

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE



Tuesday, 01 December 2020

Democratic and Members' Services
Fiona McMillan
Monitoring Officer

10:00

Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

COVID-19

During the Covid-19 pandemic Council and Committee meetings will be held virtually for Committee members and for members of the public who wish to participate. These meetings will held via Zoom and Microsoft Teams (for confidential or exempt items). For more information please contact the clerk for the meeting (details provided below).

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/ccs-conduct-code>
- 2 Minutes Highways and Transport Committee - 10th November 2020 3 - 10**
- 3 Minutes Action Log 11 - 18**
- 4 Petitions and Public Questions**

DECISIONS

5	Chisholm Trail & Abbey Chesterton Bridge Project Status Update	19 - 26
6	LHI Proposed Member Working Group	27 - 32
7	Review of Cambridgeshire Heavy Goods Policy	33 - 38
8	Highways Services Contract Key Performance Indicator (KPI) - Quarterly Report	39 - 46
9	Service Committee Review of Business Planning Proposals 2021-26	

To follow

INFORMATION AND MONITORING

10	Finance Monitoring Report - October 2020	47 - 82
-----------	---	----------------

OTHER DECISIONS

11	Highways and Transport Committee Agenda Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies	83 - 86
-----------	--	----------------

The Highways and Transport Committee comprises the following members:

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements please contact

Councillor Ian Bates (Chairman) Councillor Mark Howell (Vice-Chairman) Councillor Henry Batchelor Councillor David Connor Councillor Ryan Fuller Councillor Lynda Harford Councillor Noel Kavanagh Councillor Simon King Councillor Ian Manning and Councillor Amanda Taylor

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

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: 10 November 2020

Time: 10.00am to 11.30am

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

41. Apologies for absence and Declarations of Interest

There were no apologies or declarations of interest.

42. Minutes – 6th October 2020

The minutes of the 6th October 2020 were agreed.

43. Highways and Transport Committee Action Log

The Committee noted the Action Log

The following points were raised:

It was suggested that reference should be made to Cllr Manning's and Howell's Motion at Council, as it had been agreed it would be considered by Committee within three months. **Action required: Democratic Services.**

Two Members queried the withdrawal of the report on verge maintenance. It was confirmed that a workshop was planned, and that would feed into a report on verge maintenance at a future meeting, prior to the next cutting season.

With regard to the updated cycle map of Wisbech (Action no. 30), work was underway and further details would be shared with Councillor King. **Action required.**

44. Petitions and Public Questions

There was one request to speak which was considered under the relevant item.

45. Joint Professional Services Framework

Members considered a report which informed them of the outcome of the procurement process for the Joint Professional Services Framework. The report also sought approval to award contracts to the two preferred bidders.

Members noted the background to the procurement process, from the original decision in January 2019, to the establishment of a Project Board comprising various partners, the development of an options appraisal and subsequent procurement process. The scoring for the six final bidders was included in the confidential appendix to the report. It was proposed that the contract would go live on 1st February 2021 for the delivery of services.

A Member asked about the contract notice in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU), what this entailed, whether this was an official requirement for these type of procurement exercises, and whether it would be necessary, post-Brexit? Officers advised that contracts above a certain value had to be posted in the OJEU so that companies across the EU were aware of the opportunity. It was unclear what the process would be post-Brexit.

One Member indicated that he had not seen the confidential appendix, and it was agreed it would be circulated following the meeting. **ACTION REQUIRED.**

In response to a question on Net Zero Carbon reduction, it was noted that this was part of the qualitative assessment. The Member clarified that his query related more to the successful organisations' own zero carbon ambitions. Officers agreed to follow this up and respond to the Member. **ACTION REQUIRED.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the procurement process for the Joint Professional Services contract; and
- b) Approve the award of the framework contracts as set out in the confidential Appendix A in the report.

46. Lancaster Way Consultation Outcome

The Committee received a report that sought approval for the revisions to the Lancaster Way roundabout, including the addition of a signalised pedestrian crossing on the A142.

Introducing the report, officers advised that the main issue in the consultation had been opposition to the lack of crossing facilities across the A142 for pedestrians and cyclists. Responding to this, it was now proposed that a signalised crossing facility should be included in the scheme.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the appendices to the report, which provided the detail of the consultation responses and a preliminary design. Officers emphasised that this was a Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) scheme, and that the detailed design work had not been undertaken at this stage.

There was one Public Question from Mr John Powell of the Ely Cycling Campaign. Mr Powell's statement covered the concerns of the Ely Cycling Campaign with the solution proposed in the report, and a recommendation that a crossing suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders be installed on the western side of the roundabout. Presentation of the question and ensuing debate can be found at the YouTube recording <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BHwLy6nfil0>

The Chairman thanked Mr Powell for his presentation.

Members had also received written representations from Lynda Wrath of the British Horse Society, who had proposed that there should be a Pegasus crossing, which was a signalised crossing that could be used by horse riders. A Member asked Mr Powell if he would support such a crossing, and Mr Powell confirmed that he would. He also confirmed that a scheme which featured a crossing on the western side of the roundabout would be supported by both the Ely Cycling Campaign and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

Councillor Dupré was invited by the Chairman to speak as a Local Member. She commented that the main purpose of the Lancaster Way scheme was to achieve improvements for motorised transport, i.e. to increase the capacity and speed of cars. If employment increased in the area, as forecast, the majority of those additional employees would be travelling by car, and active travel would become more dangerous. The original design ignored the relevant local, national and international guidance, all of which promoted sustainable transport and reduction in car use, and positive examples of appropriate signalised crossings elsewhere in the county, e.g. on the A1307 in Babraham. She agreed with the speaker's proposal of a crossing for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders on the western side of the roundabout, and she outlined the many benefits this would bring. Councillor Dupré referred to the recent nearby work at the BP roundabout, which she said had caused months of misery for residents living adjacent to unofficial alternative routes, and asked that residents be protected as much as possible when the final scheme was implemented.

In response to a Member question, Councillor Dupré confirmed that livery businesses she had referred to were south of the A142, between the roundabout and A10.

Councillor Manning proposed an amendment to the second recommendation:

"Approve the addition of a signalised Pegasus crossing to the west of the roundabout within the scope of the project and cover this with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority through a change request. Officers should consult with Ely Cycling Campaign and the British Horse Society on the design of the crossing."

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Batchelor.

Councillor Howell proposed a further amendment:

"Cambridgeshire County Council to explore the option of a combined pedestrian, Toucan and Pegasus signalled crossing with the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough

Combined Authority. Advice should be sought from the Ely Cycling Campaign and the British Horse Society on the design of the crossing.”

Councillor Howell’s amendment was seconded by Councillor Harford.

A Member asked how the Amendments differed. Councillor Manning confirmed that his amendment specified that the crossing should be on the west side of the roundabout. The Member asked why it was important to specify which side the crossing was on, when ultimately this was a CPCA scheme. Whilst acknowledging that ultimately CPCA would make the decision, Councillor Manning commented that there was always a danger that the strong support for a crossing on the western side would not be made clear in the decision making process.

Following discussion, Councillor Manning amended his amendment slightly to read:

“Approve the addition of a signalised Pegasus crossing to ~~the west of~~ the roundabout within the scope of the project and cover this with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority through a change request. Officers should consult with Ely Cycling Campaign and the British Horse Society on the design and location of the crossing.”

