

# HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE



**Tuesday, 25 April 2023**

**Democratic and Members' Services**

Emma Duncan  
Monitoring Officer

**10:00**

New Shire Hall  
Alconbury Weald  
Huntingdon  
PE28 4YE

**Red Kite Room**

**New Shire Hall, Alconbury Weald, Huntingdon, PE28 4YE**

## **AGENDA**

**Open to Public and Press**

### **CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS**

- 1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**  
*Guidance on declaring interests is available at*  
<http://tinyurl.com/ccc-conduct-code>
- 2 Minutes Highways and Transport Committee - Draft Minutes March 2023 3 - 42**
- 3 Petitions and Public Questions**

### **KEY DECISIONS**

- 4 Park & Ride and Guided Busway Grounds Maintenance Contract Renewal 43 - 52**
- DECISIONS**

The County Council is committed to open government and members of the public are welcome to attend Committee meetings. It supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens. These arrangements operate in accordance with a protocol agreed by the Chair of the Council and political Group Leaders which can be accessed via the following link or made available on request: [Filming protocol hyperlink](#)

Public speaking on the agenda items above is encouraged. Speakers must register their intention to speak by contacting [Democratic Services](#) no later than 12.00 noon three working days before the meeting. Full details of arrangements for public speaking are set out in Part 4, Part 4.4 of the Council's Constitution: [Procedure Rules hyperlink](#)

The Council does not guarantee the provision of car parking on the New Shire Hall site. Information on travel options is available at: [Travel to New Shire Hall hyperlink](#)

Meetings are streamed to the Council's website: [Council meetings Live Web Stream hyperlink](#)

The Highways and Transport Committee comprises the following members:

Councillor Alex Beckett (Chair) Councillor Neil Shailer (Vice-Chair) Councillor Gerri Bird Councillor Piers Coutts Councillor Douglas Dew Councillor Lorna Dupre Councillor Janet French Councillor Ryan Fuller Councillor Ian Gardener Councillor Anne Hay Councillor Simon King Councillor Peter McDonald Councillor Mac McGuire Councillor Brian Milnes and Councillor Alan Sharp

Clerk Name:	Daniel Snowdon
Clerk Telephone:	01223 699177
Clerk Email:	Daniel.Snowdon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

# Highways and Transport Committee: Minutes

Date: 7 March 2023

Time: 10:00am to 4.07pm

Present: Councillors Alex Beckett (Chair), Neil Shailer (Vice-Chair), Gerri Bird, Piers Coutts, Douglas Dew, Jan French, Ian Gardener, Neil Gough, Mark Howell, Simon King, Peter McDonald, Mac McGuire, Brian Milnes, Alan Sharp

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

## 128. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillor Dupré, Councillor Gough substituted.

Councillors Gough, McDonald, Milnes and French declared interests in agenda item 8 – Civil Parking Enforcement as Cabinet members for South Cambridgeshire District Council and Fenland District Council and their involvement in the decision-making process at their respective District Councils.

Councillor Gough also declared an interest in agenda item 4 – Mill Road Bridge Traffic Regulation Order as he was a former member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in November 2021. Together with the Chair who informed the Committee that he was a resident of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge.

Councillor King declared an interest as a member of the Local Access Forum

## 129. Minutes – 6 December 2023 and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2023 were agreed as a correct record and the action log was noted.

## 130. Petitions and Public Questions

There were several public questions and requests to speak. They were heard under the relevant agenda item. The questions and submissions are attached at Appendix A to these minutes. There were no petitions.

## 131. Mill Road Bridge Permanent Traffic Regulation Order

The Committee received a report that sought the determination of the Mill Road Bridge Traffic Regulation Order. Following the consideration of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's consultation on Mill Road modal filter proposals at its July 2022 meeting,

the Committee would now consider the objections registered against the TRO received through the statutory process.

- The consultation was supported at Committee because it was believed data on the impact of the proposals on nearby streets would be included and it was a major flaw that it had not. Therefore, unless the determination of the TRO was deferred it was necessary to support the amendment.
- Expressed concern at the potential unintended consequences of the scheme. Focus should be maintained on business as they made Mill Road a unique community. There was substantial risk that, if the bridge was closed, the community would be adversely affected.
- Commented that when assessing the amendment, it was necessary to understand the issues and question whether there was sufficient information on which to base and balance a decision. It was clear there was. This was a place where there were businesses and people living and the Committee was being asked to balance that argument.
- Expressed the view that the amendment was not consistent with the debate that took place at the July 2021 meeting as it delayed progress unnecessarily. There was sufficient information and the Committee needed to reach a decision.
- The ETRO that had been put in place during the COVID-19 pandemic had provided a substantial amount of data that together with further consultation enabled a decision to be made
- In summing up, Councillor Sharp assured the Committee that the amendment was not designed to unduly delay the scheme but provide an opportunity to ensure that all voices were heard and fully understand the potential negative impacts on surrounding roads.

It was requested and agreed that a recorded vote be taken for the amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

[For: French, Gardener, King, McGuire and Sharp]

[Against: Beckett, Bird, Coutts, Dew, McDonald, Milnes and Shailer]

During debate of the substantive motion, Members:

- Acknowledged that the topic had been divisive, and the Committee had spent many hours debating. Sympathy was expressed for traders who were fearful for their businesses. However, it was clear that there would be an economic benefit to the area. Other areas of the city that had similar restrictions in place benefited from increased footfall and therefore would be a benefit to traders.
- Noted the discussions that had taken place regarding Mill Road to date and cited the biggest concern throughout was the economic impact on the area. Paragraph 2.8 of

the report failed to address those concerns and therefore it was not possible to support the proposals.

- Recognised Mill Road as a special community and highlighted that the responses to the consultation had been from a broad range of residents. The concerns of traders along Mill Road were serious and genuine, and it was therefore essential that everyone supported their businesses. The consultation undertaken by the GCP was thorough and the impact on businesses had been considered carefully. The decision to be made was one of balancing the costs and benefits of the proposals and it was clear the benefits outweighed the costs. It was essential that active travel was not delivered at the expense of local businesses and that funding was identified for improvements to the public realm.
- Commented that a key issue was whether the proposals would cause displacement of traffic or replacement of traffic. Mill Road was a thoroughfare on which cycling was uncomfortable due to the narrowness of the street. The traffic and current layout acted as a deterrent to active travel and the proposals would address this and encourage people to move from their cars on to alternative forms of transport.
- Reminded the Committee of the debate that took place in July 2021 when the matter first came for determination. Concerns remained with the proposals, particularly regarding access for carers and how people apply for exemptions that appeared to be accessed through online means only. Concern was also expressed regarding night-time safety where reduced traffic levels had made the street considerably quieter and people feeling more vulnerable. Officers confirmed that there would be a telephone number through which exemptions could be requested and applied for.
- Drew attention to the wider impact of the school street scheme on Vinery Road where inconsiderate parking by parents was causing significant issues on Coldhams Lane. It was noted that additional street furniture would be installed along Mill Road, however, it was essential that careful consideration be given to its placement as planters that had been installed had caused issues for cyclists. Although the road was narrow, it was this that gave the road its character.
- Noted the concerns regarding exemptions for carers and the ability of people to apply for an exemption. However, this was a process that would be monitored and evolve as a result. Following the decision of the Committee at its July 2021 meeting, the Council lost funding as a result and the Department for Transport had advised that it would welcome the reintroduction of the closure. The consultation undertaken by the GCP was comprehensive and thorough. During traffic counting during the previous closure, a three-fold increase in cycling had been observed because of the improved safety. If parents cycled with children to school, it was likely they would continue their journey to work by bicycle. By agreeing the recommendations set out in the report it would honour the will of residents and enhance the local community.
- Welcomed the different views within the debate and noted the desire of all to improve their communities. The impact on businesses and the displacement of traffic were serious concerns. However, the city centre provided a clear example of what could be achieved in terms of footfall and improving the environment through

traffic management. There was still much to do regarding public realm improvements and the network hierarchy.

- Noted comments that it was possible for arrangements to be made by blue badge holders that would allow their carers to use a badge without the holder being in the vehicle\*

\*following the meeting it was confirmed that Blue badge holders can register up to a maximum of two vehicles. The exemption to use the bridge would apply to Blue Badge holders present in the vehicle ([Mill Road bridge TRO - Cambridgeshire County Council](#))

A request for a recorded vote was made with the support of the Committee.

It was resolved by majority to:

- a) Approve the proposed modal filter on Mill Road bridge, as advertised; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly

[For: Beckett, Bird, Coutts, Dew, McDonald, Milnes and Shailer]

[Against: French, Gardener, King, McGuire and Sharp]

## 132. Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy

The Committee received the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire. The report summarised the outcomes from public consultation and presented an updated strategy for the Committee's approval.

There were several public questions and submissions to the Committee attached at Appendix A together with the responses where applicable.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Emphasised the ambition that existed in the north of Huntingdonshire and sought reassurance that active travel would continue to be developed in the area.
- In drawing attention to the Huntingdonshire map for active travel, commented that there were few routes within that area. However, it was known that residents were campaigning to have routes established. There was a focus on urban areas, but it was essential that there was route provision in rural areas in order that people were provided alternatives to the car.

