

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: 9 March 2021

Time: 10.00am to 1.50pm

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, D Giles, L Harford, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), N Kavanagh, S King, I Manning and A Taylor

72. Apologies for absence and Declarations of Interest

None.

There were no declarations of interest.

73. Minutes – 19 January 2021

The minutes of the 19 January 2021 were agreed.

74. Highways and Transport Committee Action Log

The Committee noted the Action Log.

Officers undertook to provide a further update regarding the Wisbech Cycling map.

75. Petitions and Public Questions

The Chairman informed the Committee of a petition, public speakers and local Members that had requested to speak on agenda items. The Chairman advised that he would invite them to speak at the start of the relevant agenda item.

76. The Divestment of Skanska Infrastructure Services and Novation of the Highway Services Contract

Members considered a report that provided the Committee with an overview of the forthcoming novation of the County Council's Highway Services contract from Skanska UK Ltd to Milestone Infrastructure Ltd, part of M Group Services.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Questioned whether the Council had previous experience of working with the new parent company and whether they were a bidder when the contract was originally tendered. Officers advised that M Group Services were new to the Council and that they had not placed a bid for the contract during the original tender process. M

Group were experienced in working with local authorities and it was the view of officers that they would have scored well if they had been part of the original tender process.

- Questioned whether there was opportunity to amend the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) associated with the contract and drew attention to concerns raised previously regarding their efficacy. Officers explained that the KPIs couldn't be changed as part of the novation, but through the contract, agreed changes can be made. A working group was seeking to improve the current suite of KPIs and constant contract management would enhance the performance of the operator.
- Noted that the public will still see branding of Cambridgeshire Highways on vehicles and the change would not be visible to the public and the service delivered.
- Confirmed all contracts with all Councils nationwide were being novated to M Group from Skanska.
- Noted that the novation process was similar to a retendering process in terms of checks and the pre-qualifying questionnaire that demonstrated the company was able to meet the requirements of the contract. However, the terms of the contract were not open to renegotiation. Once the new company was in place then discussions would take place regarding KPIs.
- Expressed concern regarding the current performance of Skanska, highlighting several works that had either not been completed or completed to a low standard. It was therefore essential that robust monitoring of standards be maintained and KPIs be amended accordingly. Officers requested that the list of outstanding works be provided for them to be investigated.
- Noted that the risk of challenge to the process based on legal advice received was low. If a challenge was received, it would require assessment as to whether it impacted on the novation and therefore delay the process.
- Noted that the process of the novation allowed for a re-setting of the relationship between the Council and the operator. Meetings had taken place with the senior leadership team of M Group who had provided assurance regarding service improvement. The opportunity would be taken to address KPIs and improve them for enhanced contract management.

It was resolved, to:

Approve the novation of the County Council's existing Highway Services Contract from Skanska UK Ltd to Milestone Infrastructure Ltd.

77. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee received the Finance Monitoring Report for the period up to the end of January 2021. In presenting the report officers highlighted the overall forecast

underspend on the revenue budget together with the grant provided by the Government to mitigate the impact of COVID-19.

Arising from the report:

- Officers undertook to update Members on progress relating to the Leverington Local Highways Initiative Scheme (LHI). **ACTION**
- Clarification was provided by officers regarding Executive Director budget line contained in table 2.1 in Appendix A of the report. The significant variance had arisen due to the COVID-19 support grant having been lodged against that budget line.
- Members noted that the in-year forecast underspend relating to St Neots Northern Footway and Cycle Bridge would roll forward into the new financial year and would only be removed if it was not required.
- A Member questioned whether the Dragon Patcher, pothole repair vehicle was operational. Officers confirmed that the vehicles were operational.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review and comment on the report.

78. Integrated Transport Block Funding Allocation

The Committee considered the proposed allocation of the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block Funding Allocation. The presenting officer explained that the funding was released by the Government to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. The funding was then passed on to Cambridgeshire County Council. The presenting officer highlighted the proposed allocation of the ITB capital grant contained at paragraph 2.2 of the report.