Councillor Howell seconded Councillor Manning’s amendment, as amended, and all Members indicated their support.

Officers commented that the Committee needed to be aware that the final scheme would need to be appropriately designed and safety audited, and urged a degree of caution in specifying a particular type of crossing, as it could not be guaranteed at this stage that this specific type of crossing could be achieved at the favoured location; moreover, this was ultimately a decision for the CPCA. Members acknowledged these points and understood the constraints, in particular the need to take account of land, costs and safety constraints.

A number of Members thanked the Chairman for helping the Committee identify a way forward.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note and comment on the outcome of the public consultation
- b) Approve the addition of a signalised Pegasus crossing to the roundabout within the scope of the project and cover this with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority through a change request. Officers should consult with Ely Cycling Campaign and the British Horse Society on the design and location of the crossing.

47. Cambridgeshire County Council’s response to Network Rail’s consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme

The Committee considered the proposed County Council response to the Network Rail Consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme Consultation. Presenting the report, officers outlined the background and objectives of the Network Rail scheme, the various proposals to improve capacity, and the nature of the consultation process.

Members noted comments in support of the proposed submission from Local Member Councillors Dupré and Every, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

A number of Members commended the proposed consultation response, stating that it was very comprehensive and well worded, stressing that this was a once in a lifetime opportunity, and that it was vital to take a joined up approach.

There was a query on the number of potential new dwellings (1080) and the number of new jobs (1080). It was confirmed that the second figure was incorrect, and should read 557. Officers reassured Members that the final response would include the correct figure.

One Member was delighted to see two references in the response, highlighting the Council's strong support to the Wisbech Rail reconnection.

A Member praised the emphasis throughout the report to the Council's opposition to any scheme which could adversely impact on the residents of Queen Adelaide, Prickwillow and surrounding areas. The Chairman advised that he had attended a public meeting in Prickwillow, which must be unique nationally, located in the middle of three railway junctions. He agreed that it was vital to protect the residents and businesses in communities such as Prickwillow and Queen Adelaide.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note and comment on the proposed response to Network Rail Consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme Consultation as set out in Appendix A to the report;
- b) Agree the response to be submitted to Network Rail at the close of this meeting;
- c) Delegate the agreement of any minor changes to the response to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee.

48. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee considered a report on the financial position as at the end of September 2020, which included a request to the General Purposes Committee for the additional 2020/21 Highway Maintenance Allocation Potholes Fund of £4.1M from Central Government to be spent on resurfacing schemes in accordance with the County Council's approved Asset Management Strategy.

Members noted the budgetary pressures on the Place & Economy budget, which primarily related to the impact of Covid-19. The bottom line revenue overspend for Place & Economy was £3.3M. On the capital side, government had allocated an

additional £4.1M Highways Maintenance Grant, and it was proposed that this be spent on resurfacing schemes.

A number of Members were pleased to note the additional capital grant, but asked how this would be spread equitably across the county to those areas where the need was greatest? It was confirmed that this funding would be spent within the current financial year, and shared countywide over thirteen schemes. The detail would be communicated to the Committee but in terms of distribution, there were five schemes in Fenland, three in Huntingdonshire, one in South Cambridgeshire, two in Cambridge city and two in East Cambridgeshire. **ACTION REQUIRED.** It was further noted that this year, the government had combined two sources of funding – the Pot Hole Action Fund and also the Challenge Fund. Historically the Challenge Fund had been a competitive process, but this year the funding had been divided up across highway authorities nationally. This funding was specifically for highway maintenance, and was a good opportunity for the Council to make significant improvements in a sustainable fashion, as per the council's approved asset management strategy.

One Member commented favourably on a recent Local Highways Improvement (LHI) scheme, which involved bridleway bridge repairs in Tydd St Giles, and asked if his thanks could be passed on to Jacob, Ruth and colleagues who had helped realise that scheme.

A Member queried the £998K adjustment on the street lighting contract. Officers explained that this related to legacy work that should have been undertaken by Balfour Beatty as part of the core investment period, and gave examples of the type of work involved. Processes had been put in place to ensure that this work was picked up going forward. In response to a further question on timescales, it was confirmed that this work was carried out on a recurring basis, and was not scheduled for a specific year.

One Member asked for clarification on the difference in figures for the Emergency Active Travel Funding in Section 3 compared to the table in Appendix 3. Officers agreed to circulate a response to all Committee Members by email. **Action required.**

A Member queried the backlog of LHI schemes, especially in Huntingdonshire. It was confirmed that this related mainly to the redeployment of staff during the pandemic, whilst a small number related to other issues e.g. land that had not been adopted. In the first Lockdown, government guidance had been for highways authorities to focus on safety critical work. Members were asked to share this information with their Parish, District and County Council colleagues. A number of Members spoke very favourably on the wide variety of valuable roles that Highways staff had undertaken during the pandemic, and the enormous efforts made by the County Council more generally, and urged everyone to be as patient as possible with routine work which may be outstanding as a result. A Member stressed the importance of prioritising staff wellbeing and providing necessary support.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Connor highlighted problems with a LHI scheme in Pondersbridge. £26K of third party funding had been contributed to traffic calming measures, but one of the features was now being removed, as it was considered unsafe, much to the dismay of local residents. Officers agreed to

investigate and report back to the Local Member, the Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. **ACTION REQUIRED.**

It was resolved to:

- (a) review, note and comment upon the report;
- (b) confirm to General Purposes Committee support for the allocation of the additional £4.1m grant to be used for resurfacing schemes.

49. Highways and Transport Committee Agenda Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Advisory Groups

Members noted that the following two items on the Committee's Agenda Plan would be deferred from the December to January meeting:

- Risk Register Review;
- Coldhams Lane Roundabout

It was resolved to note the Agenda Plan.

Chairman

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE ACTION LOG

This action log as at 23rd November 2020 captures the actions on service actions within the remit of this Committee including that are still ongoing on-going from the former Highways and Community Infrastructure and Economy and Environment Committees. This log updates Members on the progress on the compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

Minutes of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee 16th January 2018

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
45.	Minutes and Action Log – Skanska Enhanced Pothole Repair Service	Graham Hughes / Richard Lumley	Discuss with Skanska the feasibility of offering an enhanced pothole repair service. This was raised again at the Highways and Transport Committee on 15 th September	Part of a wider, longer term piece of work looking at possible delivery models (including future funding) for highway services.	IN PROGRESS Meeting rescheduled for 26/11/20 to discuss (original 29/10/20 was cancelled due to staff availability)

Minutes of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee 9th July 2019

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
123.	Finance and Performance Report – May 2019 – A14 Legacy	Steve Cox	Suggested that a report was brought to the Committee every six months regarding the legacy of the A14. All local members impacted could be consulted.	Discussions are ongoing with Highways England about this and the de-trunking of the existing A14. This is due to come forward to the 19 th January Committee.	IN PROGRESS update scheduled for the January meeting.

124.	Road Casualty Data Annual Report	Matt Staton	The Chairman commented that the findings of the research project regarding likely collision sites being undertaken with Loughborough University could be brought to the committee for information and comment.	Matt Staton to liaise with Loughborough University in relation to published outputs from the project. The information was to be presented to a Members Seminar.	On hold until the seminar programme resumes.

