



Transport & Infrastructure Committee

Draft Minutes

Wednesday 17 January 2024

Venue:	Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, Huntingdon PE29 3TN	
Time:	10.00 to 13.00	
Present:	Councillor Anna Smith Mayor Dr Nik Johnson Councillor Alan Sharp Councillor Ray Bisby Councillor Neil Shailer Councillor Sam Wakeford Councillor Chris Seaton Councillor Peter McDonald Ms Rebecca Stevens Mr Andy Williams	Chair and Member for Cambridge City Council CPCA Mayor East Cambridgeshire District Council Peterborough City Council Cambridgeshire County Council Huntingdonshire District Council Fenland District Council South Cambridgeshire District Council Business Board Representative Business Board Representative
Apologies	Councillor Gavin Elsey	Peterborough City Council

Minutes:

1	Announcements, Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest
1.1	The Chair welcomed Judith Barker, the new Executive Director for Place and Connectivity and on behalf of the Committee, thanked Steve Cox, the Interim Director for all his work with the Committee over the past year.
1.2	Apologies were received from the Peterborough member, Cllr Elsey. Cllr Bisby attended as his substitute and was thanked by the Chair for attending as a temporary substitute at such short notice.
1.3	Cllr Seaton declared an interest as he was a trustee of FACT Community Transport and also Chairman of Hereward Community Rail Partnership. These were deemed non-pecuniary interests and therefore would not affect his participation in items on the agenda.
2	Draft Minutes and Action Log
2.1	The minutes of the meeting of 15 November 2023 were approved as an accurate record.
2.2	Tim Bellamy, Acting Assistant Director Transport updated the Committee on the following actions listed on the Action Log: <u>Item 4:</u> The Active Travel Lead had been in contact with the constituent councils on an individual basis to understand what the concerns were regarding active travel in the rural areas. This had been fed into a meeting that had recently taken place with Active Travel England and the work they were doing on rural accessibility.

	<p><u>Item 5:</u></p> <p>The Office for Road and Rail, and the ticket operator, had supplied data which would be used to present a more detailed informed position on Soham Station.</p>
3	<p>Public Questions</p> <p>3.1 Four public questions had been received. These had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting and can be found, together with the responses given, on the website here: CMIS > Meetings under additional meeting documents.</p> <p>None of those who had submitted questions were able to attend the meeting in person so the questions were read out by the Governance Manager and responses to each were given in turn by the Chair.</p>
4.	<p>Combined Authority Forward Plan</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <p>1. That the Combined Authority Forward Plan be noted.</p>
5	<p>Director's Monthly Highlight Report –November 2023</p> <p>5.1 Steve Cox, Executive Director – Place and Connectivity, introduced the report which provided the Committee with a general update on the key activities of the Place and Connectivity Directorate in relation to Transport and Infrastructure, which were not covered in other reports to this meeting. It also provided information on some key developments, risks and opportunities that had emerged.</p> <p>5.2 During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <p>a) Officers had worked very closely with Peterborough City Council (PCC) prior to Christmas to submit an ambitious Zebra 2 funding bid; the outcome of which was not yet known. Work was also going on in parallel on the options for a new bus depot in Peterborough with a view to replicating the success that had been had in Cambridge with zero emission buses.</p> <p>b) The EV officer was engaging with County colleagues on the EV Strategy and making sure the agricultural element to it was reflected.</p> <p>c) The CPCA was a member of the A47 Alliance group and continued to fund studies looking at the connectivity from Peterborough to Yarmouth. As part of these studies a whole fleet of measures and options, that would include dualling, would be examined.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <p>1. That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee note the report.</p>
6	<p>Bus Reform</p> <p>6.1 Neal Byers, Transport Consultant, introduced the report which set out the rationale for consulting on bus franchising as a viable option for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, whilst retaining the option to introduce an Enhanced Partnership. The paper summarised the potential benefits, challenges, and implications of transitioning to a franchised bus system with the aim to ensure that the bus network not only met the current needs of residents but was also poised to adapt and thrive in an ever-changing transport landscape.</p> <p>6.2 During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <p>a) On behalf of the Committee, the Chair extended her thanks to Neal for the work he had done on Bus Reform as this was to be his last Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting. Andrew Highfield, who was also present, and would be taking over from Neal in a permanent role, was welcomed to the Committee.</p>

- b) The role of the auditor was to make sure that the information to be put before the Board presented a robust business case that was sufficient for them to make a fully informed decision.
- c) Outside of the business case officers could provide contextual information such as a view of other areas that had introduced bus franchising and enhanced partnerships.
- d) Conversations with parish councils would take place as part of the general engagement on bus routes which was taking place in parallel with the discussion on enhanced partnerships and franchising.
- e) During the last week the auditors had asked questions around some of the evidence that underpinned the assumptions. In order to report back to the auditors, the report to Board would not be presented at their meeting on 31 January, as originally planned, but could be pushed back to the reserve date of 28 February. This extra time would allow for the auditor's report to be shared at a briefing session with the Committee before being presented at Board.
- f) A requirement of the public consultation process was to publish all the documentation associated with the Outline Business Case (OBC) and the auditor's report. Anyone at that time could therefore see the detail supporting the business case including the financial dimensions.
- g) West Yorkshire Combined Authority had recently gone through the same process and their consultation questions were still available if members wished to get a sense of what residents would be asked.
- h) The Mayor appealed to members to work with him and fully engage in the consultation process.
- i) The Chair clarified that the Board would be discussing whether to go out to public consultation with Franchising stated as the preferred model, not voting on whether franchising would happen or not.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS)

