

AGENDA ITEM 2

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 15th September 2020

Time: 10:00am – 1.52 pm

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, L Dupre (substituting for H Batchelor) R Fuller, J French, Lynda Harford, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), N Kavanagh, S King, I Manning and A Taylor.

Apologies: Councillor H Batchelor Substitute L Dupre.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Referencing agenda Item 9 'Covid-19 temporary cycling proposals', Councillor Bates declared a disclosable, prejudicial interest should there be any discussion on a lorry ban on the B1040 going through Hilton, which was part of his electoral division, as he understood this would be a request one of the public speakers. He considered that it would be inappropriate to Chair or be involved in the discussion and would ask Democratic Services to remove him from the meeting before any such discussion took place.

Councillors Harford, Kavanagh, Manning and Taylor declared non-statutory disclosable interests in respect of the same item as members of Camcycle.

During the discussion on the Winter Maintenance Programme the Vice Chairman highlighted that as a personal non disclosable interest both himself and the Chairman were members of ESPO.

23. MINUTES 7TH JULY 2020

That subject to Minute 145 'Wisbech Strategy Phase 1 Delivery' being changed on the third line of the third bullet to read two, not three members,.

It was resolved:

That the Minutes be approved a correct record.

24. MINUTES ACTION LOG

Issues raised on the Action Log were as follows:

- a) **Minute 15 - 'Wisbech Access Strategy Phase 1 - Delivery'** - Councillor Dupre made reference to the constitution change to the Wisbech Steering Group agreed by the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman. This followed the request made at the July meeting by

Councillor King to enlarge the Wisbech Steering Group to enable him to be added as a third local member due to the amount of housing growth in his electoral division. She believed this was a new precedent and as such, she made a request that the membership of the Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Diamond Area Steering Group should also be enlarged, to allow her to be added to the Group and represent the interests of Sutton residents. The Chairman agreed to take this request away and discuss it further outside of the meeting with officers and with the Chairman of the said Group. *Action: Chairman*

- b) Minute 311 Previous Economy and Environment Committee - 5th March 2020 Reducing Transport Block (ITB) Funding Allocation Proposals – Reducing the length of LHI Panel making decisions on individual Schemes** - Councillor King, asked the progress on finding new dates for the current round, as the delay was a concern he had raised at the last meeting. Richard Lumley explained that this was still ongoing. Councillor King suggested that the action should be changed from 'on hold' to 'ongoing' as the original action and an earlier one in the action log seeking improvements to the criteria and running of the Local Highways Initiative Improvements Panels linked to the current requirement to find and agree new Local Highway Initiative dates.

It was resolved:

To note the action log.

25. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

One petition received by the appropriate deadline requesting a modal filter restriction on Coldhams Lane. The Committee considered the petition later in the meeting under Minute 29. 'Cambridgeshire Highways Contract Annual Report 2019-20', along with the contents of two late petitions both for and against a modal filter scheme on Arbury Road. The Chairman had also accepted seven requests to speak on the above report as referenced under Minute 29.

26. WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2020-21

This revised Plan had been brought to the Committee as part of the annual review undertaken to ensure changes in network length, new developments, budgetary changes resource pressures and revised legislation were taken into account.

It was noted that Cambridgeshire Highways currently gritted approximately 44% of the highway network comprising primary and secondary routes, the Guided Busway, cycleways and foot bridges as set out in the report. Cambridgeshire County Council, in its role as Highway Authority had a statutory duty under the Highways Act "to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that safe passage along a highway is not

endangered by snow or ice". For operational reasons the winter service gritting operations jointly provided by Skanska and the County Council were split into three weather domains: North and East; South and West and City using 37 gritters and quad bikes. Details were provided of the activities undertaken with parish councils to help promote the winter volunteer scheme. Currently there were approximately 52 winter volunteers from 22 parishes across the County, with salt supplied and replenished annually to them in strategically placed grit bins, of which there were approximately 850 within Cambridgeshire.

Challenges highlighted included the ability to accommodate the increasing length of highway network arising from new infrastructure and developments as part of the growth agenda. Discussions were currently still in progress with Highways England to understand when new roads as part of the A14 project would be handed over to the County Council so they could be included in the Winter Plan.

During the course of discussion, Members raised questions / issues including:

- referenced in one of the paragraphs queried the budget involved in purchasing salt from Highway England for the South Cambridgeshire area and whether it was more expensive. In reply it was highlighted the highways depot at Whittlesford was utilised for this, with the salt purchased being the same price as from other contractors.
- queried where could Members view the detail of which bridges and cycle paths were gritted. Reference was made to the very steep new bridge at Bar Hill that was not currently included in Appendix K. It was confirmed that this was to be included as part of a revised gritting route. Officers would need to look at the best way of treating it in adverse weather and would get back to Councillor Harford who had raised this as an issue. *Action*
- queried the number of quad bikes used to grit the cycleways and whether if required, as a result of the continued increase in the mileage of cycleways, there was budget available to expand their numbers. Currently, there were two quad bikes, designed to deal with the worst-case scenarios, with the present number considered sufficient. However if this became an issue in the future, additional equipment could be purchased.
- One Member highlighting that herself and one of the other opposition members of the Committee had undertaken considerable work to help understand the intricacies of the programme in order to make suggestions for helping reduce future budget overspends in the area. She expressed disappointment that they had not been reflected in the report and asked what steps were being taken to help avoid overspends in the future. It was explained that the Winter Maintenance budget was complex, due to the uncertainty around forecasting, as the budget spend was so weather dependent. A great deal of work had been undertaken in the last 12-18 months on the make-up of the budget and lessons had been learnt on previous under estimates regarding the cost of the service. The detail was not included in the present report as it was solely dealing with the operational aspects of Service delivery. Work to procure the new gritting

fleet had commenced and this would provide opportunities to further improve the service. A report to seek approval to award the replacement contract would come back to the Committee in due course.

- Questions were raised on both the decision making process of when to grit, how this could be further refined and how recruitment into this specialist area could be improved, the latter being a recognised concern for this and other councils. Details were provided on how decisions were made, highlighting that as this was a specialist area requiring training in understanding meteorological forecasts, recruitment was an ongoing challenge, as the responsibility involved did not appeal to that many members of staff. While the current team was considered sufficient, there was ongoing work to encourage greater recruitment, including from other areas of the Directorate.
- Highlighting that with 263 parishes in the County it was disappointing that only 22 participated in the Winter Volunteer scheme and asking what measures could be taken to make it more attractive, to help encourage greater uptake. The steps undertaken in the past included providing indemnity cover, personal protective equipment and training and efforts were made to sign up additional volunteers at the annual volunteers' conference. Officers were always looking for additional suggestions and welcomed any that Members might wish to make. In a response later in the debate, the suggestion was made that the volunteer mutual aid groups formed during the Covid 19 lockdown would be an excellent source for potential new recruits. The Chairman indicated that he had already been in discussion with the Councillor Criswell, Chairman of the Communities and Partnership Committee in respect of seeking new volunteers and obtaining contact points from such groups. *Action: Chairman to arrange for any contact details to be passed to the officer.*
- Highlighting that while the volunteer scheme was undertaken on a contractual basis, the arrangements for providing gritting for parish / district councils to undertake such activities were still carried out on an informal basis. The Member for Sutton queried whether similar, more formal contractual arrangements should be established, and also, how often were the arrangements used, as her district council had not been contacted for a number of years. While there was no formal agreement with districts / parishes / town councils, the County Council Highways department worked closely with them. Historically if there had been a severe period of snow and district councils had been unable to carry out some of their other functions, they often would help the County Council with gritting some of their local roads. If there had been a number of mild winters, the contacts could have been more infrequent. He would check the arrangements made for her particular Division. *Action: Jon Clarke / Dennis Vacher*
- Highlighting that the Milton cycle bridge link to Cambridge North station referenced as the Jane Costain Bridge in Appendix K was incorrectly named and should be changed to its correct title the Jane Coston Bridge. The officer undertook to make the change and update the detail of bridges and cycle routes included in the gritting programme in the same appendix and further to a request from the Vice Chairman, to also ensure that the most up to date appendices were posted to the website. *Action Jon Clarke / Dennis Vacher*