Arising from the report:

- A Member questioned whether the £15k Accessibility Budget had been fully spent the previous year and if it had, why the allocation had not been increased. Officers confirmed that the allocation was spent during the previous financial year. Officers undertook to provide an example of how the funding was spent. Members noted that if additional funding was required then a virement could take place. **ACTION.**
- A Member sought further information and clarity regarding air quality monitoring. Officers informed the Committee that the monitoring of air quality was a function undertaken by District Councils. The funding in the allocation was for monitoring only and did not cover the delivery of mitigation schemes. Further details on how the funding was spent could be provided as part of the year-end reporting.
- A suggestion was made by a Member for additional funding to be allocated to Local Highways Initiatives.

- Attention was drawn to the Transport Investment Plan that had been supplied as an appendix to previous iterations of the report which was a useful tool when working with the public. Officers explained that due to a range of factors, there was a delay in the allocation of funding to the schemes. The TIP once agreed would be published on the website and circulated to the Committee. **ACTION**
- Members noted that a further report would return to Committee in the summer of 2021.

The Chairman with the unanimous agreement of the Committee proposed an additional recommendation that provided the Executive Director: Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman the authority to make any necessary amendments to the proposed allocation of ITB funding following receipt of the funding from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

It was resolved to:

- a) support the proposed allocation of the ITB funding as long as that the funding is passed to the County Council by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director: Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Highways and Transport Committee to make any amendments to the proposed allocation of the ITB funding following the receipt of the funding from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.**

79. Highway Operational Standards (HOS) Annual Review

Members considered a report for the Committee's approval of the County Council's Highway Asset Management Policy, Strategy and Highway Operational Standards documents. This would ensure that the Council had a current suite of documents setting out the standards for the management of the highway assets for which it was responsible.

During the course of discussion, Members:

- Sought clarity regarding the current HOS and the procurement process for the new asset management system. Officers explained that the procurement of the wider asset management system was being worked on and the specification developed. Assurance was provided that the system would link with existing strategies and policies.
- Drew attention to Appendix 3 of the report that detailed the frequency of which maintenance checks were undertaken on footpaths and prestige cycle paths. Officers explained that the frequency of maintenance inspections was based on recommendations contained in national guidance. The frequency was also derived from risk and on previous defect history.

- Attention was drawn to gulley emptying and questioned, following the result of a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request whether there had been an underspend relating to gulley emptying. Officers informed the Committee that funding was allocated through the General Purposes Committee and there were now 4 teams emptying gullies, undertaking regular maintenance. Members noted that the funding also included other cyclic activities. Officers undertook to provide confirmation of whether there had been an underspend relating to gulley maintenance in previous financial years. **ACTION**
- Noted the reasons for the adoption of an asset management approach. However, attention was drawn to the insurance claims mentioned in the report that could provide indicative data on the relative condition of the highway. The number of insurance claims had risen 4-fold in Huntingdonshire, and it was questioned how many additional claims due to the surface dressing programme had been made and why had it been so bad. Officers explained that insurance claims received provided no indication of those that were not successful. It would be difficult to provide data on claims that relate to surface dressing as it may not directly relate to the claim made. Work was being undertaken with Skanska regarding potholes and further work would be undertaken with M Group following the novation of the contract relating to quality and timeliness. Officers undertook to explore further issues that have reportedly arisen following recent surface dressing. **ACTION**
- Welcomed the increased footway maintenance budget and questioned when it would be allocated and ensure that it was equitably split between rural and urban areas. Officers informed the Committee that the funding was only provided very recently, and officers were working on its allocation. A Member highlighted that residents would welcome the additional funding and requested that priority be given to its allocation.
- Sought greater clarity regarding allocations based on geography. Officers explained that the programme tended to be based on asset condition, life-cycle and the time of year rather than geography. However, it was accepted that there might be a proliferation of certain assets in particular areas, such as more footpaths in Cambridge City. The presenting officer undertook to review the paragraph to ensure clarity. **ACTION**
- Expressed concern at the number of Local Highway Initiative bids that were coming forward that sought to address maintenance issues.
- Referred to street lighting that was excluded from the strategy. Street lighting was extremely important to residents with complaints received regarding darkness along certain streets, coupled with issues relating to the condition of pavements. The LHI budget was being requested for additional street lighting which was of concern. Officers explained that the street lighting was managed separately. There was no policy that sought to readdress streetlighting, therefore it was for local communities to determine whether they wanted additional street lighting.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Policy;
- b) Approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Strategy;
- c) Approve the Highway Operational Standards (HOS);
- d) Agree that the Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, can make minor amendments to Appendix R of the Highways Operational Standards in accordance with the approved asset management principles;
- e) Agree that the Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, can make minor amendments to the budgetary apportionments derived from Appendix Q of the Highways Operational Standards;
- f) Agree that the Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, can append to the HOS other policies that might be approved by this committee; and
- g) Agree that Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee, can make amendments to the Highway Operational Standards (including Appendix R) to reflect actual amounts of capital funding received via the Needs Based Formula and Incentive Fund.

