



## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020

Time: 10.00am – 12.43pm

Present: James Palmer (Mayor and Chairman), Councillors Ian Bates, Peter Hiller, Jon Neish, Nicky Massey, Chris Seaton and Aidan Van de Weyer

Apologies: Councillor Joshua Schumann

### 112. Apologies and declarations of interest

Apologies were received from Councillor Joshua Schumann. There were no declarations of interest.

### 113. Minutes – 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020 were approved as an accurate record. A copy would be signed by the Mayor when it was practical to do so.

### 114. Combined authority forward plan

The Combined Authority Forward Plan was noted.

### 115. Public questions

Two public questions were accepted. The questions and responses can be found [here](#)

There were no petitions

### 116. Budget and performance update

The Committee received the monthly budget and performance update. The presenting officers drew members' attention to the performance area of the report that included a range of transport specific metrics that had been previously requested. With regard to the revenue budget, new additions that had been included were highlighted to the Committee.

With regard to the capital budget there had been one addition made following approval from the Combined Authority Board which was the A10 Dualling Outline Business Case. There were also a number of projects that were due to complete that would provide savings in coming months.

It was resolved to:

Note the November budget and performance monitoring update.

## 117. Local transport plan CAM sub-strategy

The Committee received a report that presented an update regarding the Local Transport Plan CAM sub-strategy. Following its presentation to the Committee at its March 2020 meeting, a 12-week public consultation was undertaken. The responses to the consultation were broadly supportive of the objectives set out in the sub-strategy with only 10% of respondents disagreeing with the objectives and sub-objectives of the strategy.

During discussion of the report officers explained that feedback from the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) referenced at paragraph 2.12 of the report was contained in Appendix 3 of the report. The responses had been anonymised in compliance with data protection legislation, however, officers undertook to provide the response and demonstrate how the feedback had been incorporated following the meeting. **ACTION**

In response to a question from Councillor Massey, the Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that with regard to paragraph 4.2 of the report, specifically the following sentence - *The Greater Cambridge Partnership, as a joint committee of the County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, derives its authority to exercise transport functions from the transport delegation granted to the County Council by the Combined Authority* should be deleted from the report. Councillor Massey requested the sentence be deleted and recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

It was proposed by Mayor Palmer and seconded by Councillor Neish that the recommendations be put to the vote.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- (a) Note the consultation responses to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM): Local Transport Plan (LTP) sub-strategy;
- (b) Agree the amendments made to the CAM: LTP sub-strategy in light of the consultation responses;
- (c) Note that the CAM LTP sub-strategy sets out the vision for CAM, against which, schemes contributing to the CAM will be considered; and

- (d) Recommend the approval of the CAM: LTP sub-strategy by the Combined Authority Board.

## 118. Cambridge south-east transport better public transport and active travel consultation

The Committee received a report that provided an outline to the Combined Authority's approach in responding to the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultation and receive a presentation (attached at Appendix A to these minutes) from GCP officers on the aims, objectives and purpose of the consultation.

The Mayor informed the Committee of a minor procedural amendment to recommendation c) of the report that requested the Committee recommend to the Combined Authority Board that it makes the required delegation.

The Mayor welcomed Peter Blake, Transport Director and Andrew Munro, Principal Transport Officer with the GCP to the meeting and make their presentation.

During the course of discussion Members:

- Drew attention to the concern of local residents around Stapleford and Shelford and sought further information regarding the former rail line and the work undertaken regarding its viability as a potential route. Officers explained that work had been undertaken in 2016 and in 2017 in partnership with the Local Liaison Forum regarding potential routes, of which one potential option was the former Haverhill branch line. The railway line originally terminated at Shelford and there was no track bed north of Shelford station and there was now a business park and residential area. It became clear at an early stage of the process that the route would have to pass through the residential area which did not appear feasible or desirable. Following further consultations on variations of the proposed route, two further reports concluded that the former Haverhill branch line route was not desirable as there would be a requirement for the compulsory purchase and demolition of residential properties, gardens and parking which would have added an additional £29m to the cost of the scheme. Officers were mindful that the proposed stops were some distance from the communities, however, they did provide an option for people that were not in similar reach of the railway station. The proposed route would cause minor to moderate harm to the green belt following a green belt assessment, the majority of which was caused by the hub rather than the track. Officers commented that if the former railway line was a viable option then it would have been the preferred option.
- Confirmed there was provision for up to 2,500 car parking spaces at the proposed A11 park and ride site that was based on demand forecasts including development of locations. Not all the space may be required, however, a site that had potential to be expanded if and when necessary was required.
- Noted that the proposed route did not go to Babraham or Granta Park and questioned whether a route could be developed to include those locations as the aspiration of CAM

was to link both areas. Officers explained that future mobility connections were being explored and that the hub was not viewed as the end terminus as it was expected that journeys would continue along the existing network. Consultation had been undertaken with both sites and they were content with the proposals. They were both secure sites and therefore access was difficult and the land south of Babraham was protected park land that presented additional challenges.

- Noted that the formal response would come from the Combined Authority Board following presentation to them.
- Commented that some of the proposed stops appeared quite remote from the localities they were meant to serve and highlighted the links with Local Plans and proposed development for the area.
- Drew attention to the work of the Local Liaison Forum. Originally there were no bus stops at the proposed locations. Further explanation may be required for the Babraham route due to how it was displayed on the map.

It was proposed by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Bates that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) consultation;
- (b) Agree the process by which the Combined Authority will respond to the GCP's consultation, set out in paragraphs 2.10-2.11; and
- (c) Recommend the Combined Authority delegate responsibility to the Director of Delivery and Strategy to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Combined Authority in consultation with the Chair of the Transport & Infrastructure Committee.