- Commented that there was a need in the district areas for active travel routes and there appeared to be a focus on the Cambridge side of Huntingdonshire. Concern was expressed that there had been no update provided on some of the routes marked in orange since the annual update to the Local Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
- Noted the continued concern relating to inhibitors such as consistency of routes, junction design, kissing gates and in particular, road surfacing.
- Requested that the road classification review was presented to the Committee.
- Drew attention to new developments in rural areas. Active travel schemes on those developments were often excellent, however, there was no connectivity between villages. In referencing the tool kit for new developments, it was essential for issues to be address through the planning process. Although the toolkit was welcome, it was noted that it only applied to developments of 150 dwellings or more and suggested that it should apply to all developments. Concern was also expressed that there was a Cambridge-centric approach where it was possibly easier and cheaper to establish that those in rural areas
- Highlighted the issue of shared use paths and the yet unknown classification of e-scooters by the Department of Transport.
- Recognised the value of the active travel network and commented that ambition would always be far greater than available investment. It was therefore the prioritisation and how that was carried out that was essential.
- Suggested that the imagery used within the strategy be reviewed.
- Expressed support for the review process for the strategy, and draft guide and welcomed the work of the working group. The draft tool kit was concerning and would welcome it being presented to Committee following consultation.
- Questioned the funding arrangements for active travel schemes and whether funding that would have been used to improve and repair roads in Fenland would be diverted to active travel schemes within Cambridge. Officers provided assurance that the funding was explicitly for active travel schemes. Regarding ongoing maintenance of the routes additional funding would be sought to support that on a network-wide basis.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the feedback from public consultation on the draft Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy.
- b) Note progress to date and the next steps for the process for the prioritisation of active travel schemes as part of an updated LCWIP. and for annual review.

- c) Adopt Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy.
- d) Approve the draft supporting active travel documents noted below, and delegate approval of further changes or updates to the Director of Highways and Transport and the Chair and Vice Chair of Highways and Transport Committee.
- e) Draft Active Travel Toolkit for New Developments - for stakeholder engagement
- f) Draft Cambridgeshire Active Travel Design Guide – for adoption

### 133. Fenland Transport Strategy

The Committee received a report that presented the Fenland Transport Strategy, developed in partnership with Fenland District Council and the Member Steering Group. The strategy focussed on improving accessibility and connectivity across the district and replaced the Market Town Strategies for Chatteris, March, Whittlesey and Wisbech.

The Committee received a public question / comment attached at Appendix A together with the response where applicable.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Questioned how the Committee and the Council would affect the thinking and work of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) as it was the lead for transport for the county.
- Noted the work of the CPCA regarding Wisbech Rail and the close work officers were undertaking with the CPCA. Members emphasised the importance of the scheme to the wider area.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the feedback from stakeholder and public consultation on the draft Fenland Transport Strategy;
- b) Note progress to date and the next steps for the development and prioritisation of schemes contained in the Fenland Transport Strategy; and
- c) Adopt the Fenland Transport Strategy

### 134. Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy

The Committee received a report that presented the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy developed in partnership with Huntingdonshire District Council and the Member Steering Group. The strategy focussed on improving accessibility and connectivity across the district and replaced the Market Town Strategies for Huntingdon and Godmanchester, Ransey, St Ives and St Neots.

The Committee received public questions and submissions to the Committee attached at Appendix A together with the responses where applicable.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Noted that officers were lobbying the Government to release funding to be able to progress tier 2 routes.
- Commented that people wanted more active travel options and highlighted Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes and the link with active travel. It was essential that rural areas had better connectivity. The links to other areas of the Council such as public health and environmental goals were also made.
- Requested that clear signage be displayed leaving it in no doubt as to whether a route was a shared use route or not.
- Noted the challenge in being able to reduce car miles in rural areas given the challenges faced in connectivity and public transport.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the feedback from stakeholder and public consultation on the draft Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy;
- b) Note progress to date and the next steps for the development and prioritisation of schemes contained in the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy; and
- c) Adopt the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy

## 135. Civil Parking Enforcement

The Committee received a report that provided the Committee with an update on Civil Parking Enforcement and sought authorisation for the submission of applications to the Department for Transport for the required powers.

The Committee received a public question / comment attached at Appendix A together with the response where applicable.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Noted the need for flexibility and the need for it not to be viewed as simply an income generation exercise by the Council.
- Noted that the agreement included an agency contract that could expand the Cambridge City enforcement scheme including 2 full time equivalents. There were no concerns surrounding the Council making the application and then offering agency services. The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) was able to offer funding to Fenland and Huntingdonshire District Councils as they formed part of its wider travel to work area.
- Noted the general support of South Cambridgeshire residents for CPE as there were several hotspots in the district where problem parking was an issue.
- Commented that schemes the GCP was designing were dependent on CPE working around them such as improvements to railway stations, the benefits of which would be eroded by poor parking in the travel to work area.
- Expressed the view that the current highway maintenance budget should not be used for the upkeep of signs and lines and should be maintained through the income generated from enforcement action.
- Noted that it was anticipated that following the applications made to government, CPE would begin in May 2024 in Fenland and October 2024 in Huntingdonshire.
- Noted, charges consisted of 2 bands that were set through primary legislation and the Council had no discretion to adjust them. It was confirmed that the Council would charge the upper band and discussions were taking place with the Department for Transport regarding the inflationary pressures currently faced.

It was resolved to:

Delegate the authorisation for Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to submit Civil Enforcement Area (CEA) or Special Enforcement Area (SEA) applications to the Department for Transport for Designation Orders for the introduction of CPE in South Cambridgeshire, Fenland, and Huntingdonshire to the Service Director Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee.

## 136. Commuted Sums Policy for Cambridgeshire

The Committee received a report that provided a Commuted Sums Policy for approval. The Committee noted that commuted sums were monies that may be collected to help local authorities offset the future maintenance costs of new infrastructure they acquire.

The Committee received a public questions / submission on this item attached at Appendix A together with the responses where applicable

During discussion of the report Members:

- Noted that discussions were continuing with the Greater Cambridge Partnership with regard to its projects handed over to the Council.
- Welcomed the policy that was clear and easily understood and thanked officers for the work involved.
- Questioned whether the Highways Operational Standards could be updated in order that it be able to keep pace with developments in technology. Officers confirmed that the standards were reviewed annually to ensure that technological developments were accounted for.

It was resolved to:

- a) To approve the Commuted Sums Policy;
- b) To approve the Highway Estates Roads Construction Specification; and
- c) To approve the General Principles for Development

## 137. Highways Operating Standards

The Committee received for consideration and approval, updates to the Council's Highways Operational Standards.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Confirmed that Gaist now being used to undertake asset condition surveys and requested a Member briefing to demonstrate this. **ACTION**
- Suggested that a YouTube video and communications be produced that could be shared with Parish Councils in order they understand how the asset condition surveys were carried out. .
- Welcomed the proposed approach to roadside memorials. Attention was also drawn to the encroachment of vegetation on verges due to land / property owners not cutting back vegetation, suggesting that placing a legal charge on a property would be an effective measure and deterrent.
- Noted that a report relating to speed strategy would be presented to the July meeting of the Committee that would address the extension of 30mph zones for parishes that border neighbouring counties.
- Questioned who would determine the targeted approach to weed control. Officers confirmed that the ambition was to reduce reliance on chemicals and there would be

an extensive review undertaken together with a published and detailed process for parishes to follow and communicated to Councillors.

- Raised concern regarding the encroachment of vegetations, such as conifers, on to verges, causing obstructions. It was suggested that it be considered through next review and update of the Highway Operational Standards.

It was resolved to:

Approve updates to 9 sections of the Highways Operational Standards

### 138. Highways Maintenance Capital Programme

The Committee received the Highways Capital Maintenance Programme. The report sought the approval of the Council's forward programme of highways capital schemes and provide clarity and visibility of forthcoming maintenance schemes.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Noted that an update on remedial and urgent safety work on soil affected roads would be circulated to Councillors in early April. **ACTION**
- Commented that repairing 20-30 metres of carriageway could be cheaper and easier than repairing multiple potholes along the same stretch.
- Noted that the assessment of soil base roads was continuing. In some cases, the Council did not possess the technology to add significant longevity to the affected routes. Discussions were therefore taking place with the Department for Transport relating to funding for a long-term solution and technical advice.
- Questioned how often the same pothole had to be repaired. Officers explained that the Cambridgeshire Highways KPIs established a tolerance level of failed repairs at 2%. The current reporting system did not provide the granularity of detail needed to identify geographical areas of concern; this would be addressed through the new Asset Management System. It was noted by the Committee that there were occasions where potholes were filled temporarily for public safety before a more long-term repair was undertaken.