80. A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Scheme Update

The Chairman invited Matthew Danish, representing CamCycle to present a petition that had received over 600 signatures relating to the agenda item.

Mr Danish, introducing the petition requested Cambridgeshire County Council and the Highways and Transport Committee to:

1. Remove the dangerous chicane barriers that were recently installed on the approaches of the new active travel bridges over the A14 at Bar Hill and Swavesey.
2. Adopt the government's design manual Local Transport Note 1/20 in order to ensure that design and work on active travel and cycling infrastructure in the county produces fully accessible and inclusive routes that are suitable for people of all ages and abilities as well as being compatible with all modes of active travel that use those routes.

In support of the requests Mr Danish provided the following information. Two new active travel bridges for walking, cycling and horse-riding over the A14 were opened during 2020: one near Bar Hill and the other near Swavesey. These bridges were built to modern standards, with ample-width pathways and gentle slopes, and they were well received by the public. They had been safely and successfully used by walkers, cyclists and equestrians for several months.

In January 2021, without any warning or discussion, works suddenly appeared on the approach pathways of these bridges, and dangerous new chicane barriers that obstruct the pathways were installed. Each barrier squeezes the pathway down to a very narrow pinch-point with a sharp turn. They have created a new hazard where there was none before, with people liable to slip and fall trying to navigate through the tiny gap. The narrowing of the path created conflict and forced people into close proximity during a pandemic, when the Council was supposed to be creating more space for people to spread out. Last, but not least, the Council had broken the law and violated its public sector equality duty by installing barriers that created severe difficulties for disabled cyclists who were using tricycles, tandem cycles or adapted cycles on the new bridges.

The government published a cycling design manual called Local Transport Note 1/20, and the intention of the manual was to ensure that all cycling and related infrastructure was designed to be completely inclusive and accessible to all people. Summary principle 16 in the document states: 'Access control measures, such as chicane barriers and dismount signs, should not be used' because 'they reduce the usability of a route for everyone, and may exclude people riding nonstandard cycles and cargo bikes'. It also states, in paragraph 5.6.3 that: 'Deliberately restricting space, introducing staggered barriers or blind bends to slow cyclists is likely to increase the potential for user conflict and may prevent access for larger cycles and disabled people and so should not be used'.

The installation of dangerous new chicane barriers was specifically prohibited by the Government's new manual.

By adopting Local Transport Note 1/20, the Council would help assure the public that they would always design infrastructure in a manner that met national standards and was inclusive and accessible to all people. Therefore, the petition called for the Council to undo the damage that was recently done and to adopt the new design manual to ensure that such damage would not occur again.

The petition was supported by Camcycle and the Swavesey & District Bridleway Association.

A Member sought clarification as to whether the barrier that was the subject of the petition was of the same design as the one that was installed on the Biomedical Campus and was ultimately removed. Mr Danish confirmed that the barrier was of a very similar design to the one that was removed as it was deemed hazardous.

In response to a Member question Mr Danish, confirmed that as far as he knew motorcycles using the path had not been an issue.

The Chairman thanked Mr Danish for the petition and confirmed that a formal response would be sent within 10 working days of the meeting.

Presenting the report, the Assistant Director: Infrastructure and Growth informed the Committee that the scheme was still under construction and there were 2 remaining sections to complete. The rest was complete and there were sections that had been adopted by the Council. De-trunking was in its early stages and would complete by the end of this year.

The impact of COVID-19 had made assessment of traffic levels difficult. Further assessment was being undertaken and concerns regarding the impact of the new A14 on traffic volumes on particular routes would be escalated to Highways England.

