

## A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme

To: Highways and Transport

Meeting Date: 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director Place and Economy

Electoral division(s):

Ely South, Soham South and Haddenham, Waterbeach, Cottenham and Willingham, Huntingdon North and Hartford, Godmanchester and Huntingdon South, St Ives North and Wyton, The Hemingfords and Fenstanton, St Ives South and Needingworth.

Key decision: Yes

Forward Plan ref: 2022/086

Outcome: The purpose of the report is to update the Committee with progress of the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme. The Committee is asked to agree the next steps so that the Strategic Outline Business Case for each scheme can be revalidated and subsequently enable the schemes to progress into the Outline Business Case stage

Recommendation: That the Committee:

a) notes and comments on the update report and the progress made with the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme;

b) the Council agrees to accept in total £4M of funding ( in total over 2022/23 and 2023/24) from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the revalidation of the Strategic Outline Business Case for the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme and subsequently prepare to undertake the Outline Business Case;

c) delegate the decision to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme to the Service Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the s151 officer;

d) supports the establishment of a Member Working Group involving District Councils to run in parallel to scheme development and stakeholder engagement for A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme;

e) the Council agrees to accept in total £6M of funding (£1.841M in 2022/23, £3.311M in 2023/24 and £0.848M in 2024/25) from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the revalidation of the Strategic Outline Business Case for the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme and subsequently prepare to undertake the Outline Business Case, subject to this level of funding being granted by the CPCA;

f) delegate the decision to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme to the Service Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the s151 officer;

g) supports the establishment of a Member Working Group involving District Councils to run in parallel to scheme development and stakeholder engagement for A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme;

Officer contact:

Name: David Mitchell  
Post: Interim Team Leader, Project Delivery  
Email: [david.mitchell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:david.mitchell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01223 706805

Member contacts:

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

## 1. Background

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Committee on 7 December 2021 the committee considered a report on A10 Ely to Cambridge Outline Business Case. The Committee confirmed that subject to the agreement of the scope of the work and of an appropriate funding agreement, Cambridgeshire County Council undertakes development work up to and including the production of an Outline Business Case for improvements to the A10 between Ely and Cambridge. It has recently been agreed with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) that this scheme should be renamed A10 Ely to A14 Improvements.
- 1.2 At the meeting of the Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020 members considered a report regarding the A141 and St Ives Transport Study. The report provided a summary of the A141 Transport Study and a more detailed report on the St Ives Transport Study. Work has continued with the CPCA to develop the A141 Transport Study into an outline business case which will be brought to committee for consideration in the future. It has recently been agreed with the CPCA that this scheme should be renamed A141 and St Ives Improvements.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to update the Committee regarding progress with the two schemes and the Committee is asked to agree the next steps so that the Strategic Outline Business Case for each scheme can be revalidated and subsequently enable the schemes to be progressed into the Outline Business Case stage.

## 2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The A10 Ely to A14 scheme is designed to progress the completed Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) work commissioned by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), to meet the requirements of grant funding from the Department for Transport (DfT). This proposes the preparation of an Outline Business Case (OBC) to DfT Green Book, CPCA, and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) assurance requirements, including a preferred route accompanied by robust costs and a preliminary design with full supporting information. A key early stage of the scheme is to revalidate the outcomes of the SOBC in the context of updated guidance, e.g., Local Transport Note 1/20, the requirement to assess the carbon implications of schemes and requirement for net increase in biodiversity to be at least 20%. Once the SOBC has been revalidated and any implications of this work established, the scheme can move into the OBC stage.
- 2.2 The A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme is designed to progress the completed Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) work commissioned by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), to meet the potential future requirements of any grant funding from the Department for Transport (DfT). This proposes the preparation of an Outline Business Case (OBC) to DfT Green Book, CPCA, and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) assurance requirements, including a preferred route accompanied by robust costs and a preliminary design with full supporting information. A key early stage of the scheme is to revalidate the outcomes of the SOBC for the same reasons as set out in paragraph 2.1.

