

**TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP) AND ST NEOTS S106 PRIORITISED SCHEMES**

*To:* **Economy and Environment Committee**

*Meeting Date:* **10 November 2016**

*From:* **Executive Director – Economy, Transport and Environment**

*Electoral division(s):* **All**

*Forward Plan ref:* **Key decision: Yes**

*Purpose:* **To consider and approve the Cambridgeshire Transport Investment Plan (TIP), the proposed amendment to the St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy (MTTS) Scheme List, and the prioritised schemes for Section 106 St Neots MTTS funds.**

*Recommendation:* **It is recommended that the Committee:**

- a) approve the Transport Investment Plan 2016**
- b) approve the amendments to the St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy Scheme List**
- c) approve the allocation of S106 funds to develop the business case for a northern crossing in St Neots**
- d) approve the prioritisation of St Neots schemes for S106 funds**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>	
Name:	Elsa Evans
Post:	Funding and Innovation Programme Manager
Email:	<a href="mailto:Elsa.Evans@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Elsa.Evans@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 715943

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 At its meeting in July 2016 Members of the Council's E&E Committee approved the new Transport Investment Plan approach in relation to:
- a) managing information relating to transport infrastructure investment;
  - b) managing the pooling of Section 106 contributions and other funding sources; and
  - c) the future sign-off process for schemes in the TIP.
- 1.2 Members consider the full list of schemes in the TIP for sign-off in the Autumn of each year to enable input to the Integrated Transport Block funding allocation and to the [Transport Delivery Plan](#) for programmed delivery. This is set out in the minutes of [E&E Committee Meeting 14 July 2016](#) item 238. The TIP schemes list will be updated throughout the year with new schemes added to the list as they are identified, for example from new strategies and plans.
- 1.3 In line with the approach being taken across Cambridgeshire, a district-wide transport strategy will be developed next year for Huntingdonshire replacing the existing Market Town Transport Strategies. However, there is a significant amount of S106 money from the Loves Farm development that need to be spent by July 2018 on schemes identified in the St Neots MTTS (or any amendment to this strategy). For this reason work has been prioritised to amend the St Neots MTTS in order to identify additional schemes that can be delivered in this timescale.
- 1.4 At the meeting on 9 June, Members of the E&E Committee considered the recommendation of four schemes for the allocation of S106 St Neots MTTS monies. Given the age of the existing St Neots MTTS adopted in 2008, Members highlighted the need to ensure projects aligned with more up to date priorities in the new St Neots Neighbourhood Plan. The Committee resolved to defer the recommendation report and asked officers to consult with St Neots Town Council regarding using the S106 monies for identified Neighbourhood Plan transport improvement priorities and following this, to bring a revised report back to the next appropriate meeting.
- 1.5 A prioritisation assessment of the schemes in the Amended St Neots MTTS, as included in the Cambridgeshire TIP, has been undertaken. The prioritisation methodology and the prioritised schemes are detailed in this report. Recommendations for the allocation of S106 MTTS funding is based on this prioritisation.

## **2. THE TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP)**

- 2.1 The TIP for Cambridgeshire sets out the transport infrastructure, services and initiatives that are required to support the growth of Cambridgeshire. The TIP comprises a policy document and a list of schemes.
- 2.2 The TIP policy document describes the uses of the Plan, the links to policies and strategies, the layout of the TIP list and the process for updating the list. The TIP policy document is attached in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 The TIP list is intended to be a live document. The full list as at the end of

August is attached in Appendix 2. The list is presented in District order:

- 2(i) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire
- 2(ii) East Cambridgeshire
- 2(iii) Fenland
- 2(iv) Huntingdonshire
- 2(v) Cross-district and County-wide

- 2.4 Once approved by the E&E Committee, the TIP including the plan document and the scheme list will be published on the County Council's corporate website on the [Transport plans and policies](#) page. The list will be updated regularly throughout the year and brought to Members of the E&E Committee on an annual basis in September/October.