It was resolved to:

- a) To approve the 2 year forward programme of highway maintenance capital schemes 2023-2025;
- b) To agree that the Service Director, Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee, can

make minor amendments to the programme of highway maintenance capital schemes, in accordance with the Authority's approved asset management policies;

- c) Agrees that the Service Director, Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee, can commission the delivery of the highways maintenance capital programme, via existing contracts that have been formally procured; and
- d) To note the indicative highway maintenance capital programme for the following 3 to 5 years 2025-2028.

### 139. Integrated Transport Block Funding

The Committee received a report that presented the proposed allocation of the £3.215m Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding for 2023-24. As Local Transport Authority the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) received Local Transport Plan grants from the Department for Transport that included the ITB grant. The grant was then passed to the Council to prioritise and spend

The Committee received comments from Councillor Edna Murphy and Councillor Clare Daunton, attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

During the course of discussion, Members:

- Confirmed that the LHI process remained the same as previously agreed and was not adversely affected by the additional funding provided by the Combined Authority. The Transforming Cities Fund to investment in 20mph schemes, primarily around market towns, provided an additional funding stream.
- Noted that if a village submitted an application for a 20mph scheme but was unsuccessful the intention was that the application would be carried forward, unless they scored so low that they would require further development or removal from the list.
- Commented that although £3.2m appeared to be a significant sum of money, it was relatively modest.
- Commented that there may have to be some rationalisation and prioritisation of schemes, recognising their relative importance, but also recognising the funding limitations.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the proposed allocation of the Integrated Transport Block funding for 2023-24 subject to the funding being passed to the County Council by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority;

- b) note the different approaches being taken to the development and delivery of 20mph zones from the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) and the Integrated Transport Block due to the constraints of time for spend from the TCF; and
- c) delegate to the Chair and Vice Chair in consultation with Democratic Services and the Director of Highways and Transport the nomination of County Council representatives for Member Steering Groups for the review of:
  - i. the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire and
  - ii. the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

#### 140. Roundabout and Highways Asset Sponsorship Reprocurement

Members received a report that sought approval for the procurement of a new provider for the management of advertising on roundabouts and highways assets including associated maintenance.

It was resolved to:

Approve the procurement of a new provider for the management of advertising on roundabouts and highways assets including associated maintenance.  
Currently known as Highways Roundabout Sponsorship

#### 141. Highways and Transport Corporate Performance Report

Members received a report that presented the performance data and metrics relevant to the Committee for the period of quarter 3 up to the end of December 2022.

During discussion, Members raised the following points:

- Drew attention to the Killed and Seriously Injured indicator that was an area for concern.
- Concern was expressed that almost 10% of A roads were catagorised as red. Officers advised that highways scanning should provide opportunity to address it.
- Noted the improvements on road safety, however, commented that the gradual decline was not good enough.
- Noted that the report would be presented again at Committee in July 2023, that would include a fuller set of indicators, however, may not include the full set as a number of new indicators were under development.
- Emphasised the importance of driver education in successfully reducing accidents and fatalities.

- Drew attention to the multi-factorial issue of road safety and the number of killed and seriously injured statistics. There was a correlation between the reduction in Police traffic officers and increased speeding, availability of ambulances and issues facing accident and emergency departments all impacted on death rates.

It was resolved to note the performance information and suggest any action as necessary.

## 142. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee received the Finance Monitoring Report. Members noted the overall revenue forecast overspend for Place and Sustainability of £214k and the factors driving it. The main capital variances were also highlighted. The report also sought a recommendation to the Strategy and Resources Committee that a £2.8m scheme to widen the guided busway was added to the Council's Business Plan 2023-24.

During the course of discussion, a member sought greater clarity regarding the variance of £720k related to Carriageway and Footway Maintenance and requested the original breakdown of the budget. **ACTION**

It was resolved to:

- a) Review, note and comment on the report;
- b) Recommend to the Strategy and Resources Committee to approve an updated capital budget profile for the A14 contributions whereby £2.08m of budget is transferred from 2022/23 to Years 24 and 25 of the payment profile; and
- c) Recommend to the Strategy & Resources Committee that a scheme to widen the guided busway (southern section), budgeted to cost £2.89m, is added to the Council's business plan 2023-24, for the reasons set out in the confidential appendix.

## 143. Highways and Transport Resource Update

The Committee received an update regarding the resourcing position for the Highways and Transport Directorate following the comprehensive resource review and update that was presented to the Committee at its March 2022 meeting.

During discussion, members:

- Commented that it was essential that employment offers were competitive to attract the right people and encourage people to stay.

- Commented that vacancy figures appeared to be broadly static and that it would be the default position for the Council and therefore would need to be budgeted for. Officers advised that the need for interim staff would always exist, particularly in order to cope with the ebb and flow of the capital and maintenance programmes.
- Noted that the active highway maintenance restructure included Local Highway Officers. Officers informed the Committee that the restructure sought to change the shape of the team in order that they were supported more effectively.
- Sought an update on how vacancies were being filled within the rights of way team. Officers advised that they fell within the highway maintenance restructure and once concluded recruitment to those roles would progress.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the ongoing pressures and challenges: and
- b) Note progress since this was report to Committee in March 2022.

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

The Committee noted its Agenda Plan, Training Plan and appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups.

Chair

## Highways and Transport Committee Minutes - Action log

This is the updated action log as at 8<sup>th</sup> March 2023 and captures the actions arising from the most recent Highways and Transport Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

### Highways and Transport Committee minutes of 7<sup>th</sup> March 2023

137.	Highways Operating Standards	Jon Munslow	Member briefing to be organised on Gaist on how its being used to undertake asset condition surveys.		Ongoing
138.	Highways Capital Maintenance Programme	Jon Munslow	Briefing on safety and remedial works on soil affected roads to be arranged for members	A workshop will be arranged in June 2023.	Ongoing
142.	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	A member sought greater clarity regarding the variance of £720k related to Carriageway and Footway Maintenance and requested the original breakdown of the budget		Ongoing



## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (7<sup>th</sup> March 2023)

### PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No .	Question / comment from:	Item	Question
1.	Shapour Meftah	Mill Road	Drew attention to the results of a consultation where the majority of respondents were against the TRO. Concern was expressed regarding the dispersal of traffic on to neighbouring streets commenting that there was no data to support the view there would be no impact. The bridge was designed to link either side of the railway and now it was proposed to be closed. It was essential that the decision was based on accurate data.
			<b>Response:</b> Statement – no response required
No .	Question / comment from:	Item	Question:
2.	Abdul Arain	Mill Road	Expressed concern regarding the level of consultation with residents. There was an understanding there would be some face to face consultation to understand why people travel up and down Mill road. Traffic levels on Mill Road were significantly reduced. East Road was much busier. The workshops that were held as part of the consultation were impractical as they were held during working hours. Attention was drawn to petitions that when combined had over 4,000 signatures opposed to the suggested closure. It was highlighted that many Mill Road residents did not possess English as a first language and there no suitable adjustments were made.
			<b>Response:</b> Statement – no response required.
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
3.	Mill Road 4 People		Background July 2022's Highways meeting agreed to consult on both a TRO to reinstate the modal filter

		<p>on Mill Road and on exemptions to that filter. The TRO (PR0872) has been raised and the consultation phase completed. We believe that the TRO consultation results will be reviewed by the Highways and Transport committee at its next meeting.</p> <p>The TRO was drawn up and issued following the GCP's "effective and robust" Spring 2022 Mill Road consultation which received around 2,000 responses. Theme 3 of the consultation, "Changes to traffic and access in the medium and longer term" was supported by 77% of respondents. 72% of respondents expressed support for restricting motor vehicles from crossing Mill Road bridge. We extend our heartfelt thanks to the Committee, officers and the GCP for their hard work and commitment in getting this close to resolving an issue which has been outstanding for at least 50 years; and would ask the Committee now to approve the TRO and put it into operation without delay.</p> <p>An even higher proportion (83%) of respondents to the same GCP consultation approved of Theme 2, "Improve the quality of place". The July 2022 Committee meeting decided to work with the Combined Authority and GCP to develop a public realm improvement scheme along Mill Road.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Can the committee please confirm, for the consultation, design and implementation phases of the public realm improvements on Mill Road, Cambridge:</p> <p>a) What are the planned timescales, and (indicative if necessary) budgetary provisions for the work, along with the planned sources of funding?</p> <p>b) How can interested parties' (e.g. users of the road, traders, disability groups) views best be sought and incorporated into the design in a cost effective way and at the earliest possible stage in the process?</p>
		<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The current timescales for the installation of the modal filter are set out in the paper at 2.6.</p> <p>a) precise timescales have not yet been confirmed as CCC is working with partners to consider funding for the public realm scheme</p> <p>b) contact with key stakeholders has already been established; early engagement with these stakeholders will be sought at the start of the public realm project followed by a full public consultation.</p>