Minutes of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee 4th December 2019

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
146. b) See also 311b)	Finance Monitoring Report – October 2019	Graham Hughes/ Richard Lumley	Concerns were raised regarding the perceived inequitable nature of the Local Highways Initiative (LHI) bid process to some parts of the County. Officers to establish whether it was possible to resolve the anomalies found within this process.	Report scheduled for December 2020	In progress

Minutes of Economy and Environment Committee 5th March 2020

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
311.	Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Funding Allocation Proposals	Elsa Evans / Andy Preston	Review of scoring criteria to help review to achieve more equitable distribution of funding across the County. See also 146b raised at former Highways and Infrastructure Committee in December 2019.	The Review report is going to C/VC of H&T Committee on 1 Dec for discussion with Members. It can then be decided if and when it is reported to H&T Committee	Action Ongoing

Minutes of Highways and Transport Committee 7th July 2020

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership Strategy	Matt Staton	Strategy should be circulated to all District, Town and Parish Councils and other identified interested parties.	A wider distribution will be undertaken in October as part of a coordinated communication across partners related to the new strategy	IN PROGRESS - The strategy will be shared following the 05/10/20 Road Safety Partnership Board meeting, along with a media release.

Minutes of Highways and Transport Committee 15th September 2020

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
24.	Minutes Action Log (Minute 151 Wisbech Access Strategy Phase 1)	Chairman Cllr Bates	Noting that Cllr King had been appointed as an additional member to the Wisbech Steering Group via the Outside Organisations delegations process, Cllr Dupre asked whether she could be considered via the same process for an appointment to the Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Diamond Area Steering Group.	The Chairman agreed to speak to the Chairman of the Steering Group, Councillor Criswell.	In progress
25.	Winter Service Plan 2020-21	Jon Clarke / Dennis Vacher	Cllr Harford raised the issues of gritting the new very steep Bar Hill bridge. Officers undertook to inspect the bridge and see what would be the best method to treat it.	Bridge currently remains responsibility of HE. Officers do not have any dates with regard to when it is proposed to hand this over to CCC or whether this is the intention. Should it end up with CCC, officers are looking at ways that they can add it to their Winter service plan.	Complete. Response sent 16/11/20
25.	Winter Service Plan 2020-21	Chairman Councillor Bates	It was suggested that the volunteer mutual aid groups formed during the Covid 19 lockdown would be an excellent source for potential new recruits. The Chairman had already been	The Chairman to provide an oral update.	Action Ongoing

			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 and would pass them on to the officers.		
29.	Cambridgeshire Highways Contract Annual Report 2019-20	Emma Murden	Information on Local Highways initiative schemes and other major projects should also include expected delivery dates.	Initial meetings have been held. LHI Board has a process and is being rolled out with regular updates to members. We are looking at how we can cascade a similar approach across the services.	Completed
29.	Cambridgeshire Highways Contract Annual Report 2019-20	Richard Lumley / Graham Hughes	Request for a new policy for seeking compensation for developer damage to free up local highways offices resources.	Officers would investigate the practicalities and bring back proposals for further consideration on this wide ranging issue.	Action Ongoing

Minutes of Highways and Transport Committee 6th October 2020

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
30.	COVID-19 Cycling Proposals	Graham Hughes /Jeremy Smith	To identify funding to update the cycling map of Wisbech	Issue raised again at 10 th November meeting.	Action Ongoing
30.	COVID-19 Cycling Proposals	Graham Hughes /Jeremy Smith	Asked if schemes could still be added to tranche 2 of the COVID-19 Temporary Cycling Proposals	In progress	Action Ongoing

Minutes of Highways and Transport Committee 10th November 2020

Minute number	Item title	Responsible officer(s)	Action	Comments	Completed
43.	Action Log	Democratic Services	Add Utilities report to Agenda Plan	Action from October full Council meeting – added to Agenda Plan for January 2021.	Completed.
45.	Joint Professional Services Framework	Democratic Services	Recirculate confidential appendix to Committee.	Circulated 11/11/20.	Completed.
45.	Joint Professional Services Framework	Alex Deans	Queried the successful organisations' zero carbon ambitions. Officers agreed to follow this up.	<p>Section F410 - Best Practice Groups: The suppliers are to participate in Best Practice Groups to develop solutions to key issues. One of the stated Best Practice Groups is "climate change emergency and environmental strategy".</p> <p>Section F510 - Strategies, Policies and Procedures. The suppliers are required to comply with all policies and procedures as updated and notified to them from time to time. Specifically a link was included to the Council's environmental and social value strategies that were available at time of tender.</p>	Completed

				Both suppliers have appropriate Safety, Health, Environmental and Quality (SHEQ) accreditations and policies. Jacobs has a Climate Action Plan which has a 2020 Net Carbon Zero target of 2020 (www.jacobs.com). WSP has a Global Sustainability Policy (www.wsp.com)	
48.	Finance Monitoring Report	Richard Lumley	Detail of distribution of additional £4.1M Highways Maintenance Grant to schemes across county to be circulated	Information circulated by email 12/11/20.	Completed.
48.	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Sought clarification on the difference in figures for the Emergency Active Travel Funding in Section 3 compared to the table in Appendix 3.	Information circulated by email 10/11/20.	Completed.
48.	Finance Monitoring Report	Richard Lumley	Query on LHI scheme in Pondersbridge.	Officers to respond to Local Member (Cllr Connor) and cc Chair and Vice-Chair.	Completed.

CHISHOLM TRAIL AND ABBEY CHESTERTON BRIDGE PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 1st December 2020

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): All Cambridge Divisions

Forward Plan ref: N/A

Key decision: No

Outcome: To update the committee on the programme and cost for the Chisholm Trail project including Abbey Chesterton Bridge, and seek agreement for additional project funding from the Greater Cambridge Partnership

Recommendation: Committee is recommended to:
a) note the project update;
b) to seek additional s106 funding of £2.063m for the Abbey Chesterton Bridge through the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board.

Officer contact:

Name: Alex Deans
Post: MID Group Manager
Email: alex.deans@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 07936 903111

Member contacts:

Names: Cllr Ian Bates
Post: Chair
Email: ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