Attention was drawn to the damage to the network caused by the construction of the A14. Members noted that local communities had suffered significant disruption with Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) using shortcuts to avoid diversions and had left a negative impact on the network. Officers were working with Highways England regarding maintenance and repairs. Conversations had also taken place with the Department for Transport in order to provide funding for repairs. The Committee would be updated as the work progressed.

With regard to the barriers located on the bridge at Bar Hill and Swavesey, the Committee was informed that they resulted from a stage 3 road safety audit undertaken by Highways England in consultation with the Council. There were 2 issues identified relating to vulnerable users, with steep approach ramps there was risk to cyclists entering the live carriageway at the bottom of the ramp. In all instances the key design was safety for all users which required a balanced approach. The Council was now the adopter of the assets and the barriers associated with the structures were being reviewed and the Committee would be updated when completed.

The Chairman invited local Member Councillor Mandy Smith, to address the Committee. Councillor Smith requested a copy of the response to the petition and sought clarification of whether the bridge at Swavesey was designed for equestrian use. Officers confirmed that the bridge did not have high enough parapets for equestrian use of the bridge. Councillor Smith requested a meeting with officers and the Chairman of the Committee regarding a potential bridge crossing. Councillor Smith drew attention to the damage to verges that had occurred during the construction of the A14 and expressed hope that restoration work would be completed.

The Chairman confirmed that a meeting would be scheduled.

In response to a Member question regarding whether she would support the removal of the barriers mentioned in the petition, Councillor Smith indicated that she would await the response of officers and discuss further with them.

During discussion Members:

- Thanked officers for their attention to the issues that had been brought to their attention.

- Expressed concern that the A14 scheme had not yet been delivered in totality. The through route had been delivered, however, the project as whole had not yet been completed. Members were disappointed with Highways England and their attitude towards damage that had been incurred by the highways network as a result of the works.
- Drew attention to the number of representations from residents regarding signage that had not yet been updated to reflect the new road. Officers informed Members that signage had been delayed especially with regard to wider signage along the corridor and was still underway.
- Noted that with regard to the A1123 and B1040, a detailed survey was being undertaken to obtain data on usage that would be escalated with Highways England and be compared with the original traffic modelling. If the results were different to the original modelling, then there was a legal requirement for mitigation.
- Welcomed the suggestion of the Executive Director: Place and Economy to invite Highways England to the next meeting of the Committee to address concerns raised by Members. **ACTION**

Councillor Manning proposed an additional recommendation, seconded by Councillor Taylor, in response to the petition presented to the Highways & Transport Committee, that the Committee formally adopted the Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/20.

During debate of the proposal it was agreed that it would be in order for a proper assessment of the adoption to take place and a report be presented to the next meeting of the Committee. On that basis the proposal was withdrawn.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the progress with the scheme to date.
- b) Approve the formal submission of the issues outlined in section 2.3 to Highways England to request further review and investigation as part of its Post Project Review

81. Major Infrastructure Project Delivery, Governance and Risk Management

The Committee considered a report that provided Members with an update on the improvements underway relating to delivery of infrastructure projects, their governance and risk management.

During discussion of the report:

- The Committee noted that the methodology of Prince 2 would be adapted for Cambridgeshire and a refined version would be used for smaller projects.

- Members welcomed the report and suggested that it would be useful to review after a year through exception reporting. Officers recognised the need for exception reporting and confirmed that a report would return to the Committee in the future.
- A Member highlighted the importance of reporting budget variance to the Committee and that it was essential local Members be kept informed. The Member sought assurance regarding recommendation d) of the report that it applied to local Members as well as members of the Committee. Officers explained how local Members were involved through Member Advisory Groups. The importance of an effective communications strategy was emphasised and the importance of local Members recognised.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the improvements underway relating to the delivery of infrastructure projects;
- b) agree committee decisions are required gateways 2, 4 and 6 of the gateway framework as part of project governance;
- c) note the project status summary in Appendix 3 including key risks and mitigation; and
- d) agree regular reporting of projects to Members

82. Residents' Parking Delivery Review

Due to time constraints, the Chairman exercised his discretion and moved the Residents' Parking Delivery Review forward on the agenda in order to enable its fullest discussion.

The Chairman informed the Committee that there were a number of speakers regarding this item. The Chairman invited Mr Veli Aghdiran, resident of Guest Road and speaking on behalf of Guest Road Area Residents' Association.