No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
4.	Mr John Coyle	Mill Road	Expressed concern regarding the consultation and the data used to support the recommendation. The Council was accused of the wilful sabotage of the highway in terms of roadworks that produced congestion to justify measures. The impact on surrounding areas was highlighted as an area of great concern. The proposal had been rejected twice through lack of information and it should be rejected again. .
			<b>Response:</b>  <i>Statement, no response required</i>
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
5.	Martin Lucas Smith	Mill Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To welcome the change and urge the committee to agree the officer recommendation</li> <li>- To relay my personal experience as a regular shopper on the street</li> <li>- To make clear the strong level of local support</li> <li>- To welcome that a sensible compromise has been reached</li> <li>- To point out the benefits</li> <li>- To remind the committee that the TRO stage is not a numbers game and is purely a legal objection process</li> <li>- To give suggestions for the streetscape changes</li> </ul>
			<b>Response:</b>  <i>Statement, no response required</i>
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
6.	Will Nichols	Mill Road	<p>I'm a driver who lives in Fowlmere but I work in Cambridge. I drive in each day or take the train.</p> <p>I was actually born on Mill Road itself! At the old maternity hospital that is Ditchfield Place and have always taken an interest in Mill Road, having worked nearby for the past few years.</p> <p>I want to provide a personal anecdote to demonstrate how policy decisions from local authority can change behaviour as they did in my case. When the bridge was closed to through-traffic last year I used to (admittedly rather lazily) drive my car along Mill Road most days to reach my gym, Nuffield Health &amp; fitness</p>

			<p>– it meant I could get a gym session or swim in during my lunch break before getting back to work for the afternoon; Mill Road bridge being open to through traffic gave me the most direct route, and gave me no incentive to switch to walking or cycling. I can remember several times when driving to Cambridge wanting to go to one of those local shops, which generally have a far more interest range than the more generic supermarkets, however, parking was virtually impossible with Gwyder Street car park usually full and it was usually easier and more practical to go to one of the nearby supermarkets.</p> <p>Often arguments are made by those who oppose road closures that they displace traffic but ultimately, they create the conditions to encourage modal shift and reassess our behaviours as I did in this instance by changing from driving to walking. It enabled me for the first time became able to stop and spend money in the businesses on Mill Road, frequently buying lunch and visiting shops that would have been difficult to do in my car. The reduction in through traffic, virtually none of which is stopping to use the many businesses, restaurants and shops on Mill Road, made Mill Road a much more pleasant environment to spend time – safer, less congestion, less pollution, and an opportunity to completely rethink the street focusing on people rather than cars. I have continued to walk rather than drive because I've continued the habit albeit it is a much less attractive environment now the heavy through traffic is back.</p> <p>Several shopping streets in Cambridge have reduced through traffic over the past few decades in Cambridge: Fitzroy Street, Burleigh Street, Trinity Street, Sydney Street, and Bridge Street – I'm not aware of any where business and residents are calling for the return of through traffic – the evidence shows that far from negatively impacting on businesses such measures create a much more attractive environment for people and businesses flourish as a result. The restriction of Mill Road bridge would still enable vehicles to access Mill Road but would remove through traffic from what is a relatively narrow road and certainly not suited to function as a major arterial road in the way that say Newmarket Road or Hills Road are.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I believe this is a once in a generational opportunity to reimagine how fantastic Mill Road could be putting businesses, residents, and people first, and I hope you will pass the motion today.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comments from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
7.	Mel Telford	Mill Road	1. What if any expert feasibility studies with data and projections and alternative proposals with pros and cons have been carried out to determine the effect of the restrictions upon residents, and traders and the additional congestion and pollution transferred to other routes and those who live

			<p>along them ?</p> <p>2. If so how have they been made available to the public as none of those facts appear to have been included in the consultation?</p> <p>3. If there are none available for the public to view why not</p> <p>4. To what extent do the public consultations relating to this, affect the outcome – the decisions of the council ?</p> <p>5. How much weight is placed on answers which come from residents living in the Mill Rd area and what consideration given to other Cambridge residents ?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>1. The work has been informed by the ETO(observed impacts), road accident data and subsequent GCP consultation, matters that have been considered by H&amp;T. Impacts of any modal filter would be monitored on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>2. The statutory TRO consultation accords with the legal requirement; the GCP consultation was wide-ranging and detailed the many issues affecting Mill Road. The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) procedure is a statutory consultation process that requires the Highway Authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The public notice invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a 21 day notice period.</p> <p>3. See 1 and 2.</p> <p>4. H&amp;T considered the GCP consultation in July 2022 and determined to proceed with publication of the TRO and statutory objection period. Members are considering objections received.</p> <p>5. Proximity of responder is not weighted. All issues are considered. Any person may object to the making of an order and the order making authority shall consider all objections duly made under regulations and not withdrawn</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comment from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
8.	Corinna Deighton	Mill Road	<p>Disabled does not equal Blue Badge Holder. I am the mother of a 13 year old boy who receives Disability Living Allowance from the Government, we receive high rate care but low rate mobility so do not qualify under the Blue Badge Rules for CCC. My child has several disabilities including Dyspraxia, Motor Co-Ordination Difficulties, Muscle imbalances (Tight &amp; Hypermobility), ADHD, Severe Anxiety &amp; Other Mental Health conditions, Bowel &amp; Bladder issues and we are awaiting the final assessment for Autism (all documented by health care professionals). My child cannot ride a</p>

			<p>bike, cannot walk far without being in pain and cannot use buses. We live in Coleridge and use Mill Road bridge to access the city for various reasons including therapy sessions, medical &amp; dental appointments and disability swimming clubs (held at Parkside). If you close the bridge then our access will be severely restricted to said therapies and activities and appointments, the traffic and time taken on Hills Road will prohibit us using this route – we tried before and it was over an hour long. By denying access to a road for all those who are recognised as disabled by Central Government you are guilty of disability discrimination. Any other teen can access Parkside Pool from Mill Road by any of the ‘active travel’ methods you are promoting as an alternative but yet you denying the same access to any person who via the very nature of their disability cannot use said methods. Parkside Pool is the one pool in Cambridge that offers Disability swimming lessons for teenagers and adults alike.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that at no point was I aware of this consultation and that local charities for the disabled were not consulted to make their members aware. For example Pinpoint Cambridgeshire is the local parent career forum and hub for information partnered with all the local Cambridgeshire Councils (City, East &amp; South, Hunts etc). Yet again another example of how those with disabilities were and continue to be ignored.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
9.	Camcycle	Mill Road	
			<b>Response:</b>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
10.	Sarah Lightowlers	Mill Road	With the traffic restriction being introduced on Mill Road bridge, will Cambridgeshire now be eligible for the tranche 3 funding from central government to improve walking and cycling infrastructure that was denied previously?
			<b>Response:</b>

			No, Active Travel Tranche 3 funding has already been allocated by government. However, this sustainable transport measure will improve the likelihood of success on future rounds of funding.
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
11.	William Bannell	Mill Road	The accompanying document - Mill Road Spring 2022 Consultation Report - seems to refer to a majority percentage of respondents (1986 responses out of approx 3500 leaflets distributed), as a majority opinion, inferring consent or support from the public. 70% of 1986 is 1390 responses, not very many in the whole picture. Also, the cycling campaign group Camcycle organise and coach their members in how to fill in the consultation, which is a help that the rest of the public do not receive. 3500 leaflets distributed in total is a very small number, compared to how many people around Cambridge will be afflicted, and who use Mill Road, the vast majority were none the wiser when it came to this consultation in Spring 2022. Therefore one should not take the results of the consultation as any sort of valid survey, and should not infer a popular mandate from those figures. Will the Committee recognise and acknowledge that this is the case, and adjust their decision-making accordingly, and account for the widespread opposition which has been expressed prior to the consultation deadline itself, and recognise that the figures in the Consultation Report are distorted and skewed by other factors which are not included in the report?
			<b>Response:</b>  Not for officer response but member consideration during the debate
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
12.	Bev Nicolson	Mill Road	We know how little space there is for road users at busy times, we know how easy it is for the road to become grid locked when one vehicle is badly positioned. And these are just vehicles passing through. They aren't stopping to buy anything.  Making this a no-through road (not closing it, note) will have a significant positive impact for everyone.  Can I seek an assurance from the committee that they will commit to progressing delivery of the modal filter and ensuring that work is done alongside the community to improve the streetscape?

