

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
1	The Combined Authority welcomes the alignment between its Local Transport Plan ambitions to reduce carbon emissions to net zero by 2050 and the policies set out in the EEH draft strategy	Amber	<p>Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieving net-zero carbon emissions from transport no later than 2050</li> <li>• Improving quality of life and wellbeing through an inclusive transport system accessible to all which emphasises sustainable and active travel</li> <li>• Supporting the regional economy by connecting people and businesses to markets and opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring the Heartland works for the UK by enabling the efficient movement of people and goods through the region and to/from international gateways.</li> </ul>	<p>Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieving net-zero carbon emissions from transport no later than 2050, with an ambition to reach this by 2040</li> <li>• Improving quality of life and wellbeing through a safe and inclusive transport system accessible to all which emphasises sustainable and active travel</li> <li>• Supporting the regional economy by connecting people and businesses to markets and opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring the Heartland works for the UK by enabling the efficient movement of people and goods through the region and to/from international gateways, in a way which lessens its environmental impact.</li> </ul>	Alignment remains between the principles and those within the Local Transport Plan. Amendment to the wording of the first principle to be considered (regarding the ambition to reach net zero by 2040)

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
2	Pleasing to see in policy 4 a broadly similar user hierarchy to that set out set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LTP	Amber	<p>Policy 4: We will work with infrastructure owners and operators to ensure that proposals brought forward for the development of the transport system reduce reliance on the private car by considering the needs of users on the basis of the following hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Active Travel Modes (pedestrians and cyclists)</li> <li>ii) Public transport and shared modes (bus, scheduled coach and rail)</li> <li>iii) Low emission/ zero carbon private vehicles, including two wheeler vehicles</li> <li>iv) Other Motorised modes</li> </ul> <p>All proposals to be prepared on the basis that they provide inclusive and accessible travel options for all users.</p>	<p>We will work with infrastructure owners and operators to ensure that proposals brought forward for the development of the transport system reduce reliance on the private car by considering the needs of users on the basis of the following Travel Hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling access to services and opportunities without the need to travel</li> <li>• Active Travel Modes (pedestrians and cyclists)</li> <li>• Public transport and shared modes (bus, scheduled coach and rail)</li> <li>• Low emission/ zero carbon private vehicles, and two-wheeler vehicles including motorcycles</li> <li>• Other Motorised modes</li> </ul> <p>All proposals to be prepared on the basis that they provide inclusive and accessible travel options for all users.</p>	<p>Addition of enabling access to services and opportunities without the need to travel added to the document. The priority of the first two priorities continue to be assessed. This revised policy provides a hook for greater digital connectivity</p>
3	Pleased that policy 20 echoes the Combined Authority's policy on digitally enabling transport corridors	Complete	<p>Policy 20: To realise our decarbonisation commitments, while supporting economic growth, we will expect infrastructure owners to ensure that all new strategic infrastructure investment is designed as digitally enabled corridors.</p>	No change	No change