Mr Aghdiran drew attention to the pressured car-parking situation in the Guest Road area that had been further compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic that had resulted in a substantially increased demand for parking over supply. There had been several refurbishments of properties which had resulted in additional trade vehicles. Residents now used their cars as a last resort because of the difficulty of finding any space in the area. Mr Aghdiran shared the experience of residents who had experienced issues with the residents' parking scheme. Mr Aghdiran believed that there were creative solutions that could be employed to better use the parking space available and concluded by stating that he was intending to draw the Committee's attention to residents' experiences rather than advising of solutions.

The Chairman invited Mr Jim Chisolm, speaking on behalf of CamCycle to address the Committee.

Mr Chisolm, began by highlighting his experience of early controlled parking zones in Guilford and the impact on residents and people travelling into the area. However, they offered significant reward for those wanting more pleasant neighbourhoods. Highlighting the 'new' post-pandemic normal, Mr Chisolm informed the Committee there was a risk that many would drive and park on residential streets rather than use public transport or Park and Ride. Given the gestation time for such schemes, there could not be any delay in action.

Mr Chisolm emphasised the benefits of Residents' Parking Schemes that included:

- Reduced numbers of parked and moving motor vehicles make it far more pleasant and safer for pedestrians and cyclists
- Residents who owned a car had greater certainty regarding parking availability
- Space could be made available for increased numbers of light delivery vehicles, which may otherwise obstruct all traffic
- By reducing the number of known free commuter parking slots it reduces pollution and congestion city wide, and hence the delays to essential users and buses with their passengers.

Mr Chisolm concluded by highlighting option 3 that should include the Greater Cambridge Partnership proposals for supporting an Integrated Parking Strategy as the preferred option.

The Chairman invited Cambridge City Councillor, Dave Baigent, to address the Committee. Councillor Baigent drew attention to the overarching strategic plan to reduce traffic entering the city and the on-going work to promote active travel. Councillor Baigent requested that the Council pledge to address the parking scheme that was offered to residents in Romsey. The impact of the Coleridge scheme was that cars had been shifted into the Romsey area, adversely impacting residents ability to park.

The Chairman invited local Member Councillor Linda Jones, to address the Committee. Councillor Jones highlighted paragraph 2.3 of the report onward. The report made clear there were several areas of the city where there was significant pressure. She noted the work that had been done so far but would not be addressed by a return to normal. And there needs to be a level of flexibility and creativity with existing space. Options 2, 3, and 4 would all need to be considered. Councillor Jones emphasised the need to consider options 3 and 4 and the need to act swiftly and bring options back to Committee.

Local Member, Councillor Jocelyne Scutt, was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee. Councillor Scutt, drew attention to the partnership work of the Council with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) relating to residents' parking schemes where the overall aim was to reduce congestion and pollution in the city that would be of benefit to everyone in the county. Councillor Scutt stated that it was clear that options 3 and 4 contained within the report overlapped one another and emphasised that it was option 3 that fulfilled the purpose of residents parking schemes. Councillor Scutt

highlighted areas within her Division that were suffering from the pause in developing parking schemes. There is a need to promote bus transport for those outside the city and car clubs for those within the city in conjunction with parking schemes.

The presenting officer introduced the report. The report was being presented to Committee following a 12 month pause to residents' parking schemes. The Committee noted that contrary to the report, GCP funding for residents' parking schemes was still available and had not ceased.

Arising from the report:

- A Member commented that further work was needed with partners on the approach to schemes and therefore option 4 was preferred.
- In highlighting work that had been undertaken in developing a scheme for Romsey that was affected by the decision to suspend further work on schemes, a Member commented that their preferred option was a combination of 3 and 4.
- The success of schemes in Coleridge West were highlighted by a Member and the elimination, as a result, of cars parking on verges causing them damage.
- A Member urged caution regarding differential charging rates for electric vehicles as it created inequalities by benefiting more wealthy residents who could afford such vehicles.
- A Member emphasised the importance of resident's quality of life. Parking was a huge problem where driveways were blocked, streets were blocked and people suffered constant noise and abuse from people arguing over spaces and urged the Committee adopt an option that got the programme back on track.
- The Chairman drew attention to the work undertaken by the GCP and a recently published report for their forthcoming meeting of the Executive Board. The GCP were considering a number of options regarding transport, cycling and parking that would link to option 4 of the report.