			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>That is the nature of today's decision – streetscape design work is referred to in 1.6. CCC is working with partners to consider funding for the public realm scheme. Community involvement on the public realm scheme will be sought from the start of the project.</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
13.	Chris Howell	Mill Road	Speaking in support of TRO
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
14.	David McHardy	Mill Road	I'm looking forward to the long-delayed bus gate being re-introduced. Can the committee confirm that the TRO raised no legal objections, and also when the filter will be brought back?
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Objections are detailed in 2.4 Timescales are set out in 2.6. Going forward CCC will provide regular progress updates.</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
15.	Richard Wood	Mill Road	<p>Cambridge Area Bus Users have been concerned that citi 2 bus services along Mill Road have never been restored to the pre-Covid frequency of 10 minutes (Monday-Saturday daytimes). Discussions with Stagecoach East management have revealed that traffic congestion – particularly along Mill Road – has caused significant delays, thereby increasing costs of operation, hence the reduction to a 20-minute frequency. It was, previously, common to see three buses stuck in traffic congestion between the railway bridge and Parkside Pool.</p> <p>So frustrating was this for bus drivers that, following the re-opening of Mill Road Bridge after the closure for railway works, they pleaded with Stagecoach East management to make the diversion</p>

			<p>via Coldham's Lane permanent.</p> <p>The current reduced frequency has meant poorer services to the Mill Road community, to residents of Birdwood Road, Walpole Road and Wulfstan Way and school students at St Bede's School.</p> <p>I would plead with the committee to consider carefully the need to work in collaboration with the Greater Cambridge Partnership, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Stagecoach, to transform Mill Road into a high-quality bus corridor, serving the surrounding communities with sustainable transport.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
16.	Catherine Aman	Mill Road	<p>The gate on Mill Road Bridge during the pandemic made cycling and walking on this vital artery safer, quieter and far more appealing.</p> <p>Please can the committee reassure me that they will continue to prioritise safety and health on Mill Road?</p> <p>As I understand it, the TRO has raised no legal objections and a filter will be put in place in the coming months. Will the committee confirm?</p> <p>Mill Road "belongs" to many: long-term local vendors who have served the community so well throughout pandemic and through changing economic climates; new vendors bringing their energy and vision; local residents and children and teens who use Mill Road as their route to school and work.</p> <p>We must protect and support our shopkeepers, absolutely. But we must do this without sacrificing safety and health, cycling and walking as true alternatives to cars.</p> <p>Mill Road belongs much less compellingly (imo) to those who see it as a nuisance corridor through which they must speed to get across the city. It is a community, not an impediment!</p>

			Will the committee commit to delivering this scheme and improving the streetscape on Mill Road?
			<b>Response:</b>  Objections are detailed in 2.4 Timescales are set out in 2.6. Going forward CCC will provide regular progress updates.  The commitment you refer to is part of the decision before H&T Members.
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comment</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question</b>
17.	Simon Nuttall	Mill Road	In my thirty years living in Cambridge the motor traffic on Mill Road has grown in volume, size of vehicles, and the level of impatience shown to other road users. In recent years I've had three incidents on or near Mill Road in which vans and cars have driven into the back of my bike, one on the bridge itself. My wife often reports to me incidents of close overtaking as she rides her bike over the bridge. I know experienced long-distance cyclists who actively avoid riding along Mill Road. The lobby group in favour of keeping the road open to motor traffic have themselves used an image which portrays an SUV as the only safe way across the bridge. What clearer evidence is needed of the urgency to re-introduce the modal filter to remove these dangerous road conditions? Can the committee assure me that they will continue to prioritise safer streets and give final approval for the updated bus gate scheme?
			<b>Response:</b>  <i>Statement, no response required</i>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
18.	Jennifer Williams	Mill Road	I am a local Petersfield resident with a small toddler - we cross the bridge on foot every day to access childcare and for shopping. While the bus gate was in effect, this was a safe and pleasant trip, with traffic easy to navigate. Can the committee reassure me that the needs of our smallest residents will be prioritised by bringing back the bus gate and ensuring young people's road safety, lung health and ability to enjoy the place they live in?
			<b>Response:</b>

			No officer response required
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
19.	Francesca Raphaely	Mill Road	<p>As a local resident (Brampton Road) I am writing to express my enthusiasm for a renewed closure of the Mill Road Bridge to the majority of traffic.</p> <p>I have young children and chronic illness which I have no doubt has been fuelled by living with poor quality air most of my life. When the bridge was closed, it had huge benefits enabling active travel to school and a closer sense of community, including more activity around local shops - it is no joke negotiating the mill road with a pram and a child on a scooter, when it is clogged with cars parked up and defensive bicycles on the pavements!</p> <p>I also live very close to the Coldhams Lane and contrary to the views expressed by some of my fellow residents, feel any reduction in car traffic around the city centre is progress towards the clean, liveable cities our children deserve.</p> <p>My only question is - how soon can you bring in a closure?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Timescales are set out in 2.6. Officers will be working hard to ensure the modal filter is in place as soon as possible.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
20.	Hannah Stanley Jones	Mill Road	<p>The trial period for the Mill Road bridge traffic restrictions saw the neighbourhood transformed. It was safer for pedestrians, cyclists and especially for young families. Can the committee provide reassurance from the committee that the proposals will be reinstated in the coming months?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Not for officer response</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:

21.	Cllr Katie Thornburrow	Mill Road	Local Cambridge City Councillor
			<b>Response:</b> None required
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question</b>
22.	Cllr Mairead Kelly	Mill Road	Local Cambridge City Councillor
			<b>Response:</b> None required
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
s2 3.	Cllr Richard Howitt	Mill Road	Local Cambridgeshire County Councillor
			<b>Response:</b> No response required.
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
24.	Cllr Edna Murphy	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	I am the County Councillor for Bar Hill Division which includes Bar Hill village. I will make the case for including a path around the ring road in the County's active travel plans and ask that it is included on the TIP list as soon as possible.
			<b>Response:</b> No response required

No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
25.	CamCycle	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	<p>Camcycle would like to thank the county officers for their work on the Active Travel Strategy and Design Guide. We support the aspirations of this strategy and the alignment with government policy, particularly Gear Change. The tool kit for new developments is very welcome and we support the focus on rural connections. We would like to highlight the principles for inclusive design. We would also like to thank officers for taking on board our feedback from the consultation and we are pleased to see that a number of our recommendations have been included. We've not had enough time between the publication of the papers and the question deadline to review the full details of the design guide, however, as this is a live document we hope to continue collaborating over the coming years to ensure our region has the highest standard of active travel design guidance in the UK and that it leads to significant improvements for people walking, cycling and wheeling on our streets.</p> <p>A quick review of the guide indicates that there are still some areas that need development. Can officers confirm that stakeholder engagement will continue for this design guide and provide an outline about what we can expect regarding collaboration?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>I can confirm that stakeholder engagement will continue. We will continue to engage through the Local Access Forum and other local stakeholder meetings will be arranged to regularly review the design guide.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
26.	Simon Martin	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	<p>At the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways and Transport Committee on 7th of March 2023, Members are requested to "Adopt Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy".</p> <p>The papers for this agenda item state in "2.2" that "Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy sets out our vision, objectives, detailed policies and a vision for a connected active travel network for Cambridgeshire. The active travel network identifies schemes for development and investment across Cambridgeshire with a focus on achieving mode shift from private car journeys that will</p>

			<p>contribute to the County Council’s target to achieve Net Zero Carbon by 2045, as well as wider environmental and health benefits for the people of Cambridgeshire.”</p> <p>I note that the “Huntingdonshire active travel network” map on Page 58 of September 2022 version of Active Travel Strategy Consultation document, differs from the “Huntingdonshire active travel network” map on Page 72 (Figure 16) of March 2023 version of Active Travel Strategy document, with large sections of “Existing routes” (grey), and “Tier 2 schemes” (orange) removed from the map.</p> <p>— Removed “Existing routes” includes the sections between the Alconbury area west of the A1M via Hammerton, Great Gidding, Stilton, Norman Cross, Yaxley.</p> <p>— Removed “Tier 2 schemes” include “Transport Investment Plan ID: 0301, Alconbury Weald development to key destinations; Alconbury Village, North Huntingdon, Great Fen” that is noted to be “Developer to deliver” on <a href="https://maps.cambridgeshire.gov.uk">maps.cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>, and “Transport Investment Plan ID: 0340, North of Ramsey, to the Great Fen” that has Ramsey MTTs notes as the strategy basis on the same map in the Transport Investment Plan layer.</p> <p>Before Members adopt the Active Travel Strategy, I wish to draw their attention to the following questions specific to the Huntingdonshire Active Travel Routes map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why have sections of “existing routes” (grey), and “tier 2 routes” (orange) been removed in the March 2023 Active Travel Strategy?</li> <li>2. What has happened to the routes that were previously “Tier 2” and are no longer included in the map or strategy?</li> <li>3. As the papers for this agenda item state, the strategy “identifies schemes for development and investment” does this mean those removed routes will miss out on development and investment due to no longer being in the strategy?</li> <li>4. As there is a stated aim of “focus on achieving mode shift from private car journeys that will contribute to the County Council’s target to achieve Net Zero Carbon by 2045, as well as wider environmental and health benefits”, and that Huntingdonshire has recently introduced their own Climate Strategy with similar aims by 2040, shouldn’t there be an increase in Active Travel cycling and walking routes (including those that may be candidates for bidding for funding even if such funding is not currently known), rather than a reduction in those routes?</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--