Names: Cllr Mark Howell
Post: Vice Chair
Email: mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 The Chisholm Trail is a strategic, predominantly off-road, walking and cycle link between the central Cambridge railway station/CB1 development/Southern Busway spur and Cambridge North Station. Once completed, the route will link into a network of existing cycle routes, creating a direct high quality north-south route across the city. It is a long-time aspiration and a flagship investment for the County Council (CCC) and subsequently the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), making a significant contribution towards strategic objectives including modal shift for the City.
- 1.2 It is essentially one project, consisting of a number of elements – the Abbey Chesterton Bridge is a key element funded by CCC, and the remainder of the trail is funded by GCP. Delivery of the trail was split into two phases, Phase 1 from Cambridge North Station to Coldham's Lane. There is also a section across Coldham's Common which is being delivered using Department for Transport (DfT) grant funding. The remainder is in a future Phase 2. The current phases are being led and managed by a single project team based at the County Council.
- 1.3 Following feasibility work and public consultation, a route closely following the railway line was selected and developed. Outline and detailed design of the bridge and Phase 1 was undertaken by CCC's term-service consultant SKANSKA, with a specialist bridge architect working with the consultant on the Abbey Chesterton Bridge. Planning applications were submitted, with consent for the bridge and trail given in February and July 2017 respectively.
- 1.4 The project was considered by Economy and Environment Committee in December 2016. A tender process was undertaken and the tender was awarded on the 28th June 2017 to construct Phase 1 of the trail (excluding the link on Coldham's Common which is linked to Department for Transport (DfT) grant funding) and bridge, using the Eastern Highways Alliance Framework contract. The contract was initially awarded to a joint venture between Carillion and Tarmac Construction. Tarmac Construction continued with the contract following the collapse of Carillion early in 2018.
- 1.5 The contract was awarded under a New Engineering Contract 3, Option C, Target Price contract. Such contracts are used commonly in construction and are based on an agreed target cost for a defined scope of work, with a cost-reimbursable mechanism in which the contractor is paid for their actual costs. Compensation Events may adjust the target cost, for example if the scope of work changes or if there have been unforeseen circumstances. At the end of the contract, any variance between the final target cost and contractor's actual cost is apportioned between the contractor and the employer, allowing the contractor to share any savings made or to contribute towards any overspend. This mechanism incentivises all parties to work collaboratively to deliver the project as economically as possible, as underspends (gain) or overspends (pain) are shared in an agreed proportion.
- 1.6 Included in the planning consent for Phase 1, but not part of the current contract under construction, are connections and improvements to the existing path on Coldham's Common. A DfT funding contribution of £500,000 is available for this section. Work on Common Land has required additional consent, though the Planning Inspectorate, which is

in place and requires work to commence before 15th January 2021. This element is being led by CCC although construction work has not yet started.

- 1.7 Phase 2 continues the route from Coldham's Lane to the central railway station. This is partly on existing streets and on land adjacent to the railway. It will also use new roads that will be constructed as part of new developments. As this part of the scheme is contingent on those developments, the delivery programme is uncertain, although some work has been undertaken by Network Rail to improve access using arches under Mill Road Bridge.

2. Main Issues

Cost and Programme

- 2.1 As noted above, there has been a long standing aspiration to deliver the Chisholm Trail, with a range of s106 contributions being secured specifically for the scheme over a number of years. Once the planning permissions were secured, work started on site quickly, getting the project underway. As part of the estimated cost at the time, risk allowances were made, including areas where there was considered to be uncertainty. It has now become clear to officers, however, that these risks were significantly underestimated in terms of the complexity of the project and that there had been insufficient development and design of the project before it was tendered. In hindsight, therefore, a later start date would have resulted in a better understanding of the full outturn cost for the project and a more accurate tender. This would have meant that at the time the project was presented to Members for approval, the cost would have been significantly higher, but that in itself, would have allowed Members of the Committee and the GCP Executive Board to judge the value for money of the scheme more effectively.
- 2.2 The consequence of the limited preparatory work, has been a significant number of additional design elements and compensation events for changes to the scope of work once the project was on site, resulting in cost increases and programme delays.
- 2.3 Similarly, the early start on site and incomplete design work has had impacts on land acquisition, access costs and gaining third party approvals. These issues have resulted in additional resource costs and programme delays.
- 2.4 Combining the bridge and the trail into one construction contract has provided some economies of scale in material costs, although reporting separately for both parts of the project has complicated contract and financial control and forecasting.
- 2.5 It is recognised by officers that shortcomings in project management during the early stages of this project have contributed to the current situation. Although most of the items that have come to light since the project has been on site would have occurred anyway, that does not change the fact that this information should have been available for Members and the GCP Executive Board at the time the decision was taken to proceed with the project to give a full view on the likely costs. Given this, the Executive Director has undertaken a management review of working practices and processes within the delivery teams and new processes and procedures are being developed and embedded to ensure projects operate differently and more effectively in future. A completely new team is also now running the

project and additional external resource is being secured to ensure contractual firm push back on contractual issues.

- 2.6 There remain significant risks within the overall project, although at this stage, with the works on the bridge largely complete, these sit predominately with the trail element and in particular, the Newmarket Road underpass programmed for Spring 2021. These are issues that will be considered by the GCP as they are funding the Trail element of the scheme.
- 2.7 The table below provides a summary update on the various phases and sections of the project.

Section	Status	Estimated completion date
PHASE 1: Abbey Chesterton Bridge	Under construction	July 2021
PHASE 1- Trail-Fen Road to Barnwell Lakes	Under construction	November 2021
PHASE 1- Trail-Coldhams	Design underway, works not instructed yet.	TBC

Budget and expenditure

- 2.8 The table below summarises the current and forecast financial position for the Abbey Chesterton Bridge:

Phase/Section	Approved Budget (£)	Forecast contract Outturn (£)	Additional Budget Requested (£)
PHASE 1- Abbey Chesterton Bridge	4,886,500	6,949,909	2,063,409

- 2.9 Given the stage that the bridge element of the scheme has reached, being substantially complete, no further contingency over the quantified risks are included in the forecast outturn figure.
- 2.10 Whilst these figures are forecasts of the outturn position, measures are in place across both the bridge and trail elements, through contractual mechanisms, to minimise where possible any additional funding that is required. However, until those processes have concluded, it would not be prudent to assume any lower final costs than those provided in the table above.
- 2.11 Appendix 1 provides a breakdown of where the additional costs on the bridge project have arisen.

Funding requirement – Abbey Chesterton Bridge/ Coldhams Common

2.12 Phase 1 bridge funding of £4,886,500 was approved by CCC and comprised of £2.7M from the Department for Transport's Cycle City Ambition grant with the remaining funds to come from Section 106 contributions and residual capital funding. The latest forecasts show that the budget shortfall for the bridge is £2,063,409 and it is proposed that this should be made up from CCC secured s106 contributions in the Cambridge area. These funds are currently administered by the GCP and so approval to use these contributions will be sought from the GCP Executive Board on 10 December 2020.

Phase 1 - Trail

2.13 Phase 1 and 2 of the Trail are funded by the GCP. The currently approved budget for phase 1 of the Trail is £9,269,000 and the current forecast outturn is £15,850,625, meaning a projected additional budget that is required of £6,581,625. These figures include a contingency over and above quantified risks given the nature of the project and the substantial elements remaining for completion. There remain significant risks within the project, especially the Newmarket Road underpass where deep excavations could result in unforeseen issues/delays and cost with statutory undertakers plant, and risks around archaeology which could also lead to cost and programme delays. Archaeological investigations at the underpass site have been undertaken so far as reasonably practicable. However, closing Newmarket Road for the time required for investigations under its embankment was not possible, so there remains a risk of archaeological finds, particularly at the site is in close proximity to the historic Leper Chapel.

