2. MAIN ISSUES

Sifting and prioritisation criteria

2.1 The original sifting criteria (Appendix 1) has been reviewed in line with this committee's decision on 6th December.

2.2 The proposed updated criteria is shown in Appendix 2. The following changes are proposed to the Stage 1 sift in order to produce a long list of schemes:

- The former sift 3, which sifted out schemes in Cambridge city, has been removed. This ensures that schemes across the entire county can be considered. However, it should be noted that schemes that may form part of a wider committed scheme, such as those that are part of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Greater Cambridge Partnership, Highways England or Network Rail programmes would be sifted out and therefore not considered as part of this transport scheme development

programme

- The former sift 6, which sifted out schemes without a direct impact on congestion, has been updated. It is now proposed that schemes without a direct impact on congestion, or safety would be removed. Furthermore, with regard to road safety, it is proposed that schemes that address existing accident cluster sites would meet this criteria.

2.3 It is proposed that Stages 2 and 3 of the sifting process remain unchanged. For Stage 2, this involves using the National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) congestion criteria to produce a shortlist of schemes. Stage 3 would involve using full NPIF criteria to produce a prioritised list of schemes for Member endorsement, as previously agreed.

Air Quality

2.4 Members asked Officers to investigate whether Air Quality could be an area included in the sifting criteria. Officers have since discussed with Environmental Health colleagues in the District Councils to understand the feasibility of doing this.

2.5 The consensus from these discussions is that the size and nature of the schemes likely to emerge as a result of the scheme development work are not typically conducive to improving air quality, on an individual basis. To tackle areas of poor air quality, large, strategic schemes are more effective. The size of the schemes which are likely to come forward from the Scheme Development work will generally be quite localised and focussed on particular junctions and hot spots. Whilst it would be possible to include a criteria where any potential scheme that falls within an area of poor air quality (such as an Air Quality Management Area - AQMA) in the sifting process, it would be very difficult to monitor any tangible benefit in a quantitative way, from such a scheme and therefore very difficult to rule any potential scheme in or out on Air Quality grounds.

2.6 One possible option would be to include some qualitative assessment of a scheme from Air Quality specialists, however it should be recognised that this would be a much more subjective exercise than the sifting focussed on congestion and safety elements already included.

Future schemes

2.7 For the next batch of work under this programme, it is proposed to invest a further £60,000 in the development of the A10 / A142 as part of a jointly funded approach with partners and £65,000 to cover the costs of initial data collection, analysis, and scoping to assess traffic and HGV movements and patterns in the 'diamond' area between A141, A142, and the A10; and to collect evidence to support the analysis of traffic and HGV movements on the B1040. This would bring the total commitment to £545,000.

2.8 It is also proposed that a Member Steering Group be set up to oversee the HGV Diamond Area work and endorse the outcome and recommendations over the way forward. Due to the size of the area, it is proposed that five County Councillors be nominated with the ability for members to nominate their own substitute, should they not be available for particular meetings. A chair and terms of reference will be agreed at the first meeting and it is recommended that Committee agrees the membership.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

Developing a pipeline of schemes aimed at tackling congestion, safety and air quality will improve the quality of life for everyone

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

Developing a pipeline of schemes aimed at tackling congestion, safety and air quality will improve access to jobs, services and homes in Cambridgeshire, thus ensuring it is a thriving place for people to live.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

Developing a pipeline of schemes aimed at tackling congestion, safety and air quality will help to provide the best start for children in Cambridgeshire.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

Budget for this work has been allocated through the Council's Business Plan.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

A risk assessment for each scheme would be developed once schemes have been selected.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

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

- A risk assessment for each scheme would be developed once preferred schemes have been selected.
- Any statutory or legal requirements, including consultation and environmental assessments, will be carried out on a scheme by scheme basis once preferred schemes have been selected

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

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

- The development of schemes to tackle congestion, safety and air quality should provide improved access to services for all those who work and live in Cambridgeshire. The inclusion of schemes that improve safety and air quality should have positive implications for the young and old vulnerable people.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

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

- Full public engagement would be carried out for individual schemes at the appropriate times.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

A Member Steering Group for the St Ives study has been established comprising representatives from the County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Debbie Carter-Hughes
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Elsa Evans
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Joanna Shilton
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Name of Officer: Andy Preston
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble

SOURCE DOCUMENTS GUIDANCE

Source Documents	Location
Transport Investment Plan	https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/transport-investment-plan/