- That the report should have made reference to and recognise that farmers were both encouraged to be part of the voluntary scheme and many already helped to grit the highways.
- One Member expressed concerns that the new Fendon road roundabout and other new infrastructure assets were not included in the current gritting routes. In reply, it was clarified that they were included as part of the new revised routes and on the roundabout referenced and that this would be updated in the final web documents.

On being put to the vote, seven members were in favour of the officer recommendations with three Liberal Democrat members abstaining.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Winter Services Plan for the 2020-21 Winter gritting season.

27. A141 AND ST IVES TRANSPORT STUDY

This report provided a summary of the A141 Transport Study and a more detailed report on the St Ives Transport Study.

The objective for the A141 Transport Study had been to identify a range of potential transport interventions on the A141 corridor between the Spittal's Way and Ermine Way junction and the Sawtry Way (B1090) junction, to provide capacity in the corridor for future growth beyond that identified in the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and to unlock development sites. The assessment of the A141 demonstrated that major investment in a new, strategic road link located along a similar alignment to that identified in the Long Term Transport Strategy would be required. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) had committed to funding this study.

The main objectives for the St Ives Transport Study had been to examine options for reducing existing congestion on the main A1123 and A1096 corridors in the area and to reduce unwanted through traffic on the roads in St Ives town centre. Consideration had also been given to improving bus journey times through the town centre. The recommendations for implementation were:

- Introduction of a 20mph speed limit across St Ives Town Centre with physical measures to achieve this
- A right-turn ban for all traffic from Needingworth Road onto A1123 St Audrey Lane
- Replacing the roundabout at the A1123 St Audrey Lane / B1040 Somersham Road junction with traffic signals
- Changing priorities at the Ramsey Road / North Road, Globe Place / North Road / Broad Leas and Globe Place / West Street / East Street junctions.

The local Member for St Ives South and Needingworth, Councillor Reynolds, was invited to speak next. While appreciating that most of the proposals appeared to be reasonable, he highlighted current specific pinch-points during commuter rush hour periods, referencing both the Silvaco Roundabout and Meadow Lane Roundabout as two that could not cope with the volume of traffic, especially if the latter was to be fitted with traffic lights. With reference to the Silvaco Roundabout and associated retail park around it (which included a McDonalds, Morrison's, Aldi and Tesco) he highlighted as background that this was the main route for traffic coming into St Ives from the surrounding villages and Fenland to access the Guided busway, Park and Ride and for the A14. While he supported most of the recommendations, he could not support the proposal for a right-turn ban for all traffic from Needingworth Road onto the A1123 St Audrey Lane. In his view, such a proposal, if implemented, would just create additional traffic problems for the Silvaco Roundabout at rush hour periods. One Member of the Committee suggested that a way to test the proposal to assess practicability would be to undertake it initially as an experimental Traffic Regulation Order. In reply, the Local member indicated that he was not in favour of this, as a solution, as in his experience, temporary traffic regulation orders had a habit of becoming permanent orders once the initial experimental period had ended. The presenting officer clarified that options for looking at temporary measures, including experimental traffic orders, would be at the next stage, and was dependent on funding being secured. At this early stage, it was not possible to confirm the details of the projects.

Other issues raised in the discussion of the report included,

- With reference to questions on using bespoke runs of two transport modelling tools, it was clarified that the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRM2) had been used as the strategic transport model for the whole Cambridge Sub region area and also to support the A141 proposals. The Paramics micro-simulation model covered Huntingdon and St Ives, providing an assessment of network performance and detailed modelling analysis for the St Ives town centre proposals. It was confirmed that the CSRM2 model had been used for the exiting Huntingdon Local Plan and would be used for any future Huntingdonshire Local Plan to help guide officers on the level of development north of Huntingdon, should the A141 scheme come to fruition.
- Concern from one Member that the Paramics modelling seemed to be very car based and did not provide sufficient measures to encourage, walking, cycling and public transport.
- With regard to the proposed 20 mph speed limit in St Ives, one Member expressed concern on how this would be enforced, as the experience in Cambridge had been that many motorists often did not adhere to it and the Police were indifferent to enforcing it. He sought clarification whether enforcement would be through digital enforcement. It was explained that enforcement would be through designed in physical measures to slow down traffic, rather than digital enforcement. The local Member who had spoken when asked his opinion on such a speed restriction had no issues, as 20 mph was

effectively already the speed limit by default due to the amount of traffic on the network.

- Councillor Fuller the other local Member (for St Ives North) while accepting that the main measures proposed did not affect his division, explained that he had chaired the study for two years, highlighting that the options would have been very different if it would have been possible to redesign the road layout from scratch. As it was, it had been very difficult to develop workable solutions using the existing layout of the road network. All the measures proposed as quick wins in the report would only be partial measures, with the real answer to address the major traffic congestion issues in St Ives lying with the more strategic study, as referred to in the report and to also avoid the potential issues that Councillor Reynolds had highlighted. It was right for Councillor Reynolds to raise concerns that certain measures proposed could have wider knock on implications and those concerns were shared by many residents. He supported the measures being proposed and highlighted that at a meeting of St Ives Town Council the previous week to discuss the proposals they had supported them, subject to there being full consultation when developing the detail of the projects. He was also happy to support the proposals provided, that in moving forward, there was full consultation with local county, district and town councillors, as well as with local residents. He also gave assurance to a previous Member who had already spoken that the detail of the Quick Wins as set out in the document provided measures to improve cycling, walking and the use of public transport. The proposals to remove pinch points to allow free movement of buses and other measures were the most radical seen in a long time in respect of helping make public transport and cycling a far more attractive option.
- Councillor Manning clarified that in relation to his issue on the cycling proposals, he had wished to highlight that cycle lanes shared with pedestrians was not an ideal solution compared to dedicated segregated cycle lanes, but accepted that this was difficult to achieve in built up urban areas.