2.14 Appendix 2 provides a breakdown of where the additional costs on the trail part of the project have arisen.

2.15 As the Trail element of the overall project is funded by the GCP, it will be for the GCP Executive Board to consider any changes to the scheme or additional funding to be provided.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

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

- Promoting pollution-free journeys on foot and by cycle, thus reducing harmful effects of travel on the people of Cambridgeshire
- An associated benefit to health and wellbeing from improved fitness

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

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

- The route improves connectivity for different sustainable modes of transport and an attractive, free-to-use, facility
- It provides links between residential, leisure and employment areas with the city centre and central station

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

Providing a high-quality pedestrian/cycle route, segregated from motor vehicles can create a culture of walking and cycling at an early age, can lead to healthier lifestyles which is likely to carry on into adult life, thus reducing the need for access to healthcare services.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

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

- The route provides a dedicated safe route for zero carbon journeys by reducing reliance on car journeys

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

This report sets out significant implications in para 2.1-2.11.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

This report sets out the procurement route and form of contract in para 1.4-1.5

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The following bullet points set out significant implications identified by Officers:

- The scheme is being delivered in compliance with all statutory requirements and third party consents required
- There are reputational impacts in not completing or delaying parts of the scheme
- There are risks consents may lapse and may not be granted upon re-application
- Health and Safety requirements are being upheld in the design and construction process
- Although the forecast captures risk allowances, there is still potential for unforeseen risks to emerge

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

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

- Full engagement with members and the community has been undertaken throughout the development of the scheme
- The scheme has generally received a high level of public and member support

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category

4.7 Public Health Implications

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

- The scheme offers a potential for improved public health through promoting use of non-motorised transport and its associated exercise benefits, along a route less-affected by pollutants

Implications

Officer Clearance

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?

Yes
Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?

Yes
Name of Officer: Gus de Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law?

Yes
Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes
Name of Officer: Elsa Evans

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?

Yes
Name of Officer: Sarah Silk

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

Yes
Name of Officer: Graham Hughes

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health

Yes
Name of Officer: Iain Green

5. Source documents guidance

5.1 None

APPENDIX 1: Areas of cost increase – Abbey Chesterton Bridge

Item	Cost Increase
Design changes and supervision Includes items omitted from tendered design, amended designs arising from changes to land and third party requirements, design issues payable under the Highways Services Contract.	205,400
Construction costs Additional work/materials and time arising from changes to design and third party requirements	761,050
Land and Access costs Changes to land required and accommodation works, increasing costs of land leases for construction access. Additional land agent and legal costs.	380,150
Third party consents and approvals Costs arising from third party requirements, e.g. Network Rail	70,250
Professional advice, Management and staff Costs Additional commercial advice and cost consultants given the complexity of the project and design/construction issues on site. Additional contract administration	365,400
Miscellaneous Additional communications, direct planning costs, restrictions resulting from Covid-19 pandemic and other minor changes that are part of a complex contract.	281,059
TOTAL	2,063,409

APPENDIX 2: Areas of cost increase – The Trail

Item	Cost Increase
Design changes and supervision Includes items omitted from tendered design, amended designs arising from changes to land and third party requirements, design issues payable under the Highways Services Contract.	129,030
Construction costs Additional work/materials and time arising from changes to design and third party requirements	3,515,794
Land and Access costs Changes to land required and accommodation works, increasing costs of land leases for construction access. Additional land agent and legal costs.	207,868
Statutory Undertakers' costs Additional cost associated with moving statutory undertakers plant and equipment	139,416
Professional advice, Management and staff Costs Additional commercial advice and cost consultants given the complexity of the project and design/construction issues on site. Additional contract administration	694,460
Miscellaneous Additional communications, direct planning costs, restrictions resulting from Covid-19 pandemic and other minor changes that are part of a complex contract.	111,948
Contingency	1,783,109
TOTAL	6,581,625

Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Proposed Member Working Group

To: Highways & Transport Committee
Meeting Date: 1st December 2020
From: Steve Cox – Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: N/A

Key decision: No

Outcome: To establish a member working group to review the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) scheme with any changes to be implemented for schemes to be delivered in the 2022/23 financial year.

Recommendation: Committee is asked to:

- a) Nominate 6 Members to form the working group
- b) Agree the timescale for the outcome of the review to be returned to Committee based on the options outlined in 2.9 and 2.10.

Officer contact:

Name: Matt Staton
Post: Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager
Email: matt.staton@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 699652

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Ian Bates & Mark Howell
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email: ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk, mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 The Local Highway Improvement scheme is a popular initiative that allows local communities the opportunity to bid for Council funding towards local highway projects.
- 1.2 For 2020/21 the scheme has an overall budget of £807k and 90 schemes approved for delivery. In addition, 152 applications have been received for delivery in 2021/22.
- 1.3 Applications are invited once a year for the scheme which then follows a three stage process as outlined below:

- Stage 1 - Feasibility

Once an initial application has been submitted, it will be assessed by the local highways project team. They will consider the options available that best meet the objectives of the application, including any solutions suggested. A road safety and policy review will also be included and an estimate of the cost (including any ongoing maintenance impacts) and delivery timescale will also be established.

Once these checks have been completed, the highways team will contact the applicant to discuss the outcome and work with them to refine the application throughout May to September. The applicant will then need to decide whether to submit this final updated application for assessment by the LHI Member Advisory Panel for the area, which are held in October each year.

If the feasibility assessment identifies that any solutions suggested are not deliverable and we are not able to agree on any suitable alternatives, then we will not take the application forward to the LHI Member Advisory Panel. The applicant may appeal this decision in writing via the local County Councillor, who will bring the appeal to the Chair of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee and Executive Director of Place and Economy for a final decision.

- Stage 2 - Prioritisation

The application will be scored out of five against each of the aims of the LHI Initiative by the Member Advisory Panel, made up of County Councillors from the district area, or County and City Councillors in Cambridge. The applicant will also be invited to present the application directly to the panel. This is the chance to highlight the benefits of the scheme and will give Councillors an opportunity to ask any further questions to help them prioritise your proposal.

The average score across the four LHI aims will be used to prioritise applications into a list for each district area. These district lists are then presented to the Highways and Transport Committee for approval. Funding is allocated to applications in priority order until fully allocated.

- Stage 3 - Delivery

If the application receives funding, the applicant will be asked to confirm in writing that they agree to provide the agreed contribution and approve commencement of the scheme.

If we do not receive the above, or if circumstances have changed, we will reallocate funding to the next prioritised application. Funding cannot be carried forward into future years.

The applicant will be invoiced for their contribution to the scheme on completion of the works

- 1.4 Small-scale refinements to the process have been undertaken in previous years, however, discussion and actions raised from previous committee meetings suggest a wider review is required and this paper outlines terms of reference for a member working party to lead this work.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 It is proposed a cross-party working group of 6 members is formed in order to work with officers to review the LHI scheme. In order to ensure appropriate representation, based on a working group of 6 members, the group should consist of the following:
- 2.2 Four [4] members from the Conservative group, one [1] member from the Liberal Democrat group and one [1] member from the Labour group.
- 2.3 The above representatives should be from divisions covering the range of communities across Cambridgeshire, including small and large parishes, towns and city wards.
- 2.4 In addition to Members, other stakeholders or community groups should be considered in relation to how their views and ideas could be taken into account as part of the review.
- 2.5 The working group will be facilitated by the Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager and include any other Council Officers agreed by the working group.
- 2.6 The working group is expected to focus on the following elements of the scheme:
- a) Financial contributions
 - b) The number of applications per area
 - c) Member panels, including their composition, operation and scoring criteria
 - d) Applications for Mobile Vehicle Activated Signs/Speed Indicating Devices
 - e) Officer resourcing
- 2.7 As the 2021/22 LHI scheme process is already underway, with applications having closed on 27th September, this review is expected to inform applications for LHI schemes to be delivered in the 2022/23 financial year.
- 2.8 Ordinarily the application window for 2022/23 would be opened following the Council elections in May 2021. In order to minimise delay to the process, the following timescale for the working group to undertake the review is proposed:
- 1st December 2020 – Working group established by Highways and Transport Committee subject to approval/decision
 - December 2020 – January 2021 – review to be undertaken
 - End January 2021 – draft report outlining the review findings and recommendations