### **3. ST NEOTS MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY (MTTS) AMENDMENTS**

- 3.1 To comply with the Loves Farm S106 Agreement MTTS obligations, any amendments to the MTTS must be approved in order to be allocated S106 monies. The amended schemes are included in the proposed Transport Investment Plan list 2016 referred to in paragraph 2.3 above.
- 3.2 Given the urgency of the work and the fact that a district-wide strategy will be developed next year, a full review of the strategy has not been undertaken. Instead, a review of the scheme list has been undertaken. Working in conjunction with local Members and the Town Council, a long list of schemes was compiled from schemes in the MTTS that haven't yet been implemented, infrastructure requirements identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process and from needs identified in the St Neots pedestrian and cycle audit.
- 3.3 This long list was then assessed against the relevance for a Market Town Transport Strategy to derive a Qualifying List. Schemes that are deemed not relevant under these principles are:
- Schemes on strategic routes, such as the A428 highway improvements and East-West Rail, have much wider impact than St Neots town – these schemes are considered as part of the Transport Investment Plan
  - Schemes that have implications on the local highway network much wider than St Neots town – these schemes will be considered as part of the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy next year
  - Transport concepts rather than schemes such as Northern Link Road A428-A1 are not developed enough for inclusion in a scheme list – these will be considered for the TIP should they become more developed.
- 3.4 It is this qualifying list that is proposed as the formal amendment to the St Neots MTTS Scheme List and for inclusion in the TIP.
- 3.5 The indicative locations of the prioritised schemes are shown in two maps in Appendix 3 – 3(i) for St Neots and 3(ii) for Little Paxton.

#### **4. ST NEOTS NORTHERN CROSSING – SECOND PEDESTRIAN/CYCLE BRIDGE**

4.1 Through dialogue with the Town Council, the issue of a second pedestrian/cycle bridge (northern crossing) has been raised. The scheme is compatible with the objectives of both LTP3 and the Neighbourhood Plan. Indeed it was mentioned in the adopted St Neots MTTS 2008, although at the time resources were focused on the delivery of the Willow Bridge, which serves the south of the town and was opened in 2011. St Neots Town Council through the Neighbourhood Plan have identified this piece of infrastructure as a priority for the town and wish to see the S106 MTTS monies spent on it.

4.2 However, early high level work on this has identified key risks, which result in a relatively low deliverability score for this scheme. Key risks are:

- 1) The cost of the bridge is likely to be significantly higher than the S106 funds available, further funding is required;
- 2) The bridge and its associated paths/approach ramps could have considerable land take issues in addition to the area required for the bridge span and its foundations. Issues which would need to be considered would include:
  - Level of existing ground either side of the river compared to height of the bridge, in order to ensure approach ramps are suitable for use by those with mobility issues
  - Extent of flooding (if any) experienced on adjacent land, to ensure the crossing is not rendered unusable during adverse conditions
- 3) Potentially lower risk regarding ownership of the land including transfer/dedication, as ownership appears to be mostly HDC
- 4) There could be requirements (including obtaining necessary consents) imposed by the Environment Agency as the body responsible for managing risk of flooding from main rivers
- 5) Length of time to design the superstructure and its foundations, which will require a fair amount of pre-work such as ground investigation, topographical surveys.

4.3 To enable a more robust cost and delivery issues to be understood, it is recommended that funding is made available from St Neots S106 to develop the business case for such a crossing/bridge. This could then inform the allocation of St Neots S106 funding to schemes for delivery.

#### **5. PRIORITISATION OF ST NEOTS SCHEMES FOR S106 MTTS FUNDING**

5.1 The St Neots MTTS S106 fund currently contains £1,270,358 of which £463,844 from the Loves Farm development needs to be spent by July 2018. The remaining funds £806,514 should be spent by November 2020 and beyond. An estimated further £138,000 is expected when the obligation triggers are met on current developments in the town.

5.2 Prioritisation methodology

5.2.1 The schemes within the St Neots MTTS Amended Scheme List are

assessed and prioritised, using criteria similar to the Department for Transport's Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST). The assessment criteria and scoring definition are shown in Appendix 4. In summary, the criteria are based on meeting strategy objectives and on deliverability:

Meeting Strategy Objectives:

- Strategic Case – Meeting Local Transport Plan (LTP3) objectives
- Strategic Case – Meeting St Neots Neighbourhood Plan objectives

Deliverability:

- Delivery Case – Practical feasibility
- Delivery Case – Evidence of stakeholder support
- Economic Case – Scale of impact of the project
- Financial Case – Match/alternative funding
- Financial Case - Affordability