Having commented on the report:

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse the results of the A141 and St Ives Transport Study as set out in section 2 of the report.
- b) Approve the list of proposals identified in the St Ives study set out in paragraphs 2.6 and 2.7 for submission to the Combined Authority for funding, and for consultation and delivery should funding be secured.
- c) Approve the new strategic study for St Ives providing funding for it is made available and a suitable funding agreement with the Combined Authority is agreed.

28. MARCH AREA TRANSPORT STUDY PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received a report on progress on the March Area Transport Study including details and results of the interim online public consultation exercise undertaken as a result of the Covid-19 lockdown seeking approval to proceed with the construction of the Quick Win schemes. and to proceed with the programme and costs to produce an Outline Business Case, subject to the funding being made available from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as detailed in paragraphs 2.14-2.19 of the report.

The Quick Win schemes largely comprised of the following as detailed in paragraph 2.13 of the report:

- Walking and cycling audits, providing improvement proposals for pedestrian and cycling provision on six key route corridors in March,
- Safe routes to school audits, identifying recommendations for all five March school,;
- Pedestrian and cycling signage audit and improvement proposal, connecting key routes and destinations in March, with a schedule of signage location recommendations and signage design options, including distance and journey time illustrations.

Issues raised by Members included:

- Highlighting, that as parking had not been de-criminalised in the area, enforcement would be carried out by the Police. The Member suggested that this fact should be communicated to all residents, so they were aware of who was responsible for enforcement. Officers confirmed responsibility would be with the Police and the Council role was limited to trying to ensure bus stops were free of parked cars.
- Suggesting that the Chairman should write to Cross Country Trains highlighting the regret of the Committee on their unfortunate decision to reduce services, with March affected by the proposals. The Chairman responded that this had already been raised as an issue at the Combined Authority's Transport and Infrastructure Committee, at which the Mayor, Councillor Bates as the Chairman of this Committee and the Leader of the County Council had expressed the same frustrations and concerns. As a result, a letter had been sent, and so this suggestion had already been covered.
- The Committee local member for Roman Bank and Peckover expressed concerns referencing in Appendix B the proposal to remove the central island parking spaces as part of a reconfigured layout in Broad Street. In his opinion there was already a shortage of parking in March highlighting that those living in rural areas were far more dependent on using cars. He explained that he often visited March and had not seen parking in this area as an issue, suggesting that officers would need to carefully weigh up the gain from the proposal, compared to the loss of parking spaces. It was explained that the removal of parking in the central section of Broad Street was a quick win proposal to create a better public realm and had been one of the options included in the consultation exercise undertaken to improve the area and the pedestrian experience. The detail of the proposal and other proposals for the Broad Street area would be the subject of

further consultation moving forward to the implementation stage.

- Making reference to the point made by the previous speaker, Councillor King understood that Fenland District Council were considering measures to de-criminalise parking and had assumed that this would also include March.
- The Council Cycling Champion raised as a general comment that when officers were looking to install cycle routes, segregated cycle lanes should be considered the optimum position and if this was not possible, shared cycleways with pedestrians should be the fall-back position. Officers confirmed they would use this as the starting point when considering installing additional cycle lanes.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the results from the online consultation set out in paragraph 2.4 to 2.9.
- b) Approve the construction and development of the Quick Wins schemes in Appendix A and Appendix B using budget underspend from this stage of the study and seeking additional funding from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) as required.
- c) Note the preparation of a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the schemes outlined in the Option Assessment Report, reported at the March 2020 Economy and Environment Committee.
- d) Approve the programme and costs for Outline Business Case, providing funding is made available by CPCA Board and a suitable funding agreement with CPCA is agreed.

29. CAMBRIDGESHIRE HIGHWAYS CONTRACT ANNUAL REPORT 2019-20

This report updated the Committee on the performance and achievements of the Highway Term Services Contract a partnership between Cambridgeshire County Council and Skanska for the period 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020. The contract covered professional and operational services for a variety of highway improvements and maintenance work across Cambridgeshire delivering highway and transport projects for the County Council, Greater Cambridge Partnership and supporting the work of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

It was highlighted that:

- throughout 2019/20 overall performance of the contract had continued to steadily improve, with 78% of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) being green. Four of the eighteen KPI's did not meet their target with the details provide in paragraph 2.6 of the report.
- The original procurement of the highway contract stipulated savings in year 3 against the contract of approximately £2million the sum of £1.75 million had been achieved. The £250k shortfall resulted from delays to the integration of the business across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough highway teams,

late rollout of technology on the operational fleet and the recovery of green claims having plateaued.

- Key improvements implemented over the last year included the development of an Annual Plan outlining the work required for the financial year to enable more efficient programming and resourcing and the creation of an efficiency register to better capture innovation and savings.
- In terms of Health and Safety it was highlighted that Cambridgeshire Highways maintained its good safety record throughout 2019/20 with no incidents taking place which required an employee to take time off work. No lost time incidents were experienced on Council sites since September 2018 and no incidents had required notification to the Health and Safety Executive since the beginning of the contract in July 2017.
- The contract continued to support delivery of in excess of 150 schemes as detailed in the report.

Notable successes highlighted for 2019/20 included:

- Deployment of three Dragon Patching machines to deal with potholes and surface defects, dealing with over 40,000 repairs per annum.
- Social Value fund of £27k allocated to worthy community causes where budgets did not already exist.
- Receiving £3.3 million of extra Department for Transport funding.
- Significant efficiencies in specific areas of the business, e.g. combining programmes of work, traffic management, green claims and training.

Issues raised in the subsequent discussion included:

- The Chairman and Vice Chairman congratulating the officers present for the exemplary safety record having observed the safety measures in place when undertaking site visits.
- A member highlighting that information provided in reports to the Committee on Local Highways initiative schemes never provided expected delivery dates and was also the case with some of the major projects. In reply, officers highlighted that there was an annual plan in respect of services provided by the contract and a communications plan. Officers would look at how they could improve communications on project timelines. *Action. Emma Murden*
- In paragraph 2.10, it was suggested the stakeholders reference should also include district councils, as Cambridge City Council had been omitted. Assurance was given that Cambridge City Council would be included in all appropriate consultations. .
- With reference back to the Minute Action Log on outstanding action from the January 2018 Highways and Infrastructure Committee on the Skanska Enhanced Pothole Repair Service a Member requested that discussions should be re-instated as soon as possible. Officers agreed to take this away and come back with proposals for what would be and what would not be possible in terms of an enhanced pothole service. *Action Richard Lumley*
- A further request was made for officers to look into the feasibility to devise a new policy for seeking compensation for developer damage. The Member who had raised it at a previous meeting highlighted that the local highways

offices were stretched enough without having to incur additional costs as a result of the slipshod work carried out by some contractors that then required further remedial action, at additional cost to the Council. The Chairman supported the request. As this was a wide-ranging issue, Officers would investigate the practicalities and bring back proposals for further consideration. *Action Richard Lumley / Graham Hughes*