- 9th March 2021 – review findings and recommendations presented to Highways and Transport Committee
- May/June 2021 – Application window for 2022/23 schemes opened

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

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

- Many of the schemes that are brought forward have outcomes that improve road safety, particularly for vulnerable users, such as the young, elderly or particular user types, such as pedestrians and cyclists.
- The review will consider how the scheme can further support this priority

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

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

- Investing in local communities, particularly the issues that are often of greatest local concern, promotes community development and provides benefits to all local residents.
- The review will consider how the scheme can further support this priority

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

There are no significant implications for this priority

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category. Any changes resulting from the review will require an Equality Impact Assessment Screening Form to be completed.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in paragraphs 2.1-2.4 and 2.8-2.11.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The report above sets out details of significant implications in paragraphs 2.1-2.4.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes

Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes

Name of Officer: Gus de Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes

Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes

Name of Officer: Elsa Evans

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

Name of Officer: Sarah Silk

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

Name of Officer: Richard Lumley

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

Name of Officer: Iain Greene

5. Source documents

5.1 Source documents

None

Review of Cambridgeshire Heavy Goods Vehicle Policy

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 1st December 2020

From: Steve Cox - Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref:

Key decision: No

Outcome: To agree nominations for the HGV Working Group

Recommendation: Nominate six Members to form a Member working group to review and update the HGV Policy

Officer contact:

Name: Sharon Piper
Post: Policy and Regulation Manager
Email: Sharon.piper@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 07771 961195

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Bates and Howell
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email: Ian.Bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Tel: 07799 133467

1. Background

- 1.1 The routing of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) should be developed at a strategic level as it has implications for not just local communities but the wider road network. Whilst many of the larger vehicles are passing through the County using the Highways England motorway and trunk road network, many are undertaking journeys with destination or origin points within the County and therefore making use of the local road network causing concern to local communities.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Route Map (AFRM) was designed to inform and influence management arrangements for HGV movements and the revised environmental weight limit policy was intended to form part of the wider HGV Management Strategy approved by Cabinet in July 2011 advocating that lorries needed to be managed rather than necessarily being regulated, as the movement of freight is vital to the economic wellbeing of the county.
- 2.2 Since the adoption of the AFRM in 2011, traffic management has changed dramatically with portable satellite navigation systems (satnav) and smartphones using Global Positioning Systems (GPS) offering reliable maps and real-time traffic updates rendering a link to a basic map on the County Council website of limited use to haulage businesses.
- 2.3 Whilst satnavs provide many benefits to the travelling public, they do cause other issues as the average navigation unit does not take into account height, width or weight restrictions and reports are increasing of HGVs getting into difficulty because drivers have followed the wrong type of satnav route. There are additional issues with satnavs which have not been updated with the latest road hierarchy. HGV Operators and drivers need to use truck-specific navigation units to avoid being misled by satnavs designed for smaller vehicles. There are calls for legislation to ban lorry drivers from using satnav units designed for cars, but this is work in progress at a national level.
- 2.4 Consultation with six neighbouring authorities established that only Northamptonshire County Council had an advisory Freight Map, however even this is no longer updated as their information is now registered on the national lorry route resource.
- 2.5 The council frequently receives complaints about HGV traffic with requests for some form of HGV management. Any restrictions to HGV movement needs careful consideration and should be done so in line with the Council's policy on HGV management. The current HGV Policy which refers to the AFRM is set out in the Highways Operational Standards (HOS). It needs reviewing and revising due to the changes outlined above.
- 2.6 It is proposed therefore that a cross-party Member working group with six Members should be formed to work with officers to assist in the development of the new HGV Policy to ensure that it reflects and balances the needs of those that live, work and travel through the County. Members with a geographical spread across the county and experience of the haulage industry or running business heavily dependant on HGV movement and Members representing communities heavily impacted by HGVs would be particularly useful to give a

broad input to the group. The cross party split for proportionality for a group of six is four Conservatives, one Liberal Democrat, one Labour Member.

- 2.7 In addition to Members, it is suggest that other stakeholder groups, such as the Police, representatives from The Road Haulage and Freight Transport Associations, Minerals and Waste, National Farmers Union, Public Health and other interested parties could be asked to participate to provide their views and ideas regarding the new Policy.
- 2.8 The first meeting of the working group will agree a terms of reference. The objective of the working group is to develop a revised policy for HGV management that acknowledges that HGVs have a vital role to play in today's society, supporting a range of services, but also that not all parts of the public highway are necessarily suitable for use by HGVs. It is anticipated this review and drafting of a new policy will take around 12 months to complete. The revised draft policy will come back to this committee for approval.
- 2.9 Also to note, the Economy and Environment Committee on the 23 May 2019 allocated funding to investigate Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) movements in the 'diamond' area between the A10, A142, former A14 and A141 in Huntingdonshire. The committee also appointed five Councillors to a Member Steering Group (MSG) to oversee the work. The Committee report can be found online here: <https://tinyurl.com/y23dp4ho> item 7.

The aims of the study were as follows:

- To gather information on the level of HGV traffic using the roads within the study area.
- Identify the origin and destination of the identified HGV traffic.
- Consider what interventions can be introduced to reduce the number of HGV's using the A1123 and other roads in the 'diamond' area and lessen the impact on the communities in the study area.
- Provide a narrative to the public to help the understanding of HGV movements in the area

A report which summaries the findings of the work will be made available online: <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-funding-bids-and-studies/transport-studies>

The MSG has led the work and recommends that when established, the countywide HGV working group considered the data and findings of the HGV Diamond Area Report and uses it as part of the evidence base for the development of further work and in the review and update of HGV policy in the County.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

- 3.1 A good quality of life for everyone
HGVs can significantly impact on local communities and people's lives. Through this policy, these impacts are intended to be managed.
- 3.2 Thriving places for people to live
HGVs can significantly impact on local communities and people's lives. Through this policy, these impacts are intended to be managed.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children
There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050
There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications
This work will be undertaken within the existing resources of the service.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications
There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications
There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications
An equality impact assessment will be undertaken when reviewing and revising the policy.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications
Members, the Police, Public Health, representatives from The Road Haulage and Freight Transport Associations and other interested parties will be asked to participate to provide their views and ideas regarding the new Policy

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement
The initial views of members and neighbouring authorities have been sought and Members will be asked to participate with the working group.