Councillor Manning, proposed an amendment to recommendation a) of the report to approve option 3 rather than 4 as the most appropriate way forward. Councillor Taylor seconded the amendment. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

It was resolved to:

- a) Consider the four options outlined in part 1 of this report and, in-line with officers' recommendation, approve option 4 as the most appropriate way forward; and
- b) Consider the four options outlined in part 2 of this report and instruct officers to undertake further work and to come back to committee later in 2021 with a detailed proposal.

83. Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Member Working Group

Members received a report that sought the Committee's approval of the outcome of the LHI Working Group's discussions and suggested amendments to the LHI initiative

The Chairman invited Councillor Linda Jones to address the Committee in her role as a member of the LHI Working Group. Councillor Jones, highlighted the chairing of the LHI Panels and the idea that officers chairing the meeting would ensure consistency. Attention was drawn to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) appended to the report that emphasised that the LHI process was a serious, formal one.

Councillor Jones, drew attention to the view of the Working Group that a minority of Cambridge City Councillors should be included within the Cambridge City LHI Panel as there were a wide range of LHIs within the City and the City Council made a significant funding contribution to the funding of the schemes.

Arising from the report:

- Members supported the comments of Councillor Jones, highlighting the unique circumstances of Cambridge City and therefore there should be representation from Cambridge City Councillors on the LHI Panel.
- A Member commented that with regard to chairing LHI Panels it was acceptable for an elected Member to chair the meeting providing that there was consistency in officer attendance at the meetings.
- A Member commented that it was very much work in progress and suggested a further review in the next Council. Attention was drawn to the minimum number of Councillors that should be present at a panel and suggested the number should be 5 rather than 6 as there was rarely more than 5 in attendance.

Following discussion of the report it was proposed with the unanimous agreement of the Committee to amend recommendation c) to reduce the minimum number of County Councillors to 5 and add an additional recommendation for the inclusion of a minority of Cambridge City Councillors in the Cambridge City LHI Panel.

It was resolved to approve:

- a) Appendix A – revised application criteria;
- b) A maximum of 2 people to present per application at the LHI panel meetings;
- c) Future LHI panels to comprise a minimum of **6 5** and a maximum of 8 County Councillors from divisions within the relevant district areas;

- d) Panel membership in Cambridge City, due to its unique circumstances, should include a minority of City Councillors**
- e) That the chair of the LHI panels is to be chosen from the LHI Members sitting on the elected LHI panel and that the chair is to be agreed prior to the start of the panel meeting; and
- f) The review of the online LHI panel meetings to determine whether panels should be held online going forward

84. Highways Verge Maintenance

The Committee considered a report that apprised Members of the new approach to management of highway verges across Cambridgeshire following the launch of updated national guidance.

During discussion:

- A Member highlighted that many members of the Committee received an email expressing concern about the proposed reduction to 2 verge cuts and the impact that would have on rights of way. The presenting officer confirmed that the report did not address rights of way and there were no proposals to change.
- The Committee noted that officers worked closely with District Council colleagues and shared programmes to ensure as much as possible that cutting was timed with rubbish collection.
- A Member highlighted the impact of poor parking in Cambridge City that severely impacted on verges and questioned whether it caused additional cost to the Council. Officers commented that Residents' Parking Schemes were helpful in terms managing poor and inconsiderate parking.
- A Member commented that 2 cuts in the countryside would likely be sufficient. However, it was unlikely to be enough for villages and requested that coordination with Parish Councils took place regarding the number of cuts. Officers explained that villages were budgeted for 3 cuts. There was also flexibility within verge management to obtain different results such as wildflowers if so desired.

It was resolved to:

- a) To endorse the approach set out in the report for the management of highway verges across Cambridgeshire; and
- b) To approve inclusion of the county's verge management approach in future iterations of the Highway Operational Standards

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

It was resolved to note the Agenda Plan and the additions made at the meeting.

May 2021

- adoption of the Department for Transport Local Transport Note
- A14 Issues, invite Highways England.

To be scheduled:

- Infrastructure delivery (relating to agenda item 10, Major Infrastructure Project Delivery, Governance and Risk Management) including regular update reports on projects.

Chairman