- In response to a request for examples of community initiatives that had been funded from the Social Value Fund, this included traffic management training for event organisers and work with the Road Victims Trust in helping young people get back to work and give them back their independence. It was explained that initiatives were developed from staff and community suggestions that could not be funded from existing budgets.
- Highlighting the need for improved communications raised at the Annual Staff survey (which sought suggestions for improving the Contract service) as this was an issue recognised by many dealing with the Highways Service. This was recognised as an issue, and improvements were being looked at.
- Querying on whether the four Key Performance Indicators that had not met their target were the same as in the previous year, and if this was the case, did it represent intractable issues that needed a more in depth report back to the Committee. The Member who raised it also expressed concern at how far short the performance was for some of these performance indicators compared to the target. She cited the KPI titled *'Percentage of non-compliance which would have resulted in an FPN as a proportion of all Street Works Permits that commenced in the reporting month'* which had only achieved an annualised score of 43% against a target of 5% and asked what action was being taken to improve the score going forward. It was explained that there was a small KPI Group that included the Vice Chairman and other members of the Committee who would report back to the Committee if appropriate. The same Member queried this statement as she was aware of out of date indicators and therefore any review from a working group making recommendations for changes to indicators was required to come back to Committee as part of a formal report to approve / discuss any changes. The Chairman clarified that there had been some management issues from staff redeployment during the lockdown but confirmed a report would come back in due course. In terms of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) this was a focus area for 2020 with a new notification process having been trialled in one depot that was now being rolled out to all depots with an expectation that next years' performance would show an improvement.
- Expressing concern that the Highways Team was overstretched and surmising whether this was a contributory factor to some performance indicators not being met, and whether it was necessary to review staffing resources resulting from systemic pressures. In reply, it was explained that there was a constant balancing issue on appropriate staffing levels and matching the work required to be undertaken. There had been a period earlier in the year when there had been a number of vacancies and with the Covid crisis leading to the redeployment of some staff. This had created additional pressure for service delivery. However all staff had now returned to the Directorate. The Council was also working closely with Skanska and other partners to improve pockets of inefficiency in order to further improve overall service delivery. Challenges however remained in recruiting in certain areas.

For example while people were keen to work in Fenland, it was far harder to recruit to the City and South Cambridgeshire, which was attributable to the cost of living being higher in those areas.

- On the issue of performance indicators, the point was made that most of the monitoring was generally in respect of the Place and Economy key performance indicators but that this should not be at the expense of the other, lower level performance indicators. The Chairman suggested that as these were now all on the website a link should be sent to all the Committee. *Action Emma Murden*
- In replying to a query, it was confirmed that like private sector employees working on building sites, Council and contractors' staff working for the Council were also required to carry a CSCS card to show that they had passed the necessary health and safety accreditation tests.
- Highlighting that a persistent complaint local Members received from residents was in respect of multiple contractors working on the same area of road and asking what action could be taken to improve co-ordination of such works. In reply it was explained that a Highways Utilities Co-ordinating Group met quarterly to help plan joined up working wherever possible and all the main utility providers were invited, however as attendance was not compulsory the Council was still in the hands of the contractors regarding being given the necessary information to then be able to act on it. Another Member highlighted the website: *One.network* that provided very useful information in respect of scheduled roadworks. The Chairman asked that officers look at providing works schedule lists / details of the website to all Councillors including those in parishes. *Action: Richard Lumley*

Following a vote, seven Members voted in favour and three Liberal Democrats abstained

It was resolved:

To Note the 2019/20 Cambridgeshire Highways Annual Report

At 12.05 there was five minute comfort break

30. COVID 19 TEMPORARY CYCLING PROPOSALS

Before the officer introduction, the Chairman highlighted that on this report one petition spokesperson and seven public requests to speak had been accepted. More requests had to be declined as they were either late, or were raising some similar issues to speakers who were already down to speak and in order to make the meeting manageable. In addition, he highlighted that Members had received a considerable number of individual e-mails from parishioners / residents. These were chiefly in relation to asking for a lorry ban on the B1040 which was currently not included as a proposal in the report, but for which there was a speaker, and also from local residents in Cambridge both for and against a possible Modal filter scheme on a section of Arbury Road and in Coldhams' Lane.

Two late petitions were received in respect of the Arbury Road proposal. Democratic Services orally provided the following summary of their contents:

- 1) Petition received from George Vardoulakis with over 90 signatures from the local CB4 area and with over 300 signatures from the wider Cambridge Area supporting the proposal to limit traffic on Arbury Road East by bringing in a modal filter.
- 2) A petition received from Linny Purr who was also be one of the speakers signed by 95 local residents from the CB4 area with signatures opposing the plans for modal filters to divide Arbury Road

The report introduced by the officers sought agreement to a set of proposed measures for implementation across the County for those where there was general agreement / consensus, to encourage cycling during the Covid-19 crisis and through the recovery period. The report highlighted that in May, the Government announced that £225M from the Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) was to be made available for authorities in England to be used to deliver pop-up cycle lanes, wider pavements that allowed for social distancing, safer junctions, and cycle and bus-only corridors with funding to be delivered in two tranches. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) had indicatively been allocated £575,000 from Tranche 1 and £2,299,000 from Tranche 2.

This Committee had approved CCC's Tranche 1 EATF programme at its meeting on 16 June 2020. Confirmation of the grant award was received by the CPCA on 3 July 2020, formally starting the eight week Tranche 1 delivery period (to 28 August). On 10 July, the Department for Transport invited bids for funding from Tranche 2 of the EATF to be delivered or committed by the end of the 2020/21 financial year. The guidance for the second tranche of funding remained unchanged from the first, with a focus on 'measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling, both to encourage active travel and to enable social distancing during restart'. The timescales for Tranche 2 required that funding allocated was either spent, or fully committed in the current financial year.

Highlighted from the report were:

- Indicative timescales for consultation and engagement on the Tranche 1 schemes for consideration by the Committee, including the formal processes for Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) with any confirmation of them to be the subject of a report for decision to come back to the October 2021 Committee.
- The Tranche 2 proposals developed with the City and District Councils and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) that had been submitted to Central Government on the 7th of August 2020.
- Delivery of Tranche 2 proposals, and resource implications.
- Future funding from government.

Appendix A to the report contained the lists of Tranche 2 scheme proposals across all five Cambridgeshire districts developed by the County Council in discussion with

the City and district Councils and the (GCP). A number required further work to develop the detail and to confirm both that there was the available road space to enable their safe implementation, and that the implications locally in terms of impacts on access and parking were acceptable to the City and district councils. Areas where further work was being undertaken to assess issues included:

- Improvements to Ely City Centre and in Soham town centre for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Measures in Huntingdon that reallocate road space on Huntingdon ring road.
- Measures on Cambridge Road, Godmanchester.

Some of the proposed measures involving significant changes to existing layouts such as modal filters in Arbury Road and Coldhams Lane in Cambridge would need significant further work and additional consultation with local Members to ascertain their final viability. The same flexibility agreed in relation to Tranche 1 was proposed, to allow changes to the programme, should they be needed. These would be to remove schemes from the programme if they were undeliverable and in discussion with partners and key stakeholders, to consider bringing bring new schemes into the programme, if funding allowed.