On being proposed by the Chair and seconded by Cllr McDonald, it was resolved to:

1. Note the progress of the Bus Reform business case, independent audit and recommendation to be considered by the CPCA Board
2. Comment on and agree the principle of proceeding with Franchising as the preferred model for bus reform (sections 2.14 - 2.18), for consideration of the CPCA Board
3. Note the Draft Proposed Franchising Scheme as described and set out in the exempt Appendix A
4. Note that the CPCA Board will receive the updated business case, report of the independent auditor and recommendation to proceed to public consultation.

ACTION:

1. A briefing session to be arranged for members before the OBC is presented to Board at their meeting on 28 February.

7	Bus Strategy Update (including Bus Network Review)
7.1	Neal Byers, Transport Consultant, introduced the report which set out the further findings of the Bus Network Review and the recommendations for the remaining services to complete the review.
7.2	<p>During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Cllr McDonald thanked officers for the work they had done with him and other councillors on some routes in the South Cambridgeshire area and asked that the area be considered for a future DRT trial b) Officers agreed that the work on Bus Stop Infrastructure was vitally important and further updates on this work would be forthcoming. c) Cllr Wakeford, as member for Huntingdonshire where the Ting Demand Response Transport (DRT) service had been trialled, was in favour of the pragmatic adjustments to the service that had been proposed. d) The initial retendering of the Ting service would continue in the area described in the report but over the course of the coming financial year, officers would be looking at other DRT trial areas.

- They would also have the opportunity to separate technology from the physical service so multiple areas could plug into one solution rather than having lots of competing ways of users engaging.
- e) As the idea of demand responsive/semi-flexible transport service grew across the wider area the CPCA would be able to think about how best to offer the service in an efficient way so that buses worked across multiple partner areas. Conversations would be had with colleagues across the boundary to look at cross boundary connectivity and to identify and maximise opportunities to connect with the places people wanted to travel to.
 - f) In the context of franchising, the CPCA would need to issue a service permit to enable those services that largely operated over the boundary to continue but with certain requirements mandated such as on the quality and timing of the service and how it integrated with the CPCA system.
 - g) There were opportunities around home to school transport and other bus services that were moving people around the Authority to see how they could be integrated or linked to get better efficiencies, not only for the Authority but also for other partners who were paying for bus services.
 - h) Members and residents of Peterborough were excited about the bid for Zebra 2 funding that had been put in which, if successful, would deliver 33 zero emission buses for the city.

RESOLVED: (UNANIMOUS)

On being proposed by the Chair and seconded by Cllr Wakeford, it was resolved to:

1. Recommend to the CPCA board the proposals for the two remaining tendered bus services which were placed under review and the bus services *for* which data was previously unavailable.
2. Note the submission of the Zebra round 2 bid to the Department for Transport and update on Bus Stop Infrastructure work.

8 Transport Funding Decisions

8.1 Tim Bellamy, Interim Assistant Director Transport, introduced the report which set out the funding decisions on the Regional Transport Model and the Royston to Granta Park study that officers were asking the Committee to approve.

8.2 During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Officers were already in discussion with National Highways about the movement on Junction 9 of the A505. In addition, the Regional Transport Model would help to further assess those movements so that an informed decision on the junction could be made.
- b) The scope of the Royston and Granta Park Study included all modes of travel, including active travel and would look not just at end to end but across the whole of the corridor.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS)

On being proposed by the Chair and seconded by Cllr Bisby it was resolved to;

1. Note the Royston and Granta Park study and progress undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council.
2. Approve the drawdown of £135,000 from the Transforming City Funds (TCF) from subject to approval funding to approved funding, to contribute towards the A505 Royston to Granta Park Study by Cambridgeshire County Council.
3. Note the progress on the Regional Transport Model.
4. Approve the drawdown of £78,430 from the Regional Transport Model subject to approval to approved to aid the delivery of works by Peterborough City Council on the Peterborough Transport Model (PTM4) as part of works for the Regional Transport Model project.

9 A10 Corridor Project

9.1 Matthew Lutz, Transport Programme Manager, gave a verbal update on the progress of the A10 corridor project and the potential themes that would be considered for the public consultation.