4.7 Public Health Implications
There are no significant implications within this category.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes
Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes
Gus De Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes
Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?
Yes
Elsa Evans

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

Sarah Silk

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

Richard Lumley

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health Yes

Iain Green

5. Source documents guidance

5.1 Source documents

HGV Policy in HOS

https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/asset-library/imported-assets/HGV_policy_may2015.pdf

Advisory Freight Map

<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/asset-library/Cambridgeshire-Advisory-Freight-Map.pdf>

5.2 Location

See web links at 5.1

Highway Services Contract Key Performance Indicators – quarterly report

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 1st December 2020

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): Countywide

Forward Plan ref:

Key decision: No

Outcome: To approve the Key Performance Indicator report

Recommendation: Committee are being asked to note and approve the report

Officer contact:

Name: Emma Murden
Post: Highways Commission Manager
Email: Emma.murden@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 07786 336249

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Bates & Howell
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 Highways & Community Infrastructure (HCI) Committee on 4th December 2019, raised questions about the quality of work undertaken by the Council's Highways Contractor, Skanska. Members highlighted the need to review the measures in place to monitor the performance of the contract. It was agreed that Committee receive a quarterly report on progress of the Highway contract key performance indicators (KPIs). The desire for a quarterly report was reaffirmed at the Highways & Transport (H&T) committee on 15th September 2020.
- 1.2 A number of Councillors at the Committee on 4th December 2019, expressed an interest in understanding the Highway KPIs. Officers met with these Councillors; Harford, King, Scutt on 14th April 2020 and Manning on 4th February 2020 to explain how the performance of the Highways Contract was managed. Guidance on how to report quality of work issues was also rolled out to staff, who use the contract. These findings were then reported to Cllr Howell, as Vice Chair of Highways and Transportation Committee.
- 1.3 Contracts benefit from having clear KPIs in place to provide tangible evidence of the level of achievement and progress set against the aims of the contract. Contract management KPIs aim to optimise processes and to deliver favourable outcomes, by measuring what matters, working back from the required outcome. The key KPI priorities of the highway services contract are:
- Health and safety of the travelling public and staff
 - Quality of work is of the required standards
 - Cost certainty is achieved
 - Service delivery timescales are met
 - Satisfaction surveys for staff and stakeholders
 - Environmental processes are in place.
- 1.4 This report covers why we collect the data, what data is collected and what outcomes these KPIs aim to achieve for the highway service. There are a set of 18 KPIs for the highway services contract, these are set out in more detail in Section 2. Each has performance clauses that are assessed against certain criteria, which have an impact on the original contract, for example extensions and reductions to the main term of the contract being one.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The Annual KPIs for the last few years are summarised in appendix 1. The table describes the measure, reason and results.
- 2.2 The current KPIs for 2020-21 are detailed in appendix 2 of this report.
- 2.3 Those KPIs that do not meet the required performance have a performance improvement plan (PIP) submitted by the contractor. The PIP sets out what actions and steps the contractor will take to achieve the target, currently there are 4 PIPs in progress:

- CAT2 defect repairs carried out on time (planned highway repair works to defects carried out in up to 12 weeks) Aims to have recovered by Nov/Dec 2020 – currently 89% (target 95%).
- Percentage of non-compliance which would have resulted in a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) as a proportion of all Street Works permits that commenced in the reporting month. Following the implementation of the Street Manager system in July 2020, the calculation for this KPI is currently being reviewed, so this figure is not current, and the Street Works Governance Group will confirm new calculations shortly. The issue predominantly relates to notification of on and off site times. Currently 42% (target <5%).
- Final Accounts being completed within 3 months of the works completion – has slipped back to below the target following implementation of Causeway, Skanska’s new works management system. Aims to have recovered by Nov/Dec 2020 – currently 78% (target 98%).
- Target cost verses actual costs for projects – a working group comprising of the Commercial and Performance Groups has been set up to review this – currently 81% (target 95%).

2.4 These are being monitored by the highway contract Joint Management Team (JMT) and reported to the highway contract Strategic Collaboration Board (SCB) to oversee actions and progress.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

- 3.1 A good quality of life for everyone
The report above sets out the implications for this priority in 1.3, how we are contributing to health and safety of the travelling public and staff, by meeting our targets to deliver a good service.
- 3.2 Thriving places for people to live
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire’s children
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050
The report above sets out the implications for this priority in 1.3, the recycling KPI demonstrates this and looks to assess the services carbon footprint.

4. Significant Implications

- 4.1 Resource Implications
The finance KPI’s are detailed within Appendix 1.
- 4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 1.4, following the procurement rules, evaluating risks and demonstrating value for money from the KPIs.

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

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes

Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes

Gus De Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes

Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes

Elsa Evans

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

Sarah Silk

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

Richard Lumley

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health Yes

Iain Green

Appendix 1

KPI	Measure	Target	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Primary KPIs					
Operational Delivery					
Percentage of in and out of hours' emergency calls responded to within the response time define in the HIAMP	Response times when attending emergencies are achieved as required by The Highway Operational Standards	90%	92%	96%	95%
Percentage of Cat 1 orders completed within agreed timescales, as defined in the HIAMP	Response times for repairs are achieved as required by The Highway Operational Standards	90%	54%	82%	91%
Programme Delivery					
Percentage of schemes delivered to the agreed programme dates	Projects are delivered to the agreed timescales.	95%	78%	77%	93%
Percentage of schemes delivered within +3%/-10% of agreed target costs	Projects are costed correctly within certain tolerances between target and actual costs	95%	74%	83%	81%
Health, Safety & Environment					
Lost Time Incident Frequency Rate (LTIFR) To measure the employee time lost following an Incident per 100,000 hours worked.	Health and Safety Performance is an industry standard	1.2	0.00	0.20	0.00
Value for Money					
Output achieved for budgeted spends based on year start targets	Skanska delivering efficiencies/ lower costs for some of the most common maintenance activities. Activities to be included are Surface dressing, Micro Asphalt, Slurry Seal, Potholes, Gully Emptying and Grass Cutting.	<=2015-17 unit cost	93%	89%	TBD
Cost Certainty - Option C works					
Cumulative actual annual costs within % of total target costs agreed per year (annual programmes)	Projects are costed correctly within certain tolerances between target and actual.	+3%/-10%	-9%	-1%	TBD
Team Effectiveness & Public/ Member Engagement					
Stakeholder Survey	Satisfaction survey sent to Parishes, District, City Councils and County Councillors	TBA	-	-	Benchmark

Secondary KPIs					
Operational Delivery					
Percentage of Cat 2 orders completed within agreed timescales, as defined in the HIAMP	Response times for repairs are achieved as required by The Highway Operational Standards	95%	89%	92%	90%
Percentage of cyclic maintenance activities delivered to the agreed programme	Cyclic maintenance covers safety fencing, surface dressing, surface treatments, footway slurry seal, patching, retread, grass cutting and horticulture, gulley cleansing and jetting, delivered in accordance with the works order priorities.	95%	100%	99%	100%
Percentage of Precautionary Treatment runs completed within the target detailed in the Winter Service Plan	Gritting runs delivered to the agreed timescales	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Defect Certificates as % of total number of Task Orders.	Quality of work - works defects are logged by CCC officers	2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
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.	Coordination with other roadworks to minimise disruption to the travelling public, poor planning can lead to FPNs.	5%	9%	11%	42%
Health, Safety & Environment					
Accident Frequency Rate (AFR) To measure the number of reportable accidents per 100,000 person hours worked. Reportable accidents are those as defined in RIDDOR regulations prepared by the HSE.	Health and Safety Performance is an industry standard	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
Recycled Construction Waste, Percentage of arising's recycled into usable construction material	Environmental - indicates use of recycled materials into usable construction material.	95%	96%	97%	98%
Cost Certainty					
Audit failures in Open Book Costing Mechanism (OBCM) - % value of the audited value where audit discovers an error in any cost categories (Plant; Labour; Materials; Sub Contractors; Overheads).	Accounts audited for errors	1%	-	-	TBD
Financial					
Percentage of final accounts for all task orders that are agreed within 3 months of completion date	Budget management - Following works completion final costs on orders should be completed in 3 months.	100% changed to 98% in 2018	96%	85%	78%
Team Effectiveness					
Delivery with the agreed annual Cultural Improvement Plan targets	Collaboration -Staff Survey	100%	-	-	Benchmark