Petition supporting a Modal Filter in Coldhams Lane Cambridge

Following the officer introduction, the Chairman welcomed David Trippett speaking on behalf of Paula Downes Chair of Coldhams Lane, Romsey Residents Association representing people living on the Lane and neighbouring streets between the Beehive Centre and Sainsbury's Roundabout to speak to a petition with over 200 signatures supporting the proposal to reduce Traffic on Coldhams Lane with a Modal Filter. He highlighted that in August the Association had conducted a survey about the proposal. Of the 139 local respondents, there had been 128 substantive replies. 89% of the resident responses were asking the Council to reduce traffic with 62% of residents approving the proposals to specifically stopping through-traffic. He also referenced an additional petition for more bus services on Coldhams Lane with 142 signatures. More details of the submission are provided in the Appendix to the Minutes.

Next the Chairman invited public speakers / District Councillors to speak as set out below.

a) Councillor Baigent Cambridge City Councillor

In his introduction Councillor Baigent expressed his support for the Bus gate on Mill Road bridge which he believed was a successful solution to reducing pollution, enabling social distancing and providing a safe area for residents and cyclist to move around and shop safely in the area. While there had been opposition from traders, the mail-bag he received indicated the vast majority of residents supported the scheme and the clear advantages it provided.

He highlighted that this was not the case for the proposed Coldhams Lane modal filter, which unlike Mill Road, was a mainly residential street. His mailbag was full of concerns from local residents of the Romsey area including Thoday, Sedgewick, Brampton, Catharine, Cavendish and Cromwell roads who were in total opposition to the proposal due to the expected immense amount of rat running it would produce in the side streets in Romsey. As many of the side roads had two way cycling systems he believed such a change would result in accidents within hours of their implementation. He also highlighted that such a scheme would force 17,000 vehicles to bypass the filter and force them onto either Newmarket or Chery Hinton Roads and as Coldhams Lane was a main route into the city from Cherry Hinton, the necklace villages and from the A14 would lead to further massive congestion,

While he agreed that the amount of traffic along Coldhams Lane was horrendous for the residents, the solution proposed required more discussion, of which he was very keen to be a part of. He suggested that this should be between both County Councillors and City Councillors along with officers from both Councils to look at a workable position for Coldhams Lane, which he believed should involve physical traffic calming measures to slow down traffic, improved cycle lanes and by an introduction of a monitored 20mph speed limit.

On a point of clarification to the speaker, a Committee member asked if he wished to comment on the petition received that was strongly in favour of a Modal Filter, and asked whether he would not support a trial period to assess whether it was effective or not. In reply, Councillor Baigent reminded the Member that traffic always found the easiest way to bypass obstacles and this would be through the backstreets of Romsey and with 17,000 vehicles likely to be displaced, he would not support an experimental scheme as he did not believe it would be safe and was putting forward the views from residents of Romsey.

b) Roxanne De Beaux Executive Director Camcycle

She explained that Camcycle welcomed the County Council's work during the Covid-19 pandemic to improve key routes for active travel as it would free up capacity on the roads and public transport for those who needed it most, and help people to keep safe distances when walking, cycling or using mobility scooters. The organisation was concerned to see that in many areas of the County, motor traffic was already exceeding pre-Covid levels, and therefore supported the speedy implementation of the Tranche 2 measures. She urged that officers work closely with local stakeholders to ensure the measures were implemented effectively and also that there should be effective communications with local communities. The latter should include highlighting the importance of new commuting corridors presenting them as complete routes. She also raised three questions and these and the fuller text provided to Democratic Services are included in the Appendix to the minutes. She concluded by saying that there was a great deal of silent support for the proposals.

c) Andrew Milbourn Hurst Park Estate Residents Association

In his presentation he explained that Hurst Park Estate Residents Association represented about 400 dwellings in roads just to the south west of Arbury Road and exiting onto Arbury Road at Leys Road.

He explained that feedback from residents in his area concluded that a majority 75% were in favour of the Arbury Road modal filter on the grounds that it would improve Arbury Road making cycling and walking safer and reduce rat running through the estate. The 25% against the scheme were not happy that their car journeys would be longer. He highlighted that Arbury Road accounted for in his estimate, about 20% of fatal accidents in Cambridge in the last 10 years, with 2 fatalities in the Road in the last ten years. He believed that this showed it not only felt dangerous, but was dangerous, and statistically someone would die in the next few years if some radical improvements were not made.

d) Lucy Edgeley on Behalf of the Arbury East Residents Association

Spoke in support of the Modal Filter on Arbury Road speaking on behalf of the Association representing residents on the old residential narrow stretch of Arbury road leading to Milton Road. She highlighted that although there was a 20 mph limit on the road, since lockdown residents had observed that there been an increase in speeding and aggressive driving along the road. Her main points being that the scheme would help people maintain safe distances while walking, cycling or using a mobility scooter, would help protect the NHS and reduce serious injuries due to dangerous driving along the road and would lower pollution, helping protect people's health and slowing down the spread of the virus. In summing up the benefits, this included enabling safe distancing to be undertaken which had been impossible up to now for all those already referenced and would also help end dangerous driving and lead to a reduction in accidents and also help stop cycling on the narrow pavements. Less cars would also have a dramatic effect on pollution / air quality, which was particularly bad due to the extensive build-up of traffic from the traffic lights at the end of the road.

e) Linny Purr speaking on behalf of Havenfield Retirement Flats on Arbury Road, Cambridge and other local residents and shopkeepers opposed to the Arbury Road Modal Filter

In respect of the proposal she highlighted that the modal filter would be located outside Havenfield Retirement Flats of predominantly 70-90 year old residents in Arbury Road, Cambridge who grew up when the roads were quieter but who supported increased cycling and walking for those able to. The vast majority of Havenfield residents and shopkeepers in that part of Arbury Road were against this proposal. She suggested that the benefits of the proposal were small and would have huge unintended consequences, even if only a temporary trial of 6-18 months was allowed to go ahead.

With reference to the Council's Corporate priorities, she explained that such measures would restrict access for the elderly and disabled who would have to undertake long detours to by-pass the roadblock to go to church, the doctors and to buy food. As most Hone's residents were only on the state pension they also had serious concerns on how they be able to pay the increased taxi costs that they would have to incur as a result of the long detours that would be required and therefore not meeting the first priority of "A good quality of life for everyone". On the second corporate priority 'Thriving places for people to live' the Country was already in a recession, limiting access to the shops in the street by banning cars would result in less people being able to visit them, leading to closures and more redundancies. In respect of the third Corporate Priority titled 'The Best Start for Cambridgeshire's Children' she suggested that children walking and cycling to the two primary schools along residential streets in Kings Hedges and the Arbury estates, would be in greater danger not only by the displaced traffic, but would also suffer ill-health as a result of poorer air quality. She therefore asked that the Committee reject the proposal for the trial road closure in Arbury Road.

f) Councillor Gerrie Bird Cambridge City Councillor

Spoke against any more road closures without full consultation with residents and City Councillors, stating that no Cambridge City Officers or Councillors had been consulted on the latest proposals, and highlighted her concerns on the Tranche 2 proposals including Union Lane, Guildhall Street, Peas Hill and Arbury Road and the lack of consultation on previous closures, particularly highlighting Mill Road. She stated that by closing such roads, which were public rights of way, without undertaking equality Impact assessments as required by the Equalities Act 2010, the County Council was discriminating against the elderly, the disabled and blue badge holders, of which the City had 3400. These were the most vulnerable people, who were not able to cycle or walk for any distance and the measures proposed would therefore restrict their access to shops, doctors and other facilities. One of the recognised reasons for obtaining a blue badge being that the person could not reasonably use public transport. She also highlighted the loss of disabled parking in some of these affected areas including the loss of seven bays around the Peas Hill area. Such measures would force more people to have to use taxis which would add high costs to the most vulnerable in society who could ill afford to pay for them and as a result, leave many of them isolated.