			<p>5. The proposed response to the Active Travel Strategy Consultation from Huntingdonshire District Council approved by Cabinet (15 Nov 2022) mentioned how Ramsey's routes had been requested to be "reviewed and considered further under the LCWIP methods. In doing so this would include projects for the market town of Ramsey being included within Tier 1" as response to Q10, however the map suggests this has not happened as there are no Tier 1 routes showing on the map for the Market Town of Ramsey, and as a member of the Public I do not know if this made part of HDCs final response, however has HDCs recommendation been considered and included in the finalisation of the March 2023 version of the Active Travel Strategy or has this been overlooked/rejected, and if so why?</p> <p>6. As the "Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Consultation: Report of Consultation" references feedback on Q10 of "Concern about the lack of active travel improvements across Huntingdonshire compared to other areas", I feel there should have been further routes added to the Strategy map for the reasons previously stated rather than reducing the already noted "lack of active travel improvements across Huntingdonshire" (bulletpoint 4 of Q10 'Qualitative' responses in Report of Consultation Findings), and question if reducing them is responding correctly to the consultation feedback that has been received?</p>
<b>N0.</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The draft Active Travel Strategy was published in September for consultation and changes have been made to the draft version of the active travel network maps considering suggestions from the public and to address any updates or make corrections.</p> <p>1. The existing route to Yaxley marked as grey on the map was removed as Sustrans have declassified it as an NCN route as it was not deemed safe enough to be an NCN route, so has been removed as an existing route shown on the map. The route between Alconbury and Ramsey identified as ID 301 on the MyCambridgeshire Map was removed as it is a route already being funded and delivered by the developer. The original inclusion of the route from Ramsey to the Great Fen Project was an error as it is primarily a leisure route and does not meet the objectives of the Active Travel Strategy connecting people to places of education, employment, medical centres, transport hubs or local services to achieve modal shift. It was therefore removed as a Tier 2 route. The Ramsey Market Town Transport Strategy is being replaced by the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy.</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Route ID 301 will be constructed and once complete it would show on the map as an existing route. Officers will review route ID 340 as part of the annual review of the action plan to reconsider its inclusion.</li> <li>3. Route ID 301 already has funding and is being delivered. Dependent on the outcome of officer review of ID 340, if it is included into the future review of the action plan it would become eligible for funding but would likely score low against funding criteria which is often active travel focused.</li> <li>4. Despite the removal of the identified schemes above, additional schemes have been added to the active travel network maps. Specifically to Huntingdonshire, following suggestions made during the public consultation, links between Tilbrook and Kimbolton, and between Holme and Sawtry have been included to provide links to local schools and centres. As stated on page 66 of the Strategy, it is important to note that the proposed active travel network will evolve as studies are completed and scheme proposals are developed.</li> <li>5. The consultation response from Huntingdonshire District Council has been considered as part of the review of the Strategy. At H&amp;T Committee in October 2022 it was agreed that an updated LCWIP would include walking routes in Ramsey and Littleport. The Active Travel Network maps do not show the LCWIP cycling routes due to scale.</li> <li>6. As mentioned above, proposed routes as part of the consultation that meets the vision and objectives of the Strategy have been added to the active travel maps. The comments made during public consultation have been noted, but further work needs to be undertaken to act on those suggestions. Such work will take place under action ATAP 01 of the High-level action plan (page 62) <i>“Develop a prioritised action plan of studies and schemes. Schemes to be included as an expanded Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.”</i> Further work will be undertaken as resource and funding allows to further develop the active travel network across the county.</li> </ol>
27.	Daniel Carney (Chair Girton Parish Council)	Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy	<p>I have been authorised to speak on behalf of Girton Parish Council, of which I am the Chair.</p> <p>As part of the A14 works, bridleway 99/6, linking Girton village via further Rights of Way to Madingley and Dry Drayton, was stopped up in a way that we believe to be in contravention of the Planning Act 2008, under which the entire A14 scheme was authorised. According to the Act, for a Right of Way to be removed a replacement must be provided or the Secretary of State must determine that one is not required. No replacement has been provided, and Highways England have made no claim that “not required” was the case. Whilst replacements have been seen at Bar Hill, Lolworth, and Boxworth, in Girton we are left without a right to cross the A14 to reach the previously connecting ROWs without making a major diversion from the original route. This</p>

			<p>diversion is even greater for cyclists and horse riders, who may not use the A14 crossing on footpath 99/4, a stretch of path which plans for the A14 upgrade show was due to be upgraded, work that has not materialised.</p> <p>There is a great deal of concern within the village about the removal of much-used public rights of way. Therefore, on behalf of Girtton village I am asking the Council to explain how has been allowed to occur, and how the Act has been complied with. But above all I want to emphasise that these links were valued by the local community and are very much missed. So can you please provide us with proposals for what can be done to provide alternatives that restore connectivity and go some way to make up for the loss of these much used and important local rights of way?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>This is one of several paths severed or rerouted due to the A14 works for which the new alternative was not built on the correct alignment according to the Development Consent Order. Therefore, although the new route is physically available, it has not legally come into effect. National Highways (previously Highways England) are paying for the legal work to address 28 such paths impacted in this way by the A14 through new legal orders, and this route is one of the initial priorities for that work.</p> <p>However, to provide connectivity to existing public footpaths, upgrades to footpaths 99/4 and 99/5 are needed. The County Council continues to recognise the importance of resolving this issue and restoring as far as possible the connectivity that has been lost and it is intended these routes be upgraded to bridleways. Officers will contact the Parish Council to discuss their concerns and to try and resolve them.</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
28.	Cambridge Living Streets	Cambridges hire Active Travel Strategy	<p>Living Streets Cambridge broadly welcomes the Active Travel Strategy and the laudable aims to rebalance and embed active travel in everyday processes. However, if walking is to be treated as a priority, and the ambition to 'Enhance' and 'Expand' approaches is to be realised two changes must be realised.</p> <p>First there needs to be a shift of resources to deliver the change - too often walking and cycling are conflated with little distinct expenditure on the pedestrian environment.</p>

			<p>Second, particularly where space is limited, there are often tough choices to be made in respect of the trade-offs between modes of travel. If walking is genuinely to become top of travel hierarchy, then it must be considered a priority in decision making.</p> <p>Will this committee ensure that the resources assigned in realising the strategy are commensurate with the objectives set out here and will they ensure that in future deliberations by officers or the county the tough choices are not ducked? Otherwise this strategy will, like so many previous initiatives be reduced to warm words.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Commitments to improvements to walking are equal to those to improve cycling in the Active Travel Strategy. The LCWIP identifies walking improvements in large market towns across Cambridgeshire, and although not possible to map on the active travel network maps, are mapped as part of the LCWIP.</p> <p>However, to provide connectivity to existing public footpaths, upgrades to footpaths 99/4 and 99/5 are needed. Unfortunately, these paths were outside of the red line boundary of the A14 scheme, so this is having to be separately addressed. The County Council continues to recognise the importance of resolving this issue and restoring as far as possible the connectivity that has been lost and it is intended that these routes be upgraded to bridleways. Officers will contact the Parish Council to discuss their concerns and seek to resolve them.</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>29.</b>	CamCycle	Fenland Transport Strategy	<p>Camcycle thanks officers for all the hard work that has gone into the Fenland Transport Strategy. We know that there is huge potential for an increase in walking and cycling in this district with the right infrastructure and support in place.</p> <p>We'd like to ask, given the low levels of engagement in the strategy survey, how does the county plan to work with local communities and groups on designs for upcoming prioritised routes and projects?</p>

			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>We welcome the support of the Fenland Transport Strategy. The next stages of work are to build on the emerging action plan of schemes, interventions, and studies to deliver the Strategy. This work will involve reviewing the emerging action plan and prioritising the schemes for funding. This will be done with the Member Steering Group and be approved by the Highways and Transport Committee at CCC.</p> <p>As schemes move through the development process stakeholders, local communities and Members will be engaged at various stages. We always welcome suggestions as to how we can improve engagement- please get in touch with any suggestions.</p>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
30.	CamCycle	Huntingdons hire Transport Strategy	<p>Camcycle thanks officers for all the hard work that has gone into the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. We welcome Policy TSH18 on reprioritising space for active travel, which is in line with national policies and funding objectives.</p> <p>Given the existing barriers to those travelling in the district and several tragic fatalities including that of Celia Ward on the Huntingdon Ring Road, we believe that safer routes are urgently needed including a revocation of the ban on cycling through Huntingdon city centre, safer active travel routes around the ring road and restrictions on traffic over the Huntingdon-Godmanchester Town Bridge.</p> <p>Will the county commit to prioritising safety for people walking and cycling in Huntingdonshire and deliver schemes that help people reach their everyday destinations safely on foot or by cycle?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>We welcome the support of the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. The next stages of work are to build on the emerging action plan of schemes, interventions, and studies to deliver the Strategy. This work will involve reviewing the emerging action plan and prioritising the schemes for funding. This will be done with the Member Steering Group and be approved by the Highways and Transport Committee at CCC.</p>

