

TRANSPORT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT

To: Economy & Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 8th February 2018

From: Graham Hughes, Executive Director

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: 2018/029 **Key decision:** Yes

Purpose: To set out the process for prioritising transport infrastructure schemes to be developed using budget allocated in the Business Plan

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to:

- a) Note the scheme development work being undertaken by the Combined Authority;
- b) Approve the list of schemes shown in Table 2 to be developed in 2018/2019; and
- c) Approve the process for sifting and prioritising transport schemes from 2019/20 onwards (as shown in Appendix 1), to be developed and designed ready to be implemented when funding opportunities arise.

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

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Historically, the County Council had a dedicated budget for delivering medium-sized transport schemes (between £1m - £5m). As local government finances became more challenging, the available funding for such schemes was withdrawn and with it the development of a pipeline of schemes ready to implement. With the creation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the additional investment this brings, it is timely for the County Council to once again develop a pipeline of transport schemes ready for implementation either by the Combined Authority or to submit as part of funding bids when opportunities arise.
- 1.2 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 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.
- 1.3 Funding bidding rounds often stipulate that eligible schemes need to be deliverable within a certain limited timeframe, therefore having a number of schemes that are ready to be delivered will help to maximise the chances of securing additional funding.
- 1.4 It should be noted that the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) is developing its Future Investment Strategy for 2020 onwards. A paper to the GCP Executive Board in December 2016 considered principles for the prioritisation of future GCP schemes as well as the potential for a fund for smaller-scale schemes and a rolling fund. There is therefore no requirement to consider schemes in Cambridge in the proposed criteria as they are likely to be developed by the GCP. South Cambridgeshire has not been excluded as there may be schemes, particularly further from Cambridge that are close to or that cross geographic boundaries, that are not a priority for the GCP or that do not meet relevant GCP criteria, but might be a priority when considered in a County-wide context.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 It is proposed that this budget be used to develop schemes costing between £1m and £5m, filling a gap not currently covered by other budgets. Funding for schemes costing under £1m is already available through the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block, while funding for schemes over £5m can be sought from the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership and the Department for Transport's (DfT's) Large Major Schemes Pot (subject to meeting specific criteria), as well as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership, both of which plan to deliver a programme of wide-ranging schemes, many costing over £5m.
- 2.2 It is also proposed that schemes developed using this budget focus on addressing existing congestion issues on the road network. Many of the existing budgets focus on safety, encouraging sustainable transport, and catering for future planned growth and development. Therefore there are limited budgets available to develop schemes addressing specific existing congestion issues. Such issues can often have considerable impacts on quality of life and local economies.

2.3 It is proposed that schemes be identified in line with the principles set out in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2. The budget would then be used to fully develop and design new transport schemes. Work would include feasibility, design, business case work, consultation, and any land purchase, planning permissions, or other statutory processes. This would result in a pipeline of schemes that are ready to be delivered when funding opportunities arise.

2.4 Work to date has 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

2018/19 Schemes

2.5 Officers have reviewed the Transport Investment Plan to identify schemes which could be developed early on in the programme. Officers have focused on schemes which could be delivered without planning permission and within the existing highway boundary or schemes where sufficient information is already available in order for design work to commence. The long list of schemes identified are shown in Table 1.

Table 1- Long list of schemes identified

<i>Scheme</i>	<i>District</i>
A142 Fordham to Soham	East Cambridgeshire
A10/A142 roundabouts, Ely	East Cambridgeshire
March junctions improvements package <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 2 Industrial Northern Link Road, March • A141/B1099 Wisbech Road – roundabout • A141/Gaul Road • A141/Burrowmoor Road • B1101 Broad Street /B1101 Station Road /B1099 Dartford Road • B1101 High Street/Burrowmoor Road – roundabout • B1101 High Street/St Peters Road • A141/Hostmoor Avenue • B1101 Elm Road/Twenty Foot Road 	Fenland
A141 junctions Huntingdon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A141 / St Peters industrial area roundabout • A141 / B1090 roundabout 	Huntingdonshire
St Ives junctions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1096 / Meadow Lane • A1123/B1040 and A1123/Harrison Way roundabouts • B1090/A1123 	Huntingdonshire

2.6 It should be noted that in October 2017 the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority approved a shortlist of feasibility studies and business cases for schemes in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Three of the schemes being taken forward by the Combined Authority were identified by officers in the longlist shown above in Table 1. These are as follows:

- A142 Fordham to Soham, expanded to cover the route from Newmarket to Chatteris

- A141 capacity enhancements, Huntingdon – including the two junctions listed above
- March junctions improvements package

- 2.7 There is additional work being brought forwards in Wisbech using funding from the LEP to develop the Wisbech Access Strategy which sets out the case for transport investment to support the Fenland Local Plan.
- 2.8 The longlist has been updated to reflect the Combined Authority's programme to form a shortlist of proposed schemes. Members are asked to approve this list of schemes for further development as set out in recommendation a).

Table 2 – Schemes proposed to be developed in 2018/19

<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

- 2.9 For completeness, the full programme of Combined Authority schemes in Cambridgeshire only is shown in Table 3 (some of these schemes may cost over £5million). Some of this work covers existing County Council priorities and identified schemes at congested junctions.