She ended by stating that before any more road closures were agreed, the County Council must consult with all residents, undertake equality impact assessments as required under the Equalities Act that, as it was passed in 2010 to protect the elderly and the disabled, superseded the laws on Emergency Traffic regulations, which she believed dated from around 1984.

Councillor Manning as a clarification sought to reassure the Committee that local County Councillor for Arbury and the District Councillor for West Chesterton had been invited and had attended consultation meetings on the proposals for Arbury Road, as well as having met with officers from the County to discuss the proposals.

g) Councillor Balacki Hilton Parish Councillor

The Parish Councillor spoke proposing an additional project for tranche 2 regarding the need to restrict Heavy Goods vehicles (HGVs) on a stretch of the B1040 used as a main route for HGVs in the County.

He explained that during lockdown local residents in his area had seen a large reduction in HGV traffic on the road and this had encouraged many more people to feel safe to take up cycling. The measure he was proposing was to enable this to continue and he, along with many residents who had signed a petition, would like to see the Council instigate a ban to allow parishioners to be safe between and Hilton and Papworth. He was asking the County Council to place an experimental traffic order (ETRO) to instigate a 24 hour HGV Ban as the B1040 was a B not an A road. This could he said be easily achieved by placing road signage at the Papworth end of the village and at the St Ives end of the village to state that lorries should take the alternative route via the A1307 to the A 1198 to the A428.

h) Cllr Scutt the local County Council Member for Arbury

She spoke arguing that the proposals needed to be considered across boundaries and electoral divisions and that while she was a local member for one electoral division for Cambridge she felt a responsibility to all the residents of Cambridge and even beyond where the proposals would have an impact. Proposals in the North of Cambridge affected residents in the South of Cambridge and vice versa.

While she had supported all the global warming and congestion relief measures the County Council and City Council had put forward to promote healthier living and encouraging greater walking and cycling she however recognised that those who were elderly and disabled needed to be taken into account. In addition, while she had attended some of the consultation events, that should not be taken to imply that she agreed with the proposals. In addition, the latest proposals for Arbury Road had arisen very late, compared to discussions on different, earlier proposals. She was also there to represent the concerns of traders on that section of Arbury Road who had already seen their trade seriously affected by the initial Covid-19 lockdown, the three churches in the area and residents concerned at the ability to reach them if there was a closure of Arbury Road. She recognised there were currently extremely differing views on the proposal and was not promoting either side, while also highlighting that she had supported the previous proposals to provide cycle-ways along Arbury Road. She also highlighted that the closure of Histon Road had resulted in additional traffic being channelled onto Carlton Way and Mere Way and forced the

re-routing of the number 8 bus. She also drew attention that any proposal to block Gilbert Road would result in traffic being re-directed onto Stretton Avenue.

In summing up she concluded that far more consultation was required for the Cambridge proposals, as they were inter-linked and that any scheme to improve one section of the network would impact on other streets. Proposals should not be seen as being isolated from each other and that officers needed to see them as part of an overall Cambridge Plan recognising the interconnectivity of routes in Cambridge and also their impact beyond the City.

Following the last speaker the Chairman opened up the debate for Committee consideration. As one of the earlier public speakers had requested a 24 hour lorry ban on the B1040 that was not currently part of the report and would require the consideration of the Committee, the Chairman, Councillor Bates who he believed had a disclosable prejudicial interest as the local Member, passed over the Chairmanship to the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Howell, He also asked Democratic Services to remove him from the meeting until the Committee had made a decision and as a result, took no part in the subsequent debate and voting on the proposal.

Councillor Howell in introducing the debate clarified that the Committee clarified that a a first step the Committee should discuss the late, additional request from the Hilton parish councillor. He highlighted that a great number of emails had been sent to Committee Members in the run up to the Committee meeting supporting a 24 hour lorry ban on the B1040 and for redirecting lorries to use the old A14 route. The Vice-Chairman sought clarification on whether officers had been able to ascertain if such a proposal would be acceptable to the Department of Transport and the feasibility of monies from Tranches 1 and 2 being used for this project. Officers in response indicated that the rules on Tranche 2 were extremely restricted and their initial view was that it was unlikely, as the Department was likely to advise that lorry bans were a separate matter for the County Council. As the discussion had not yet been undertaken with the Department, officers were happy to take the request away and report back on the Department's final decision.

In the discussion on the proposed lorry ban;

- One Member raised concern that the Committee was only being asked to consider this one proposal, as his understanding had been that the list was now complete and that no amendments could be made. If this was not the case, he would have liked to champion further other schemes that had been put forward, but had not made the final tranche 2 list. The Vice-Chairman explained that what he wished to propose was that through the delegation process, the Lorry Ban was taken away as a test case, not just for it, but to see if any other additions could be proposed. He explained that while normally a delegation for action outside of the meeting was made to the Executive

Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, he was proposing an additional recommendation that, the Department of Transport be approached to ascertain whether it was feasible. In addition, as Councillor Bates had ruled himself out, he was suggesting that any subsequent required decision could be delegated to the Executive Director, in consultation with himself and Councillor Harford as an additional Committee Member consultee. This proposal was seconded by Councillor King, and on being put to the vote was agreed unanimously.

Councillor Bates was invited back into the meeting to oversee the debate on the original report recommendations.

Issues raised in the debate included:

- Councillor Manning raising a number of points including:
 - Raising his concerns at the capacity for the officers to be able to carry out the schemes as this had been a central Government directive with very tight timescales and with instructions that officers should not draw on outside consultants resources to help achieve the objectives.
 - Highlighting that Coldhams Lane Residents Association and other residents associations had been very proactive in providing their views on the initial consultation exercises that had been carried out and as a result of their and other residents feedback, including Havenfield Home residents, changes had already been made to some of the proposals.
 - He expressed concern that the report provided no details on the process on how the final tranche 2 list had been finalised or why some schemes had been included and others rejected.
 - Highlighting that he had now spoken to a taxi Industry representative and they had indicated that they would provide GPS (Global Positioning System) measurements on any increase in journey time and subsequent increase in fare prices from specific proposals. This would provide a clear evidence base when further considering some of the more controversial City Projects.
 - Regarding the effects of the proposals on disabled people, he highlighted that the term 'disability' covered a wide number of people with different needs and while some might lose out from the proposals for instance people in wheelchairs, for other people such as those with mental health and visual impairments, the potential benefits were huge.
 - He highlighted, what he believed had been a misinformation leafleting exercise in the Arbury area, regarding the length of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). These had stated that it would have to run for 18 months rather than explaining that, that was the maximum period allowed and that a full road-block was proposed, rather than one that allowed buses

to pass. On the point on restricting access to shops in Arbury Road, he highlighted that there were shops on either side of the proposed restriction zone.