Appendix 2

Cambridgeshire Highways KPI Dashboard											
vDRAFT	Reporting month: August 2020						2020/21				
		KPI description	Target	Frequency	Contract Group	Apr-20	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	
Primary KPIs	Operational Delivery	Percentage of in and out of hours' emergency calls responded to within the response time defined in the HOS	90%	Monthly	Performance	93%	91%	90%	92%	97%	
		Percentage of Cat 1 orders completed within agreed timescales, as defined in the HOS	90%	Monthly	Performance	85%	65%	88%	90%	91%	
	Programme Delivery	Percentage of schemes delivered to the agreed programme dates	95%	Quarterly	Performance			96%			
		Percentage of schemes delivered within +3%/-10% of agreed target costs	95%	Quarterly	Commercial			60%			
	Health, Safety & Environment	Lost Time Incident Frequency Rate (LTIFR) To measure the employee time lost following an Incident per 100,000 hours worked.	1.2	Monthly	SHE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Value for Money	Output achieved for budgeted spends based on year start targets.	<=2017-18 unit cost	Annual	Commercial						
	Cost Certainty - Option C Works	Cumulative actual annual costs within % of total target costs agreed per year (annual programmes)	+3%/-10%	Annual	Commercial						
	Team Effectiveness & Public/ Member Engagement	Stakeholder Survey	Benchmark	Annual	Performance						
Secondary KPIs	Operational Delivery	Percentage of Cat 2 orders completed within agreed timescales, as defined in the HOS	90%	Monthly	Performance	91%	72%	66%	78%	89%	
		Percentage of cyclic maintenance activities delivered to the agreed programme	95%	Quarterly	Performance			TBA			
		Percentage of Precautionary Treatment runs completed within the target detailed in the Winter Service Plan	100%	Monthly	Performance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		Number of Defect Certificates as % of total number of Task Orders.	2%	Monthly	Performance	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	
		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.	5%	Monthly	Performance	100%	65%	22%	45%	TBC	
	Health, Safety & Environment	Accident Frequency Rate (AFR) To measure the number of reportable accidents per 100,000 person hours worked. Reportable accidents are those as defined under RIDDOR.	0.75	Monthly	SHE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		Recycled Construction Waste, Percentage of arisings recycled into usable construction material	95%	Quarterly	SHE			97%			
	Cost Certainty	Audit failures in Open Book Costing Mechanism (OBCM) - % value of the audited value where audit discovers an error in any cost categories (Plant; Labour; Materials; Sub Contractors; Overheads).	1%	As appropriate	Commercial						
	Financial	Percentage of final accounts for all task orders that are agreed within 3 months of completion date	98%	Monthly	Commercial	38%	60%	71%	52%	65%	
	Team Effectiveness & Public/ Member Engagement	Delivery with the agreed annual Cultural Improvement Plan targets	100%	Annual	Cultural						

Finance Monitoring Report – October 2020

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 1st December 2020

From: Steve Cox – Executive Director, Place & Economy
Chris Malyon – Chief Finance Officer

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable

Key decision: No

Outcome: To provide the Committee with the October 2020 Finance Monitoring Report for Place & Economy (P&E).

The report is presented to provide the Committee with the opportunity to comment on the financial position as at the end of October 2020.

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to review and comment on the report.

Officer contact:

Name: Sarah Heywood
Post: Strategic Finance Manager
Email: sarah.heywood@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 699714

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Bates and Howell
Post: Chairman and Vice-Chairman
Email: ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 The appendix attached provides the financial position for the whole of Place & Economy Services, and as such, not all of the budgets contained within it are the responsibility of this Committee. To aid Member reading of the report, budget lines that relate to the Highways and Transport Committee are unshaded and those that relate to the Environment and Sustainability Committee are shaded in Appendix 1. Members are requested to restrict their questions to the lines for which this Committee is responsible.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 Revenue: The report attached as Appendix A is the Place & Economy Finance Monitoring Report for 2020/21 as at the end of October 2020. Place and Economy as a whole is forecasting a bottom line revenue overspend of £3.3m, which is unchanged since last month. Within this there have been a few changes within Highways, with a forecast increase in lost income due to the second lockdown which is offset by various small reductions in other budget areas.
- 2.2 £4.8m of the forecast pressure is attributable to the impacts of Covid-19. The majority of these pressures are for the loss of income which is used to fund existing services. These pressures and the assumptions on the recovery profile of income are being closely monitored and regularly reviewed.
- 2.3 Capital: The figures assume that General Purposes Committee approved the additional pothole funding of £4.2m on 24th November.
- 2.4 The vacancy, tree and Local Highway Initiative (LHI) activity data is reported within the Finance Monitoring Report.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

- 3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

There are no significant implications for this priority.

- 3.2 Thriving places for people to live

There are no significant implications for this priority.

- 3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

- 3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

The report addresses the resources position for this Committee as at the end of October 2020.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

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

There are no significant implications within this category

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

Source documents: None

Highways and Transport Policy and Service Committee Agenda Plan

Published on 2nd November 2020

Updated on 11th November 2020

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
- Finance Report – The Council's Virtual Meeting Protocol has been amended so monitoring reports (including the Finance report) can be included at the discretion of the Committee.
- Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

19/01/21	Commuted Sums	Justin Styles	2020/049	07/01/21	11/01/21
	Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study	Karen Kitchener	Not applicable		
	Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan	Clare Rankin	Not applicable		
	Risk Register Review	Steve Cox	Not applicable		
	Utility Company interface and provision of accurate and timely information relating to highway schemes	Sonia Hansen	Not applicable		
	Transport Investment Plan	Cathryn Rutangye	Not applicable		
	A14 Legacy Fund	Justin Styles	Not applicable		

	Highways England NMU Routes	Justin Styles	Not applicable		
	Local Highways Improvements Member Workshop Report	Matt Staton	Not applicable		
	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable		
[16/02/21] Provisional – reserve meeting				04/02/21	08/02/21
09/03/21	Performance Report	Jamie Leeman	Not applicable	25/02/21	01/03/21
	Highways Contract Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Quarterly Update Report	Emma Murden	Not applicable		
	Highways Verge Maintenance	Jon Clarke / Richard Lumley	Not applicable		
	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable		
	Highway Infrastructure Asset Management	Mike Atkins	Not applicable		
[13/04/21] Provisional meeting				31/03/21	02/04/21
08/06/21	Notification of the Appointment of the Chairman/Chairwoman and Vice Chairman/Chairwoman	Democratic Services		27/04/21	31/05/21
	Risk Register Review	Steve Cox	Not applicable		
	LHI Panel Scoreboards	Richard Lumley	Not applicable		
	Highways Contract Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Quarterly Update Report	Emma Murden	Not applicable		
	Performance Report	Jamie Leeman	Not applicable		
	HoS Annual Review	Mike Atkins	Not applicable		
	Finance Monitoring Report	Sarah Heywood	Not applicable		

To be scheduled

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

Highways Audit Steve Cox / Neil Hunter Internal Audit

Please contact Democratic Services democraticservices@cambridgeshire.gov.uk if you require this information in a more accessible format