Table 3 – Relevant Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Schemes

<i>Scheme</i>	<i>Work to be carried out</i>
<i>Highway Scheme Development</i>	
A142 Capacity Study (Newmarket to Chatteris)	Feasibility
A141 capacity enhancements, Huntingdon	Feasibility
March Junctions improvement package	Feasibility
A505 corridor study	Feasibility
A14 Junction Improvements (Jct 35 – 38)	Feasibility
Wisbech Access Study Packages	Preliminary Design
Coldham's Lane roundabout improvements	Design
<i>Strategic Schemes</i>	
Cambridgeshire capacity rail study	Feasibility
Cambridge South Station	Options appraisal / business case
Soham Station	Options appraisal / business case
Regeneration of Fenland Railway Stations	Preliminary Design
A10 Foxton Level Crossing	Feasibility
Huntingdon Strategic River Crossing	Feasibility
St Neots River Great Ouse cycle bridge	Preliminary Design

Sifting and prioritisation process

- 2.10 If further scheme development funding is allocated for future years, it is proposed that a sifting and prioritisation process be established to develop a forward pipeline of schemes

ready for delivery as and when funding becomes available. It is suggested that the sifting and prioritisation process be developed to focus on schemes which tackle congestion, cost under £5 million, and are not already funded or part of a committed wider future scheme, as set out above. The full proposed process is described below and shown in Appendix 1.

- Stage 1 – Initial sift of schemes

The Transport Investment Plan has been used as the starting point for schemes and a sifting process has been developed based on the factors set out above. Approximately 80 schemes have passed this first sift to form a long list of candidate schemes. Thoughts on this process and the sifting criteria used would be welcomed.

- Stage 2 – second sift

For the stage 2 sift it is proposed 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

The next stage would be 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 is worth noting that the NPIF has been used by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to help determine its transport priorities.

- 2.11 It is proposed that a paper be presented to this committee each December to approve the following year's programme of schemes to be developed.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

- Developing a pipeline line of schemes aimed at tackling congestion will enable improved access to jobs, services and homes in Cambridgeshire.

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

- What are the capital and revenue costs?

A budget of £1 million has been allocated to this work from the Capital Budget as part of the Council's Business Plan – Scheme Development for Highways Initiatives.

- Is the organisation delivering value for money?

The Council will follow the correct procurement process to ensure value for money.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

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

- All Council procurement and contractual procedures will be followed for any work that is commissioned e.g. feasibility studies, business cases, or design work.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

A risk assessment for each scheme would be developed once 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 should provide improved access to services in Cambridgeshire.
- A full Community Impact Assessment will be carried out once schemes have been selected and the development process has commenced.

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

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.7 Public Health Implications

The following advice was provided by the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) Public Health team:

Transport policies have potentially significant public health implications, which are worthy of careful consideration by decision makers. The emphasis on tackling congestion in the criteria for funding outlined in Appendix 1 has a potential positive impact on health because (a) congestion may worsen air quality, with increased concentrations of particulates and nitrogen dioxide, which can have negative short and longer term impacts on respiratory and heart disease (b) if the economic benefits of reducing congestion translate through to

improved employment and income in the local area, this is associated with better health outcomes.

However, the number of formal air quality management areas in Cambridgeshire is low, and the impacts on health of reducing congestion at specific junctions, where people spend a limited amount of time during travel to work or school, are likely to be smaller than the potential benefits to health from increased local rates of walking and cycling. Studies show that cycling and walking for both utility and leisure have direct health implications including:

- Active commuting conferring a 10% reduction in the risk of developing heart disease and stroke¹.
- Switching from private motor transport to active travel or public transport being associated with a significant reduction in body mass index (BMI)².
- Regular cycle commuters having half the level of sickness absence (1 day less) per year compared to those who do not.
- Individuals cycling for utility 4 time more likely to achieve UK recommended level of physical activity compared to those who do not³.

A synthesis of studies⁴ which examined the relationship between cycling/walking and mortality over time found that individuals who walked 168 minutes per week (17 mins twice per day for 5 days) cycled 100 minutes per week (10 minutes twice per day for 5 days) had 10% lower death rates compared to non-walkers and cyclists. In addition, a growing evidence base shows that access to cycling and walking infrastructure is associated with increased levels of cycling and walking. A study⁵ of 3 infrastructure projects showed that after 2 years, proximity to new cycling and walking infrastructure predicted increases in activity compared to those living farther away (with 15.3 additional minutes/week walking and cycling per km nearer to the new infrastructure).

The exclusion of cycling and walking infrastructure projects from the criteria outlined in Appendix 1 may therefore reduce opportunities to improve population health locally, particularly if this sets a precedent for other transport policy decisions.

¹ Hamer, M., & Chida, Y, *Active commuting and cardiovascular risk: a meta-analytic review*. Preventative Medicine, 2008;46(1):9-13.

² Martin A, et al. Impact of changes in mode of travel to work on changes in body mass index: evidence from the British Household Panel Survey. (2015) J Epidemiol Community Health 0:1–9. doi:10.1136/jech-2014-205211

³ Quantifying the contribution of utility cycling to population levels of physical activity: an analysis of the Active People Survey

⁴ http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/256168/ECONOMIC-ASSESSMENT-OF-TRANSPORT-INFRASTRUCTURE-AND-POLICIES.pdf?ua=1

⁵ New Walking and Cycling Routes and Increased Physical Activity: One- and 2-Year Findings From the UK iConnect (2014)

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Fiona McMillan
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:
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble

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