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
4	Policy 24 supports the delivery of high quality sustainable mass transit systems such as the CAM	Complete	<p>Policy 24: We will support the development and delivery of high quality, segregated mass transit systems where there is the potential market for its long-term sustainability; priority will be given to supporting the delivery of such systems in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge (the CAM)</li> <li>• Milton Keynes</li> <li>• The A414 corridor in Hertfordshire</li> </ul>	<p>Working with partners and operators, we promote the development and delivery of high quality public transport and segregated mass transit systems. Initial priority will be given to supporting the delivery of Mass Rapid Transit in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro</li> <li>• Milton Keynes Rapid Transit</li> <li>• The A414 corridor in Hertfordshire.</li> <li>• Oxford sub-urban network - Bus rapid transit and Cowley branch line</li> </ul> <p>Where further transit systems are identified, we will work with partners to maximise their potential and deliverability.</p>	Policy revised to show an appetite for mass transit systems elsewhere in the region - however CAM remains first and centre
5	The policy set does not recognise the full potential of the CAM, which is a regional solution for the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough rather than a Cambridge-focussed scheme, and is both a low-carbon solution, and an enabler of sustainable housing and employment growth	Amber	See Ref #4	See Ref #4	No mention specifically within the policy around the CAM providing access to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough; however the language use changes the reference from Cambridge to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
6	Policy 5, for example, could consider adopting a “doubling nature” ambition of the kind embodied in the Combined Authority’s policies	Amber	Policy 5: In identifying future investment requirements, we will prioritise proposals on the basis of value for money, their contribution towards achieving net-zero carbon targets, and their contribution to wider sustainability and environmental net gain outcomes.	In identifying future investment requirements, we will prioritise proposals on the basis of value for money, their contribution towards achieving net-zero carbon targets, and their contribution to wider sustainability, environmental net gains and health outcomes.	<p>The policy was changed to reflect health outcomes; however no amendments on the potential to adopt a 'doubling nature' ambition</p> <p>However on page 6 the strategy now reads "all new transport-related development should protect and enhance the environment and be based on the principles of net-zero carbon, net biodiversity gain, net environmental gain and contribute towards doubling the land actively managed for nature"</p>

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
7	<p>Combined Authority also supports the central, and in the future the Eastern, sections of East West Rail (policy 7, 8), including the new station at Cambridge South (policy 10). EEH should consider supporting the Combined Authority in pressing for Cambridge South to be delivered by 2025</p>	<p>Complete</p>	<p>Policy 7: We support the delivery of the East West Rail project (including its Eastern Section), with the expectation that Phase 2 of the Western Section is open from Oxford – Bedford by 2024, Aylesbury – Milton Keynes by 2025 and the Central Section by 2030.</p> <p>Policy 10: We will work with partners, the EWRCo and Network Rail to ensure that where the East West Main Line intersects existing main lines the opportunity is taken to establish regionally significant transport hubs: priority will be given to developing proposals in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oxford Stations</li> <li>• Bicester Stations</li> <li>• Aylesbury Station</li> <li>• Bletchley/Milton Keynes Stations</li> <li>• Bedford Midland Station</li> <li>• East West Rail/East Coast Main Line</li> <li>• Cambridge/Cambridge South Stations.</li> </ul>	<p>We support the delivery of the East West Rail project (including the ‘eastern’ section from Ipswich and Norwich to Cambridge), with the expectation that Oxford to Bedford is open by 2024, Aylesbury-to Milton Keynes by 2025; and Oxford-Cambridge by 2030.</p> <p>We will work with partners, the EWRCo and Network Rail to ensure that where the East West Main Line intersects existing main lines the opportunity is taken to establish regionally significant transport hubs: priority will be given to developing proposals in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oxford Stations</li> <li>• Bicester Stations</li> <li>• Aylesbury Station</li> <li>• Bletchley/Milton Keynes Stations</li> <li>• Bedford Midland Station</li> <li>• East West Rail/East Coast Main Line</li> <li>• Cambridge/ Cambridge South Stations</li> </ul> <p>In addition, on page 18 under "Improving North-South Connectivity" the strategy states "we support the delivery of Cambridge South Station by 2025"</p>	<p>Comments taken on board and amendments made accordingly</p>