			<p>The operation of Huntingdon Ring Road and Town Bridge have been identified for detailed study work.</p> <p>The county council is committed to the safety of all users of the highway network including people walking and cycling. The LCWIP routes have been prioritised on connecting people to everyday destinations. The Tier 2 routes identified in the Activity Travel Strategy will also be prioritised and connectivity and safety are expected to be key in this prioritisation. Godmanchester bridge and the western section of the ring road are included as Tier 1 routes in the LCWIP.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
31.	Huntingdon shire Cycling and Walking Group	Huntingdons hire Transport Strategy	<p>Hunts Walking &amp; Cycling Group was formed in 2019 to promote and support active and sustainable travel in Huntingdonshire. We have almost 2,000 members on our Facebook group: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/HuntsWalkCycle">http://tinyurl.com/HuntsWalkCycle</a></p> <p>When are there going to be a joined-up, fit-for-purpose cycle routes between Huntingdon and St Ives? There have been petitions and calls for safe cycle routes for years but so far little sign of action. Some feel that the number of cyclists has actually reduced in the last 15 years due to the roads becoming busier and more dangerous for cyclists. There are two main cycling routes connecting both towns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The strategic route via Houghton &amp; Wyton has a short key missing link on the A1123 Huntingdon Rd, opposite Dobbies Garden Centre – see photo 1</li> <li>2. The route via Hemmingfords to Godmanchester is only partly suitable for cyclists and becoming increasingly busy to cycle along through Godmanchester from Cow Lane to the White Hart Pub along the busy B1044 Cambridge Road. – See photo 2</li> </ol> <p>Cow Lane is full of potholes, and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians particularly in the dark. Installing a good safe cycle route between two of our main towns in Huntingdonshire would help encourage modal shift from car to bicycle for a journey of less than 6 miles between two major population centres that many people could easily cycle in about 30 minutes. Active Travel in Cambridgeshire is not just about Cambridge City. Huntingdonshire deserves decent active travel routes with cats eyes on dark stretches, and wide enough to enable multiple users if space permits.</p>

			<b>Question:</b> When can we have a timetable for completing the missing links in these two strategic active travel routes from St Ives to Huntingdon which have been identified as a priority for investment in the draft Active Travel Strategy and the draft Local Walking & Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response:</b>  Funding opportunities for schemes continue to be sought. Further work will be undertaken to prioritise schemes in the emerging Action Plans to develop a pipeline of schemes for delivery. Both schemes highlighted here are included as Tier 1 LCWIP schemes but progressing schemes is dependent on funding being secured.
<b>32.</b>	CamCycle	Civil Parking Enforcement	Welcoming the work done and a question on timescales. Relating to TMA Part 6
			<b>Response:</b>  In November 2022, Cambridgeshire County Council sent an application letter to the Secretary of State seeking permission to proceed with the civil enforcement of moving traffic contraventions pursuant to Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.  The Order is due to be laid before Parliament in June 2023.
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>33.</b>	CamCycle	Commuted Sums	In the Housing Estate Road Construction Specification for January 2023, the requirements for crossings do not seem to acknowledge the changes to the Highway Code which came into force in January 2022.  It needs to be made clear that those walking and cycling should be prioritised above vehicular access in designs – for example Copenhagen crossings or continuous footways should be highlighted as a side road design in preference to the use of dropped kerbs

			Camcycle would like to ask why policies for new developments are not already being made consistent with the Active Travel Strategy, LTN 1/20 and the county and country's wider transport aims.
			<b>Response:</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>Question / comment from</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>34.</b>	CamCycle	Highways Operational Standards	<p>Camcycle welcomes the move to introduce an authorisation process for the change of surface to Public Rights Of Way. It is extremely important that there is a consistent approach to this across the county and that any routes which are intended for utility cycling (in line with the new Active Travel Strategy) are constructed with smooth, even, hard, all-weather materials with proper drainage, following LTN 1/20 guidance, in order to ensure fair access for people of all abilities.</p> <p>We note that the county council gained government funding via the Combined Authority in January 2023 of which part will be used for officer training on LTN 1/20 and the creation of a new Active Travel Centre of Excellence.</p> <p>We would like to ask if LTN 1/20 could be included as a reference document in the Collation of Information form and could the Centre of Excellence be included as an official consultee?</p> <p>We'd also like to note that there is a lot to read in the Highways Operational Standards document (which is due to last 10 years), but we hope changes can be made in the coming years in line with developing transport policy.</p> <p>For example: Point 22 – parklets should be more clearly encouraged as a way to support sustainable and liveable communities. Point 23 – 'Copenhagen crossings' or continuous footway designs should be included in this list. Point 25 – cycle stands should be encouraged on the highway rather than the on footways in order to maintain space for pedestrians and increase accessibility for all types of rider and cycle.</p> <p>Lambeth Council has recently published an ambitious Kerbside Strategy and we would urge Cambridgeshire to produce something similar to guide future policy.</p>
			<b>Response:</b>

No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
35.	CamCycle	Finance Monitoring Report	<p>In light of the two fatalities on the southern section of the busway path, Camcycle strongly welcomes the proposal in point 2.6 to allocate funding to widen this much-used active travel route and ensure it is safe for all users.</p> <p>We'd like to ask if this project could include consultation with the path's current users and other stakeholder groups such as Camcycle and Cambridge Living Streets so a design can be developed that considers the needs of current users and adequately provides for the growth in people walking and cycling in this area.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>None required</p>



## Park & Ride and Guided Busway Grounds Maintenance Contract Renewal

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 25<sup>th</sup> April 2023

From: Executive Director Place and Sustainability

Electoral division(s): All

Key decision: Yes

Forward Plan ref: 2023/056

Outcome: Approve the re-procurement of a Grounds maintenance contract for Park and Ride sites and the Guided Busway.  
The estimated expenditure through this contract would be £1m over the 5-year period of the contract.

Recommendation: a) Agree to the re-procurement of the Grounds Maintenance contract as outlined within the report  
  
b) Delegate responsibility for awarding and executing the contract for the provision of Grounds Maintenance services and any extension periods to the contract to the Executive Director Place and Sustainability in consultation with Chair and Vice-Chair Highways and Transport Committee.

### Officer contact:

Name: Campbell Ross-Bain  
Post: Bus Operations & Facilities Manager  
Email: [Campbell.ross-bain@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Campbell.ross-bain@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01223 844467

### Member contacts:

Names: Cllr Alex Beckett/ Cllr Neil Shailer  
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair of Highways and Transport Committee  
Email: [alex.beckett@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:alex.beckett@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
[Neil.shailer@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Neil.shailer@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01223 706398

## 1. Background

- 1.1 In 2018 the Economy and Environment Committee approved the request to commence a procurement process to secure a grounds maintenance contract for the Park & Ride sites and Busway for a period of 5 years (3+1+1).
- 1.2 Working with Cambridgeshire County Council procurement team and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) a dual contract was procured to deliver the following services across the two authorities:
- a) Trumpington Park & Ride
  - b) Madingley Road Park & Ride
  - c) Newmarket Road Park & Ride
  - d) Milton Park & Ride
  - e) Babraham Road Park & Ride
  - f) Longstanton Park & Ride
  - g) St.Ives Park & Ride
  - h) 25 km of Busway track and maintenance track
  - i) 14 Local Environmental Management areas (LEM's)
  - j) All open spaces, tree, hedge and shrub maintenance and associated works across multiple housing sites within SCDC.

## 2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The current 5-year contract expires on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and as this contract has reached the end of permitted extension periods a re- procurement process is required. The existing contract is a contract delivering services for CCC Park & Ride and Guided Busway and to SCDC. It is proposed to procure a new contract on the same basis. CCC have received confirmation from SCDC of their approval to move forward on this basis.

This dual contract model has been successful over the period of the existing contract and provides an economy of scale for the two authorities, delivering efficiencies for grounds maintenance services. The contract is to be procured under the Procurement Contract Regulations 2015 and will be advertised on the Pro Contract System using the following timeline:

- a) April 2023 – Publish tender.
  - b) May 2023 – Responses to tender received.
  - c) June 2023 – Evaluate tenders.
  - d) July 2023 – Moderation process.
  - e) July 2023 – Award contract.
  - f) 5<sup>th</sup> October 2023 – New contract commencement date.
- 2.2 It is anticipated that the CCC element of the 5-year contract (3+1+1) will exceed £500k and under CCC's Contract Regulations the decision to re-procure is therefore one for the relevant Policy & Service committee to decide upon.

The estimated budget spend in each year is up to £200k. Current budget allocations for this are included within the 2023/24 service budget and future year budget plans. The CCC element of the contract amounts to c35% of the overall contract value, with a total

anticipated dual contract value of £2.85M. SCDC have provided approval on their element of the contract to allow the re-tender process to proceed.

On the award of dual contracts, a separate contract will be entered into by each authority. This allows for flexibility and risk management within each Local Authority. Once the contracts have been awarded the management and decision making relating to the contract will sit separately with each authority. This ensures that either contract can continue to operate without the other.

Potential bidders will need to pass all elements of the selection criteria which include; economic and financial standing, health & safety qualifications, and data protection and GDPR regulations, before being evaluated on the qualitative criteria, including the following:

- a) Customer care.
- b) Waste management and environmental considerations of entire operation including transportation of equipment.
- c) How the service might improve the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of Cambridgeshire.
- d) Innovation and efficiency.
- e) Consideration of vulnerable and elderly.

.

### 3. Alignment with corporate priorities

#### 3.1 Environment and Sustainability

The Busway maintains 14 Local Environmental Management areas which will continue to be maintained and monitored to ensure the conditions remain in place for the identified species within these areas.