9.2 The key points highlighted in the update were as follows:

- a) The study focussed on movement along the corridor between Ely and Cambridge to explore opportunities to address existing and future challenges around capacity and road safety.
- b) The study area covered the A10 between the A10/A142 roundabout to the south of Ely ending before the Milton interchange and also considered the impacts of improvements on the surrounding area.
- c) Current users of the A10 between Ely and the A14 experienced congestion due to the volume of traffic, mix of vehicles (including HGVs and agricultural vehicles) and frequent road traffic incidents, particularly clustered around junctions. For non-motorised users the A10 failed to provide an attractive route due to the absence of dedicated facilities. These existing issues created a constraint on the economic performance of the region and negatively impacted on carbon emissions and the environmental and social wellbeing of local communities. These issues would all be exacerbated by the planned substantial growth in the corridor and region (including 44,000 jobs in Cambridge and Waterbeach New Town) if sustainable transport infrastructure was not in place.
- d) The project was aiming to complete the preparation of an Outline Business Case (OBC) to Green Book standards, in alignment with the Combined Authority's and Cambridgeshire County Council's (CCC) assurance requirements. This would entail a review and revalidation of the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) which was completed in July 2020, to make sure that recent changes in national and localised policies, standards, guidelines and data were considered. This would also ensure that the project continued to meet the requirements for grant funding from the Department for Transport (DfT).
- e) Re-engagement with the public and other stakeholders was important as this last took place in 2020 and there needed to be a period of open and transparent communication of the developments and changes within the project.
- f) The engagement would give the A10 corridor study team an opportunity to provide clear explanations of the distinctive elements and process, and to widely test views of the emerging new themes and possible options. This approach supported the DfT requirement for Localism to have been considered. With this in mind Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and the principle consultants WSV were undertaking a risk based assessment of the different engagement consultation options and would then produce updated programmes that reflected the different options available.
- g) A full briefing session for TIC members would be provided in due course outlining the themes and potential consultation material that would be tabled at subsequent TIC meetings.
- h) A programme of planned delivery would also be presented to members alongside continued engagement with the A10 working group. The output from this engagement would ensure that decision makers had a comprehensive understanding of public opinion, their concerns and the potential options.

9.3 The following points were made by councillors:

- a) It was timely to be able to stand back and consider what needed to be delivered in terms of connectivity, especially post Covid.
- b) The interchanges at both ends of the projected corridor, including the Milton Interchange needed to be carefully considered along with the impact that the traffic coming off that corridor would have.

ACTION:

1. A workshop on the A10 corridor project to be organised for members

<p>10</p> <p>10.1</p> <p>10.2</p>	<p>Peterborough Station Quarter (PSQ)</p> <p>Anna Graham, Transport Programme Manager, introduced the report which, subject to the Department for Transport's approval of the Outline Business Case (OBC), sought the Committee's approval of the OBC and the commencement of the Full Business Case (FBC) to the Combined Authority Board.</p> <p>During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The PSQ development had the potential to make a huge difference to Peterborough with wider economic growth and the expansion of businesses in the area. It was therefore important that it was looked at in a wider perspective and not just through a transport lens so that potential for the surrounding area of the Station and the links into the city centre were also carefully considered. b) The initial piece of work undertaken before launching into the OBC was to look at the overarching Masterplan and to take a phased approach to the wider project. The OBC was the first of these phases. c) The Chair highlighted the amount of work that had gone into this project and in particular the excellent partnership work, including with Peterborough City Council. <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> (UNANIMOUS)</p> <p>On being proposed by the Chair and seconded by Cllr Bisby it was resolved to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subject to the approval from the Department for Transport of the Outline Business Case, recommend to the Combined Authority Board to approve the Outline Business Case and approve the commencement of the Full Business Case. 2. Note that the Director of Place and Connectivity has the delegation to enter into a Grant Funding Agreement up to £1 million in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer.
<p>11</p> <p>11.1</p> <p>11.2</p>	<p>Budget and Performance Report</p> <p>Tim Greenwood, Finance Manager, introduced the report which provided an update of the financial position for 2023/24 and an analysis against the 2023/24 budgets, up to the period ending November 2023.</p> <p>During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The known delay to the A141 scheme was noted but members were reminded of its importance to the Huntingdonshire Local Plan and the need to expedite the project as soon as possible. b) Officers were in talks with the DfT to accelerate the A141 scheme. c) The figures stated in 3.4 of the report relating to Bus Services in PCC and CCC reflected the budget but would be reprofiled as part of the ongoing MTFP process. d) There had been a deferral on the Fletton Quays expenditure because it was a completed scheme with more than one source of funding being drawn upon with the funding streams with time limits being used first. The progress and deliverability of the project would not be affected by this. <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the financial position of the Transport Division for the financial year 23/24 to November 2023. <p><u>ACTION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officers to examine the causes of the difference between the Bus Services figure for CCC and that of PCC and report back to the Committee.

12	<p>Transport & Infrastructure Committee Agenda Plan</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>1. That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee Agenda Plan be noted.</p>
13	<p>Exclusion of the Press and Public</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>1. That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting remain in public session.</p>
14	<p>King's Dyke Update</p> <p>14.1 The Committee had no questions of the report, and it was agreed to note the item.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>1. To note the contents of the report.</p>
15	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>15.1 The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 13 March 2024.</p>

Meeting Ended: 11.54am