- 2.3 The programme for the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme is currently being prepared with the selected supplier from the Joint Professional Services Framework (JPSF). The initial expectation is that the work will be completed across the two financial years 2022/23 and 2023/24. The resources required from the County Council teams to support delivery are being assessed and engaged so that they will be available to meet the demands of the scheme when required.
- 2.4 The programme for the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme is currently being prepared with the selected supplier from the Joint Professional Services Framework (JPSF). The initial expectation is that the work will be completed across the three financial years 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25. The resources required from the County Council teams to support delivery are being assessed and engaged so that they will be available to meet the demands of the scheme when required.

### Financial Implications

- 2.5 For the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme a paper was submitted to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022. The Board approved the drawdown of £4M funding on the 26<sup>th</sup> January 2022, to enable full commencement of the A10 Ely to A14 Improvements scheme. The initial programme indicates completion in 2023/24 so that this is in line with the Department of Transport expectations regarding consideration of future funding for detailed design and construction. It is clearly important that momentum is maintained on this challenging programme.
- 2.6 For the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme it is anticipated that a paper will be submitted to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2022. It is also anticipated that The Board will consider approval of the drawdown of £6M funding on the 27<sup>th</sup> July 2022, to enable full commencement of the A141 and St Ives Improvements scheme. The Council and the Combined Authority will look to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies wherever possible to reduce the burden on our budgets. This will be kept under constant review and reinvested within the programme especially when further information becomes available. An update will be provided in a timely manner. The estimated costs have been provided to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in the table below.

	£M 2022/23	£M 2023/24	£M 2024/25
Consultants	0.800	1.923	0.503
CPCA (Note 1)	0.073	0.098	0.024
CCC	0.292	0.390	0.097
Risk (Note 4)	0.288	0.400	0.062
Third party (Note2)	0.338	0.450	0.112
Consultation (Note3)	0.050	0.050	0.050
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.841</b>	<b>3.311</b>	<b>0.848</b>

### Notes

1. The estimated value for CPCA costs has been assumed at 25% of the CCC estimate.

2. The total of estimated third party costs is £0.9M. This includes the £0.5M for Network Rail as advised by the CPCA. The additional £0.4M allows for the potential other requirements from other statutory bodies e.g. Environment Agency, water authorities, drainage boards, Middle Level Commissioners etc
  3. The values for consultation are the additional expenses that CCC may occur with consultation over and above any consultation work undertaken by consultants.
  4. Since the work scope for consultants is not confirmed at the time of providing this estimate the risk value is an allowance only at this stage but would cover additional surveys, land access charges, legal agreements etc.
- 2.7 In order to secure the funding the Council will need to enter into a separate Grant Funding Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for each scheme. In advance of the Grant Funding Agreements being in place the Council has received and signed Letter of Intent agreements with the CPCA which released limited funding to start the Council's project management process for each scheme.
- 2.8 For both schemes project risks will be managed through project governance, where the Council are the Delivery Agent and the CPCA are the Project Sponsors (funders). The Project Boards for each project will make the key decisions and hold the financial and programme risks. The Project Boards will have officer representatives of both organisations. The officers must hold appropriate financial and decision-making authority to enable participation, input and make decisions on behalf of the body they represent. The approach to budget management and risk will be tiered with only key decisions being made by the project board. This will include control over strategic scope change, financial and programme change and the reporting of health and safety matters throughout the project life cycle.

### Stakeholder Engagement

- 2.9 It is anticipated that both significant schemes in the development of important infrastructure within the County will attract significant interest from a variety of stakeholders, including statutory and non-statutory bodies, businesses, community groups and individuals. It is suggested that for each of these schemes a Member Working Group, including representatives from District Councils is established so that the Member Working Groups can consider plans as they develop for stakeholder engagement.

## 3. Alignment with corporate priorities

### 3.1 Environment and Sustainability

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

- Current travel conditions between Ely and Cambridge, particularly in peak periods, are unreliable and congested. The Ely to Cambridge study identified multi-modal

transport solutions to address this issue, and to support planned growth. The OBC work takes forward the highway strand of the recommendations from that study, and should address the needs of all users, including cyclists, pedestrians, disabled people, equestrians and public transport users

- Transport investment in St Ives and Huntingdon has been identified which could reduce traffic from inappropriate routes and deliver improved facilities for more sustainable travel modes.
- The assessment of carbon both embedded in the schemes and as potential carbon savings generated by the schemes will be carefully considered during the revalidation of the SOBC work for both schemes. The assessment is known as a Lifecycle Carbon Assessment. The selection criteria for the preferred schemes to be developed within the OBC stage for each scheme is anticipated to take into consideration the carbon implications.