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
8	<p>We would welcome EEH's explicit support for increased capacity at Ely North Junction and on the line between Ely and Newmarket via Soham to support both passenger and freight traffic, and for the restoration of a rail service between Wisbech and Cambridge that can take advantage of new train paths created by that capacity (policy 17, policy 30).</p>	Amber	<p>Policy 17: We will work with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council alongside Network Rail and Government to support the priorities identified in the Cambridgeshire Rail Corridor Study</p> <p>Policy 30: We will work with Network Rail and all relevant Sub-national Transport Bodies to develop proposals that increase freight on the rail network with priority given to the following corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Felixstowe to Nuneaton</li> <li>• East West Main Line</li> <li>• Southampton to West Midlands</li> </ul>	<p>We will work with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council alongside Network Rail and Government to support the priorities identified in the Cambridgeshire Rail Corridor Study and we support the delivery of Cambridge South Station by 2025 and aspirations for services to/from a new station at Wisbech.</p> <p>We will work with Network Rail and all relevant Sub-national Transport Bodies to develop proposals that increase freight on the rail network with priority given to the following corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Felixstowe to Nuneaton</li> <li>• East West Main Line</li> <li>• Southampton to West Midlands</li> <li>• West Coast Main Line (Inc. Northampton Loop)</li> </ul> <p>Page 24: Delivery of the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements currently planned will provide some additional capacity on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton corridor. However, further investment in and electrification of that corridor will be required if rail freight is</p>	<p>Policy 17 amended to provide explicit support for the Wisbech rail reopening; however no mention in Policy 30 around the need for improvements at Ely North Junction specifically</p>

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
9	<p>Stansted Airport is very significant for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area and connectivity to Stansted via the M11 should be reflected as a priority in policy 28</p>	Complete	<p>Policy 28: We will work with infrastructure owners/ operators, Network Rail, Highways England and the Government to improve surface access by public transport to international airports in order to reduce the environmental footprint of their operations, with priority given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luton Airport – with a focus on improving travel opportunities via services on the Midland Main, and ensuring the right level of service and capacity on the Direct Air Rapid Transit service (DART)</li> <li>• Heathrow Airport – with a focus on improved interchange and connectivity via the Old Oak Common transport hub, and through delivery of Western Rail Access to Heathrow.</li> </ul>	<p>We will work with infrastructure owners/operators, Network Rail, Highways England and the Government to improve surface access by public transport to international airports in order to reduce the environmental footprint of their operations, with priority given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luton Airport – with a focus on improving travel opportunities via services on the Midland Main, and ensuring the right level of service and capacity on the Direct Air Rapid Transit service (DART)</li> <li>• Heathrow Airport – with a focus on improved interchange and connectivity via the Old Oak Common transport hub, and through delivery of Western Rail Access to Heathrow.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport – with a focus on improved travel opportunities via services on the West Anglia Main Line between Cambridge, Stansted, Bishops Stortford and London.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments taken on board and amendments made accordingly</p>

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
10	The key road freight corridors mentioned in policy 33 should include the A47, and reflect the need to dual that road between Peterborough and Wisbech	Amber	<p>Policy 33: We will work with Highways England, local highway authorities and the freight sector to ensure that strategic corridors for road freight and logistics are fit for purpose: priority will be given to the following corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M25/M1</li> <li>• The A34 and M40 north of Oxford</li> <li>• The A1 corridor (north of Huntingdon)</li> <li>• The A14</li> <li>• The A508 into Northampton</li> </ul>	<p>We will work with Highways England, local highway authorities, local planning authorities and the freight sector to ensure that strategic corridors for road freight and logistics are fit for purpose: priority will be given to the following corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M25/M1</li> <li>• The A34 and M40 north of Oxford</li> <li>• The A1 corridor (north of Huntingdon)</li> <li>• The A14</li> <li>• The A508 into Northampton.</li> </ul>	<p>EEH outline that they have recognised importance working with local authorities. Highways England suggested clarification about the list not being exhaustive.</p> <p>No mention of the A47 within the policy; however on page 31 there is reference to the A47 Wansford to Sutton and A47 Peterborough to Wisbech as part of the SRN and RIS2</p>



### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
11	A further key regional road priority the strategy should promote is dualling the A10 between Ely and Cambridge	Green	No reference	<p>Page 31: Investment, where required, in the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the Major Road Network (MRN) to support all road users and future proof the network. Delivery of investment in the Major Road Network (as outlined in EEH's initial 5-year programme of investment in the MRN submitted to the DfT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bedford Western Bypass Dualling</li> <li>• Aylesbury Eastern Link Road</li> <li>• Ely to Cambridge A10 Dualling Improvements (LLM)</li> <li>• Ely to Cambridge A10 Junction Improvements</li> <li>• A1139 University Centre Access, Peterborough</li> <li>• A10 Corridor Scheme, Broxbourne</li> <li>• Century Park Access Road Phase Two (LLM)</li> <li>• Vauxhall Way Improvements, Luton</li> <li>• A509 Isham Bypass</li> <li>• A43 Northampton-Kettering Phase Three</li> </ul>	Not included within the policies; however now reference in the section on targeted investment in the highway network
12	From a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough perspective, it is clear that EEH's current geography does not match the area's economic connectivity. As the comments on the Transport Strategy above make clear, Cambridge is not a bookend	Red	No reference	No reference	Other than the reference to the rail corridor and the need to provide enhancements along the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail corridor and HS2 there is no specific mention of the travel movements to Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk or the Midlands (areas beyond the EEH boundaries) within the Transport Strategy

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
13	The Combined Authority would therefore invite EEH to begin discussions with Transport for the East and its own members about the potential for fixing a genuinely strategic geography on which future conversations about a STB role might be based	Amber	No reference	<p>Page 8: The Heartland's location within the United Kingdom makes our relationship with neighbouring regions of great strategic importance, both in terms of economic linkages and as part of the wider transport system that connects other regions and national with the UK's global gateways</p> <p>Page 23: We will work with adjoining Sub-national Transport Bodies and Network Rail to assess the need for improved surface access to the other international gateways that support our region including Birmingham Airport, East Midlands Airport (for freight) and St Pancras International</p>	<p>Some reference to movements beyond the boundaries such as the East Midlands in the Luton-Bedford-Wellingborough-East Midlands work (page 18), Stansted Airport (Ref #9) and East-West Rail (Ref #7) however limited on the movements between regions (in and out)</p> <p>Update to be sought from EEH on the discussions being had (CPCA to be involved going forward?)</p>
14	The Combined Authority and its member councils are also sceptical about the proposed model of concurrent powers, especially in relation to highways interventions and bus partnerships	Red		No specific reference within the Transport Strategy	Aligns to Ref #13, #16 and #17
15	Coordinating the exercise of concurrent powers threatens the creation of a new bureaucratic industry. Effective upstream alignment of strategy is a more effective and much cheaper tool than dual-running the exercise of powers	Red		No specific reference within the Transport Strategy	Statement

### EEH Transport Strategy: CPCA Feedback

Ref	CPCA Comment	RAGC Status	Initial EEH Document	Revised EEH Document	Comment
16	The Combined Authority is far advanced with business plans for the reform of bus commissioning in this area: the potential for a further layer of bus commissioning to be added could jeopardise the good progress that has been made with operators and other stakeholders, at a time when the bus market has been seriously disrupted by Covid, rendering much work and public expense nugatory	Amber		Page 21 now states "Across the region, we will work with bus operators, through the EEH Bus Operators Association, to develop a long-term plan to support the role of scheduled bus and coach services"	No other reference to the bus industry and the commissioning within this sector in the papers seen to date - an update needed from EEH
17	A number of the Combined Authority's member councils are not supportive of the creation of a statutory STB under any circumstances. They take the view that decision should be taken as close to the citizen as possible and that a regional STB is too remote	Amber		No mention of a statutory STB within the Transport Strategy; however in the Operating Framework there is reference to "England's Economic Heartland is recognised by Government as the Sub-national Transport Body (STB) for the Heartland region"	With the development of the Operating Framework the question should be asked as to whether the EEH are positioning themselves as a statutory STB for the Heartland? No reference within the document and at the meeting on Friday 5th February it was reinforced to Mayor Palmer by Mayor Hodgson and Martin Tugwell that the EEH are not "trying to take powers away from the LTAs - as I think everyone on this call would have problems with that". Review of EEH governance to be encouraged