- 5.2.2 The two Meeting Strategy Objectives scores are added to give a Total Objective Score. Given the constraint of the S106 spend deadline, the Delivery Case scores are double weighted. The six Deliverability scores are added to give a Weighted Deliverability Score.
- 5.3 The prioritised schemes are shown in Appendix 5 in the order of Total Objective Score. The Weighted Deliverability Score for the respective scheme is indicated alongside for reference.
- 5.4 The scheme that scores highest on Meeting Strategy Objectives is the bridge. However, the Deliverability Score is low, due to the risks identified in paragraph 4.2 above. Until the business case for the bridge is completed in 4-5 months' time, it will not be possible to ascertain how much, when and whether further S106 funds can be spent on detailed design works and planning application before the spend deadline of 2018.
- 5.5 Officers therefore recommend that the prioritised projects in Appendix 5 are approved in order that options are available to spend £413,844 (funds left after an estimated £50,000 for the bridge business case). Refer to paragraph 5.1 above.
- 5.6 Should there be a strong business case AND a full funding package can be sourced, then it is proposed that the bridge will be the top priority with as much of the £413,844 as possible to be spent on it. Any remaining balance that cannot be used on the bridge by 2018 will be spent on the next possible project(s) on the project list depending on the amount of money available. As time is critical for spending S106 money by July 2018, it is proposed that once the prioritised order of schemes is approved by Members, officers will proceed with delivery without going through Committee approval again.
- 5.7 Likewise, the remaining S106 funds with longer spend deadline will be allocated following the same principles as above, i.e. if the bridge goes ahead, then all S106 money available will go towards funding it.
- 5.8 It should be noted that the St Neots MTTs S106 alone (£1.4 million) will not be able to cover the full costs of the proposed Northern Crossing. Other sources of funds will need to be sourced and could include existing and future Community Infrastructure Levy that will be collected by St Neots Town Council. There is also the possibility of agreeing to use a portion of the

Integrated Transport Block funding that is available to Cambridgeshire on an annual basis.

## **6. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

### **6.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

- Schemes in the Transport Investment Plan aim to either provide direct improvements to the road network or in many cases look to encourage a shift to sustainable transport modes. Managing congestion in these ways will enable growth and support the local economy.

### **6.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

- Proposed schemes in the Transport Investment Plan should help to improve accessibility and as such help people live healthy and independent lives by improving cycling and pedestrian facilities, sustainable transport information and public transport.
- The proposed northern crossing pedestrian/cycle bridge should help to improve accessibility and as such help people live healthy and independent lives.

### **6.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

- Junction improvements and improved cycling and walking infrastructure will support and protect vulnerable people, in particular children, and at locations of high risk of injury crashes.

## **7. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

### **7.1 Resource Implications**

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

- Management of the TIP will not bring about any significant resource implications, as the aim is to streamline processes around the management of transport infrastructure planning and the management of Section 106 money.
- The fast-tracked review of the St Neots MTTS has involved additional Transport Officers time on top of that which was originally programmed. Resource is also required to commission and undertake the business case for the proposed northern crossing described in section 4 of this report.

### **7.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications**

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

- The Loves Farm S106 Agreement specifies that MTTs contributions must be spent on the St Neots MTTs or amendments to the Strategy. Therefore, schemes need to be formally added to this list as Amendment if we wish to spend S106 contributions on them.
- High level risks have been identified for the St Neots northern crossing / bridge. A robust business case is required before S106 and other funding are committed to delivering the scheme.

### 7.3 **Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category. Equality Impact Assessment for individual schemes will be undertaken as appropriate.

### 7.4 **Engagement and Consultation Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category. Consultation for individual schemes will be undertaken as appropriate.

### 7.5 **Localism and Local Member Involvement**

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

- There are no significant implications for the Transport Investment Plan. Local Members are involved at individual scheme level.
- The St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy schemes have been reviewed by officers in conjunction with Local Members and St Neots Town Council resulting in the proposed amendments as described in section 3 above.
- Local Members and the Town Council are involved in the proposed St Neots northern crossing, and will be with the development of the business case.

### 7.6 **Public Health Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category. The TIP includes active travel modes and safety schemes which promote public health. The Public Health service will have been consulted on schemes through Local Transport Plan consultations and consultation on Planning Applications and proposed mitigation. It is also anticipated that the Public Health service would be consulted further when individual schemes are developed further for delivery.

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
<b>Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Julie Thornton
<b>Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?</b>	Yes (no significant implications) Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Mark Miller

<b>cleared by Communications?</b>	
<b>Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Emma Middleton on behalf of Paul Tadd
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
Local transport plans and policies	<a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20006/travel_roads_and_parking/66/transport_plans_and_policies">http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20006/travel_roads_and_parking/66/transport_plans_and_policies</a>
Transport Delivery Plan	<a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20006/travel_roads_and_parking/66/transport_plans_and_policies/4">http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20006/travel_roads_and_parking/66/transport_plans_and_policies/4</a>
St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy 2008	<a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/930/st_neots_market_town_strategy">http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/930/st_neots_market_town_strategy</a>
St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029	<a href="http://www.stneots-tc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/St-Neots-NDP-24-February-2016-Final-Plan.pdf">http://www.stneots-tc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/St-Neots-NDP-24-February-2016-Final-Plan.pdf</a>