### 3.2 Health and Care

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

- Air quality impacts will be quantified in detail in the Outline Business Case. The potential provision of more sustainable forms of transport should bring associated health benefits in enabling an increase in non-motorised forms of transport.

### 3.3 Places and Communities

The following bullet point sets out details of implications identified by officers:

- Achieving good access and connectivity for major development planned at a new town north of Waterbeach and at North East Cambridge is a priority for the Council and the Local Planning Authorities.
- Transport investment has been identified and funding allocated by the Combined Authority for further study work into strategic infrastructure in the area which will cater for future growth requirements and improve the transport network and the economy.

### 3.4 Children and Young People

There are no significant implications for this priority

### 3.5 Transport

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

- Current travel conditions between Ely and Cambridge, particularly in peak periods, are unreliable and congested. The Ely to Cambridge study identified multi-modal transport solutions to address this issue, and to support planned growth. The OBC work takes forward the highway strand of the recommendations from that study, and should address the needs of all users, including cyclists, pedestrians, disabled people, equestrians and public transport users
- Transport investment in St Ives and Huntingdon has been identified which could reduce traffic from inappropriate routes and deliver improved facilities for more sustainable travel modes.

## 4. Significant Implications

### 4.1 Resource Implications

Resources have been made available to deliver these schemes within defined budgets.

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

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.3 and 2.4. Currently the work scope is for design activities only that are being procured through the Councils Preferred Supplier Framework.

### 4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.7. Grant Funding Agreements between the Council and CPCA are being prepared for each scheme. Both schemes will be managed using established governance and risk management to ensure compliance, programme and delivering the schemes within approved budgets.

### 4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

The following bullet point sets out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- While this work will be undertaken on behalf on the CPCA, Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken and kept under review throughout the programme at the appropriate stages.

### 4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.9

### 4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.9

### 4.7 Public Health Implications

There can be significant implications to public health both positive and negative in the delivery of infrastructure schemes. This report is about process and funding rather than the detail of the schemes themselves. At this stage there are no significant public health implications. Due to the immaturity of the schemes at this stage it is not possible to consider the specific public health implications of them. The Outline Business Case stage of both schemes will include considerations of the public health implications.

- 4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas (See further guidance in Appendix 2):
- 4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.  
Neutral Status:  
Explanation: The schemes will not impact on any buildings.
- 4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.  
Status: To be determined  
Explanation: Low carbon transport options are being developed in the scheme. It is too early to determine the status of the impact.
- 4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.  
Positive Status:  
Explanation: One of the key issues is to ensure compliance with the CCC requirement for an increase in biodiversity net gain by 20% within the schemes. Both schemes include specific work in examining the existing environment and assessing any impacts from potential measures.
- 4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.  
Neutral Status:  
Explanation: The potential improvements that develop from these schemes will produce waste during the construction phase, however any impact will be minimised by the choice of construction materials and maximising opportunities for recycling, including aggregates, concrete and re-use of bituminous material. Further where suitable as the end product, existing materials will be retained within the potential improvements.
- 4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:  
Neutral Status:  
Explanation: the schemes are not sufficiently mature to determine the status at this stage.
- 4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.  
Status: To be determined  
Explanation: Air quality impacts will be quantified in detail in the Outline Business Case.
- 4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.  
Neutral Status:  
Explanation: The Outline Business Case will need to address any implications in this area.

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: Clare Ellis

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: Alex Deans

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?

Yes

Name of Officer: Iain Green

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

Yes

Name of Officer: Emily Bolton

## 5. Source documents guidance

### 5.1 Source documents

Committee report A10 Ely to Cambridge OBC reported to 7 December 2021 Committee meeting link here: [Document.ashx \(cmis.uk.com\)](#)

Committee report A141 and St Ives Transport Study reported to 15 September 2020 Committee meeting link here [Document.ashx \(cmis.uk.com\)](#)

### 5.2 Location

n/a