#### 3.2 Health and Care

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### 3.3 Places and Communities

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### 3.4 Children and Young People

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### 3.5 Transport

The Park and Ride facilities and the Guided Busway provide key elements of the transport infrastructure serving Cambridgeshire. The ongoing grounds maintenance of these facilities

is essential to their ongoing successful operation, avoiding issues of over grown vegetation etc for service users and bus operators.

## 4. Significant Implications

### 4.1 Resource Implications

The estimated cost of the contract to Cambridgeshire County Council (assumed in the service budget) is estimated to be £200k per annum over the 5-year period of the contract. Provision has been made within the service budget allocations for this in 2023/24 and future years.

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

All procurement activity will be undertaken in compliance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and will be supported by both the Procurement and Bus Operations services.

### 4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

Dual party contract required. The contract will be signed only with confirmation from legal services and procurement on the appropriateness of the contract to be entered into.

### 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

Working with community groups along the Busway corridor allows us to modify small areas of verge within community areas to encourage wildflower species and local community involvement and pride in their environment.

### 4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

### 4.8 Climate Change and Environment Implications on Priority Areas (See further guidance in Appendix 2):

#### 4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.

neutral Status:

Explanation: No buildings involved in the contract

#### 4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.

Neutral/positive Status:

Electric bus fleet to replace the Park & Ride fleet in May/June 2023. Universal bus fleet operating on the Busway will be replaced by electric buses later in 2023. Whilst this does not directly affect the Grounds maintenance contract itself, holistically the Park and Ride Busway services and County Council zero carbon targets will benefit from this change.

- 4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.  
Positive Status:  
The Busway maintains 14 Local Environmental Management areas which will continue to be maintained and monitored to ensure the conditions remain in place for the species within these areas. Tree surveys along the 25km of the Busway will be undertaken every 2.5 years within the contract to ensure the condition of the trees is safe for the public and positive for the environment. Working with community groups along the Busway corridor allows us to modify small areas of verge within community areas to encourage wildflower species and local community involvement and pride in their environment. Also leads to reduced grass cutting at critical times of year for these species and an element of re-wilding.
- 4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.  
Positive Status:  
Explanation: Removal of any existing plastic tree protectors will be undertaken within this contract.
- 4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:  
Neutral Status:  
Explanation: No change in sites or busway and no watering of existing planting is undertaken.
- 4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.  
neutral /positive Status:  
Electric bus fleet to replace the Park & Ride fleet in May/June 2023. Universal bus fleet operating on the Busway will be replaced by electric buses later in 2023. Whilst this does not directly affect the Grounds maintenance contract itself, holistically the Park and Ride Busway services and County Council zero carbon targets will benefit from this change
- 4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.  
neutral Status:

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 Head of Procurement and Commercial? Yes  
Name of Officer: Clare Ellis

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or Pathfinder Legal? Yes  
Name of Legal Officer: Emma Duncan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your EqIA Super User? Yes  
Name of Officer: Faye McCarthy

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?  
Yes

Name of Officer: Christine Birchall

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service  
Contact? Yes

Name of Officer: Sue Procter

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?  
Yes

Name of Officer: Iain Green

If a Key decision, have any Climate Change and Environment implications been cleared by  
the Climate Change Officer?

Yes

Name of Officer: Emily Bolton

## 5. Source documents guidance

5.1 Source documents  
None

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT - CCC501682876

**Which service and directorate are you submitting this for (this may not be your service and directorate):**

Directorate	Service	Team
Highways & Transport - Trans, Strat & Dev	Park & Ride	Park & Ride Parking

**Your name:** Campbell Ross-Bain

**Your job title:** Bu operations and facilities manager

**Your directorate, service and team:**

Directorate	Service	Team
Highways & Transport - Trans, Strat & Dev	Park & Ride	Park & Ride Parking

**Your phone:** 07714063875

**Your email:** Campbell.Ross-Bain@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

**Proposal being assessed:** Renewal of grounds maintenance contract

**Business plan proposal number:** not applicable

**Key service delivery objectives and outcomes:** Creating a greener, fairer and more caring Cambridgeshire. Service delivery embeds an approach that considers and implements opportunities to support existing and new businesses, making it easier for them to grow and invest in Cambridgeshire. Actively work with VOI (Scooter hire), Outspoken Cycle delivery, Sherman & Waterman (Sunday market), 1Go Motorcycle training business, Young Drivers Events team, TESLA, BP Connect, Film Companies and others to encourage business opportunities and provide additional services to users of the sites. Awareness raised of the level of poverty and inequality across Cambridgeshire, and how services may support efforts to tackle this and increase employability in conjunction with partner organisations. Park & Ride sites have wherever possible implemented footpaths and cycle routes directly into the sites from neighbouring properties and housing estates. This allows lower income families and workers to directly access the bus services and facilities on site. Service delivery prioritises sustainable practices wherever possible. Park & Ride and Busway teams encourage and promote modal shift from cars to buses and other forms of green transport. Provide cycle parking facilities at all sites as well as electric cycles/scooters and electric vehicle charging. Actively engaged in the promotion of two solar canopy schemes covering two sites and generating green energy. Furthering understanding of climate change to support the Council's commitments towards Net Zero by embedding climate considerations in all the work we do. See above, also actively engaged in the replacement of the Park & Ride bus fleet to electric buses in 2023. Actively engaged in the replacement of the Universal Bus service fleet to electric in 2023. Implementing policies, projects and strategies that promote safe and healthy communities. See above, also ensuring the 25km long Busway maintenance track is safe for all users. Installation of solar studs along large areas of the maintenance track. Maintenance and

modification of lighting columns along the southern Busway maintenance track. Increase in grounds maintenance to ensure hedgerows and trees are maintained to ensure safe passage along the Busway.

**What is the proposal:** A simple re-tender of an existing 5 year grounds maintenance contract for the Park & Ride sites and Guided Busway.

**What information did you use to assess who would be affected by this proposal?:**

Observation and knowledge built up over 18 years working in a frontline environment with customers and bus operators. Introduction to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion e-learning module. Participation in the EDI conversation online meetings. Park & Ride demographic information: 70% female Majority within the 35 to 64 age group. Majority within the £15k to £25k income group 48% workers 27% shoppers 90% car drivers 25% concessionary bus pass holders Busway Demographic information: 60 % female 50% workers 35% retired

**Are there any gaps in the information you used to assess who would be affected by this proposal?:** No

**Does the proposal cover:** All service users/customers/service provision in specific areas/for specific categories of user

**Which particular employee groups/service user groups will be affected by this proposal?:**

Existing customers using or looking to use the Guided Busway and its maintenance track. Existing customers using or looking to use the Park & Ride sites.

**Does the proposal relate to the equality objectives set by the Council's Single Equality Strategy?:** Yes

**Will people with particular protected characteristics or people experiencing socio-economic inequalities be over/under represented in affected groups:** About in line with the population

**Does the proposal relate to services that have been identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics/who are experiencing socio-economic inequalities?:** No

**Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?:** No

**What is the significance of the impact on affected persons?:** No cuts to services, increase in grounds maintenance, leaf clearing and sweeping of the maintenance track.

**Category of the work being planned:** Procurement

**Is it foreseeable that people from any protected characteristic group(s) or people experiencing socio-economic inequalities will be impacted by the implementation of this proposal (including during the change management process)?:** No

**Age:** Straight re-tender of existing grounds maintenance contract with increases in budget to spend on increased hedge cutting, leaf clearance and sweeping.

**Disability:** As with Age

**Gender reassignment:**

As with Age

**Marriage and civil partnership:** As with age

**Pregnancy and maternity:** As with age

**Race:** As with age

**Religion or belief (including no belief):** As with age

**Sex:** As with age

**Sexual orientation:** As with age

**Socio-economic inequalities:** As with age

**Head of service:** David Allatt

**Head of service email:** david.allatt@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

**Confirmation:** I confirm that this HoS is correct



# Highways and Transport Policy and Service Committee Agenda Plan

Published on 3rd April 2023

## Notes

The definition of a key decision is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 2, Article 12.

\* indicates items expected to be recommended for determination by full Council.

+ indicates items expected to be confidential, which would exclude the press and public.

The following are standing agenda items which are considered at every Committee meeting:

- Minutes of previous meeting and Action Log
- Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
04/07/23	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable	19/06/23	26/06/23
	Milton Road Residents' Parking Scheme	Nicola Gardner	Not applicable		
	Risk Register	Sue Procter	Not applicable		
	Parking and Enforcement Policy	Sonia Hansen	2022/036		
[05/09/23]	<i>Reserve Date</i>				
03/10/23	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable	11/09/23	25/09/23
05/12/23	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable	20/11/23	27/11/23

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
<i>[23/01/24]</i>	<i>Reserve Date</i>				
05/03/24	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable	19/02/24	26/02/24
<i>[30/04/24]</i>	<i>Reserve Date</i>				

To be scheduled

Cambridgeshire County Council Future Transport Priorities – Chris Poultney (Key Decision)

Please contact Democratic Services [democraticservices@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@cambridgeshire.gov.uk) if you require this information in a more accessible format