- Councillor King raised issues on the main proposal for Wisbech, highlighting that the town had a cycling lobby and while not as well established and resourced as the Cambridge Group, it should be consulted and their involvement embedded in future work. He believed the proposal for the Freedom Bridge should be more adventurous. He suggested that it could perhaps run from the Sutton Road and Leverington Road junction to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route crossing of Lynne Road and asked that his suggestions should be the subject of further discussions between himself the Chairman and Vice Chairman and officers outside of the meeting. He also requested that consideration should be given TO Identifying funding, if at all possible, to create a revised new Cycling Plan for Wisbech.
- Councillor Kavanagh highlighted that as Covid-19 cases were rising again, it was even more important to put in place measures that encouraged social distancing and that officers' should be commended rather than criticised for what they had achieved at such short notice. He supported for public health reasons, measures to encourage cycling and walking, suggesting that this purpose appeared to have been forgotten, by some of those opposed to the proposals. On the point made earlier on lost disabled parking places, he asked for assurance that any parking places temporarily removed were replaced on a one to one basis. In respect of the Coldhams Lane proposal, this was in his constituency and for many years he had, under the 'Local Highways Initiative Programme', sought to obtain improvements to make the road safer including erecting speeding indicator devices. There was also currently an application for a new pedestrian crossing. He also highlighted that the Combined Authority had plans to redesign the roundabout at Sainsburys to make it more cycle friendly. While the bus gate on Mill Road had dissenters, he believed it had been a success. However, in his opinion, the Modal Filter proposals on Coldhams Lane could undermine the measures in Mill Road as there would be a major rat run problem with 17,000 vehicles having to go elsewhere, and this would inevitably be through the densely populated terraced housing area of Romsey. As a result, he could not support the scheme especially as the Combined Authority were looking at access from the east of Cambridge and would be looking at the network in its totality. He suggested that the proposals for both Coldhams Lane and Arbury Road would require a great deal more investigation and local member and resident consultation due to their impact in other surrounding areas. While he was in favour of the Arbury Road scheme in principle, the concerns around rat running around Kings Hedges and Arbury had to be taken into account in seeing whether the scheme was finally viable.

- Cllr Harford endorsed earlier concerns expressed on officer capacity and she did not wish to see any unnecessary complications placed on the officers. She highlighted concerns on a scheme at Girton removed from the final list without further consultation, although it had enjoyed wide local support. She wished to place on record her thanks to all residents who had written to her. From what she had received and heard in the debate, she expressed that her major concern was the level of division currently present in the local community as a result of the Arbury Road proposals and stressed the need for further work to seek to progress a scheme that could reconcile the very different views.

Note: At this point in the debate Democratic Services advised the Chairman that the debate would need to be finalised in the next ten to fifteen minutes as there was a Children and Young People Committee due to start at 2.p.m and with the current IT package, it was not possible to stream two meetings live on Youtube. As a result, there was a real danger that the current meeting would have to be cut short. The Chairman ruled that he would only take one more speaker before taking amendments and moving to a vote.

- Councillor Taylor expressed the view that there appeared to be an overreliance on closing roads to traffic, which if taxi use increased as a result, could have an adverse affect on many people's finances. It was useful to have seen the views of Panther taxis in an email before the meeting and thanked the Chairman for passing that on to her and the rest of the Committee. She highlighted that it was not only the disabled and blue badge holders that required taxis, but other groups such as pregnant women, mothers with pushchairs and young people using them at night for personal safety. She would not want their safety compromised by the fact the journeys might be longer due to any of detours from road closures, and then having to make the decision not to use them on financial grounds. She asked officers to look again at some of the proposals especially in terms of allowing taxis to be an exception when they could show that a customer had a genuine need. She also expressed concern that the way the report presented ETRO's was that they would, in the case of the schemes in the report, automatically become permanent once the trial period had ended .This would be seen as deception by local people if this was the officers' intention.

In reply to some of the issues raised by councillors and others, officers responded as follows:

- On the question of publicity raised by the Cambridge Cycling campaign, resources for additional communications was being made available to promote the new walking and cycling routes.

- On the question of the Level Crossing and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), the intention was to report back to Committee in October or November.
- The proposals for Peas Hill and other proposals around Cambridge City centre referred to by Councillor Bird came from Cambridge City Council and their Cambridge City Centre Restart Group, who were also very mindful of providing alternative disabled parking.
- It was the policy that where disabled parking bays were removed, the officer team worked on the premise that there should be no loss of disabled parking and to either then provide equally accessible alternative bays and if this was not possible, to review the proposals again.
- On officer delivery capacity, a specific Delivery Team for Tranche 2 had been assembled, and would be seeking consultants' support. The Government had relaxed their total ban on using consultants, to advising that they should only be used when "absolutely necessary".
- On the Wisbech proposals put forward, the officers would investigate at whether they were practicable and advise the Councillor accordingly.
- It was clarified that the Arbury Road and Coldhams Lane proposals had not been taken forward in the first tranche as Officers' had recognised at that time that a great deal more work was required to be undertaken. There was an expectation that data being collected from the Histon Road closure would help in looking at the impact of the Arbury Road proposals. Officers fully accepted that a great deal more investigatory work and consultation was required before any decision could be taken to progress either scheme.
- It was confirmed that if there were objections to any of the Experimental Traffic schemes then the appropriate decision making route was for them to come back to Committee for decision, especially as there was no longer a Cambridge Joint Area Committee

Councillor Manning proposed two amendments to take account of the need to consult with opposition members as follows:

Amendment to recommendation b) to add the words 'along with lead opposition members' So that it now read: "Delegate to Executive Director - Place and Economy in discussion with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, along with lead opposition members, the agreement of any changes to the programme").

To add a further additional recommendation as follows:

"Officers should take into account the views of local members at County and district level and where appropriate at Parish level when progressing with individual schemes".

Councillor Howell suggested that instead, this could be dealt with by one amendment in b) by the addition to Cllr Manning's proposals of the words (Cambridge) "City proposals" and was seconded by Councillor King. As there was so little time left of the meeting, on being asked if this was acceptable and Councillor Manning confirming in the affirmative, Councillor Howell was happy to accept Councillor Manning's first amendment with the addition of the wording he had suggested to make clear it was in relation to Cambridge City proposals.

Further to this, the recommendations with the amendment from Councillor Howell was put to the vote along with the other recommendations not already agreed. As a result,

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To ask Officers to take away the B1040 Lorry ban proposal and consult with the Department of Transport of whether it, and any further schemes would be appropriate for inclusion in the current tranche 2 list, with any final decision on the B1040 proposal, to be in consultation with the Vice Chairman with the involvement of Councillor Harford.
- b) To note the list of cycle scheme proposals for development and implementation from Tranche 2 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund as set out in Appendix A;
- c) To delegate to the Executive Director - Place and Economy in discussion with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, the agreement of any changes to the programme and to also include lead opposition members for any changes to the Cambridge City programme.

31. HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

The Committee received the Committee's forward agenda plan.

In discussion:

- Councillor Taylor asked what progress had been made on the request she had made at the July meeting for a report on a review of project management regarding lessons to be learnt from recent large scale highways projects that had overrun / gone over budget in order to help guide future project management best practice. The Chairman was not able to give a date for a report to come back to the Committee, but was able to give assurance that the work had been commissioned by the Executive Director, and was currently being progressed.
- Councillor Dupre noted that while there were scheduled quarterly reports on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), she could see that currently there was not any reference to a fundamental KPI review report and following the request

she had made earlier in the meeting, asked that this should be added to a future meeting. *Action.*

It was unanimously resolved to note the agenda plan with the following changes:

- Future Transport Policies removed from October meeting
- Additions to November Committee all non-key decisions:
 - Chisholm Trail Project Status Report Moved from October
 - Coldham's Lane Roundabout
- Lancaster Way (previously on for December)

Chairman
October 2020

APPENDIX

WRITTEN STATEMENTS PROVIDED THAT THAT WERE READ IN IN RESPECT OF MINUTE 30 - COVID 19 TEMPORARY CYCLING PROPOSALS

A) SUBMISSION FROM COLDHAMS LANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

The Coldhams Lane Residents Association represents people living on the Lane and neighbouring streets between the Beehive Centre and Sainsbury's Roundabout.

In August we conducted a survey about traffic on CL. It reached 139 local respondents w/128 substantive replies. I'll be referencing this data throughout.

Alongside this, I've two petitions and two positive solutions to offer you today.

The problem

Many of you will know that our Lane is a residential road next to a beautiful Common. It has a children's playground, a Primary School, two allotments, a sports field, a nursing home, and soon the Chisholm Trail. Many families with young children live here. It could and should be an active, healthy, green community. **BUT** ... the Lane has utterly unmanageable levels of motor traffic. This is destroying the community and with it, most opportunities for active travel.

- it's commonly used as a short cut between points on the ring road.
- it is forced to carry c.17,000 motor vehicles per day (7/19), resulting in daily jams that often stretch for 100s of meters & the resulting pollution, aggravates C-19 transmission & disincentives any 'active travel' (68% of respondents report concern about air quality).

situation is set to worsen

- Closure of Mill Road bridge
- planned addition of 1,200 - 12,000 new homes on Marshall's development

...not bad enough? Speeding at evenings / night = daily danger to life:

- a 25yr-old died speeding on CL in 2009.
- Only this weekend, a woman almost rammed the children's play area before felling some traffic lights
- Houses shake when speeding HGVs thunder along,
- Residents often woken at night by motorbikes screaming along at 70+ mph
- 409 serious accidents are on police record since 2010
- Speeding survey (organised by Cllr Kavanagh): 14k+ vehicles speed on CL every week,

What Consequences?

1. the road is often uncrossable for pedestrians, particularly the elderly & those w/children. One elderly neighbour, Ken, would wait 20min to cross to the bus stop; or there's Alex having to dodge traffic with his 2yr old just to reach the fantastic playground; countless residents' children can't cycle to school or cross the road.
2. 43% of adult cyclists feel unsafe, esp, b/c of wide HGVs, so cycle on the pavement, endangering pedestrians.

1 in 3 pedestrians feel they cannot socially distance effectively on CL. Some of the pavements channels are between 1 – 1.8m only.

What are the solutions?

The major headline from our survey was that:

[1] 89% of residents are asking you to reduce traffic.

The package you're voting on today includes a trial modal filter for Coldhams lane and I urge you to support it. 62% of residents approve specifically stopping through-traffic.

We can also present to you today a petition with over 200 signatures supporting the modal filter.

[2] More buses.

I present to you today a petition for more bus services on CL with 142 local signatures.

This would guarantee access to shops, esp. for the disabled & elderly (some of whom can't drive) while safeguarding business interests.

We're in touch with the big supermarkets about co-funding an electric shuttle that loops around them all. M&S is already potentially v. favourable.

Final point:

Joe Baker (GCP) spoke to us last week. GCP is looking for a bus route into the city from the East. They're v interested in CL for this, particularly as a means of providing residents in the planned Marshall's development a bus route, as an incentive *not* to drive. Our members overwhelmingly support more bus services -- could work for all parties.

B) SUBMISSION FROM CAMCYCLE

Camcycle welcomes the county council's work during the Covid-19 pandemic to improve key routes for active travel. This will free up capacity on the roads and public transport for those who need it most and help people to keep safe distances when walking, cycling or using mobility scooters. We're concerned to see that in many areas of the county, motor traffic is already exceeding pre-Covid levels, so we urge the council to implement Tranche 2 measures as quickly as possible to help people to choose active travel for more of their everyday journeys.

The list of schemes presented here could be transformative for walking and cycling in our region and we urge the council to work closely with local stakeholders to ensure the measures are implemented effectively and communicated well to local communities. It's particularly important to highlight new commuting corridors (such as Scheme 5: Cambourne to Cambridge) to new cyclists, presenting them as complete routes rather than individual measures, as well as showing how existing routes are better joined up, such as how the Guided Busway connects via a safer, filtered Arbury Road and the proposed temporary

cycle track on the Elizabeth Way bridge as an alternative to narrow and congested shared-use pavements and bridges.

- What plans has the county made for promotion of the new walking and cycling routes, particularly to those who currently travel by car?

With two of the three recent cyclist deaths on the county's roads taking place at roundabouts, we particularly support efforts to improve safety at notorious junctions including the Lensfield Road/Fen Causeway roundabout, Newmarket Road/Barnwell Road roundabout and Mitcham's Corner. We encourage the council to continue to prioritise human safety and movement of people using sustainable transport modes rather than merely motor vehicle traffic flow at junctions like this as it tweaks and amends its schemes and works towards its new Vision Zero strategy. Removing the biggest barriers to active travel will unlock walking and cycling for the greatest range of ages and abilities. We urge the council to continue to work with stakeholders to install missing elements of key routes, for example enhanced measures in Milton village on the key Waterbeach to Cambridge route and improvements around the Mill Road bus gate scheme.

- What plans are in place for continued engagement with stakeholders and local residents?

We also encourage the council to continue to work on plans for improvements in every town and village across the county. For example, we've had correspondence in the last week from people who cycle in places like Wisbech and Linton who are concerned about the safety of their journeys.

- How does the county plan to continue to gather ideas for improvements across the county and when will the LCWIP be published?

Overall, we welcome the work of councillors and officers and urge them to be bold and decisive when implementing upcoming schemes. With an uncertain winter ahead, it's important to protect our communities and the NHS, and ensure that families and key workers can make essential journeys to work and school, and do necessary shopping, without fear of infection from the virus or serious injury from dangerous driving.