## 119. Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro Programme Update

Members received a report that informed the Committee of the latest developments of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) programme and the establishment of a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) that would deliver the programme. The report also sought to provide details of alternative general areas for the Cambridge to Cambourne (C2C) route.

Officers informed the Committee that the CAM SPV, One CAM Ltd had been established Company has been established and set up. Lord Robert Mair, a renowned tunnelling expert had joined as Chairman of the Board. Recruitment of key leadership roles was advancing including non-executive directors.

The scheme was reliant on good joint working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and have conducted officer meetings with GCP colleagues. A steering group had been

established with the GCP that would embed the single network approach and officers had been proactive in highlighting it to the Department for Transport.

There was recognition for the need for greater cooperation at a political level and officers drew attention to recommendation b) that would provide opportunity for the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to provide views on the CAM and other schemes that would be relayed to the GCP by the Mayor at its Board meetings as a non-voting member.

Attention was drawn to the alternative route proposed for the C2C route that was attached at Appendix 2 of the report. The Chief Executive of the GCP had expressed concerns about how the views of the GCP had been represented in the report, in particular the quote regarding further investigations on the northern route that implied a level of acceptance of the northern route that did not yet exist. The view of the GCP was that they had raised concerns regarding the validity of the route because it was more expensive. It was the view of officers that Jacobs had been working well with the GCP an initial appraisal was undertaken in 4 weeks and in 3 out of the 9 criteria the proposed alternative route was less favourable. Consideration of the East West Rail interchange location required consideration. There had only been preliminary conversations with key stakeholders such as the American Cemetery which had been positive. It was the view of officers that further consideration be given to the alternative route.

In order for the proposed alternative route to be put forward to the GCP Board at its December meeting an additional recommendation c) would be required that;

- c) Subject to recommendation (b) being approved by the Combined Authority, propose that the alternative northern route for the C2C (as proposed in appendix 2 to this report) be proposed for consideration by the GCP Executive Board in December to be adopted in preference to the southern C2C route.

During discussion of the report:

- Attention was drawn by a Member who also expressed concern regarding the timelines of the overall project. He recalled discussions that Outline Business Cases (OBC) were due to be produced in 2021. Given the extensive resources at the disposal of the Combined Authority timelines would have been expected to form part of the report. In response the Mayor, explained that there was clarity regarding the process of a business case for a one-system solution. The approach allowed for individual business cases to come forward. It was possible to work as an integrated programme without impeding the ability of individual schemes and business cases to be brought forward. The process was acceptable to HM Treasury.
- A Member emphasised the urgency of the C2C route commenting that while it was accepted that the alternative route had only been developed over the previous 4 weeks, there was no clear direction for it. The Mayor responded by drawing attention to new bus routes that had recently become operational. The route was broad area of work that required collaboration to find a solution to. The intention was to work together in order to decide how the route would develop into the best solution for Cambridgeshire. There were significant issues with public transport along the St Neots to Cambridge corridor. It was imperative the correct solution be found and it was essential that the

views of the public be listened to. Working collaboratively with the GCP was also essential in order that the best solution was delivered.

- It was welcomed that the issues were being looked at. However, it was essential that it was carried out openly and transparently
- Concern was expressed by a Member regarding the proposed governance arrangements that appeared to allow the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to make decisions on GCP schemes in advance of the CGP Board and for that reason would not support the recommendations set out in the report.
- Clarity was sought by a Member regarding when the OBC would be published and the CAM delivered. Officers explained that work on the OBC was underway and would be available in spring 2021. It was essential that prioritisation be given to getting the scheme right for the area over tying the scheme to specific dates and milestones. The Combined Authority had been working with the GCP during that time to determine the scheme.
- Concern was expressed by a Member regarding the delivery of the Local Plan and the need for confidence that the scheme would be delivered in accordance with the Local Plan. In response the Mayor drew attention to the additional bus routes that had been established to alleviate pressure until 2027. It was essential that the right scheme be delivered.
- In drawing attention to East West Rail a Member questioned whether consultation would be undertaken on proposed locations for a northern and southern station. The Committee was informed that there was now a formal alternative to the southern station. Up to now only a southern station had been published and it was anticipated there would be consultation on both.
- A Member questioned what alternative route corridors had been considered. Officers explained that several had been considered and there were some sub-options that could be considered. All routes provided their own unique challenges, impacts and consequences.
- With regard to an Environmental Impact Assessment of the American Cemetery, a Member questioned whether it had yet been undertaken together with other sensitive locations such as Madingley Hall and 800 Wood. Officers explained that a desktop exercise had been undertaken and would require formal assessment. Results had been shared with GCP officers and officers undertook to share the technical work with the Committee. **ACTION**
- A Member requested that the technical work be presented to the Committee and the GCP Board and sought further clarity on route options that have been considered. Officers undertook to share all relevant documentation as it was developed. The GCP had been presented the technical reports. Initial environmental mitigations had been costed. The purpose of the report was to put forward the route as a suggestion for work with the GCP.

- Clarity was sought regarding GCP response to the Jacobs review and questioned that as the GCP had provided a robust response to the Jacobs review how officers intended to respond to it. It was explained that the response had been noted but not accepted, and therefore an alternative route was being put forward and it was essential that the Combined Authority was not only delivering the southern section of the CAM.
- Clarity was sought by a Member regarding the potential tunnelling options around Cambridge and questioned whether there was opportunity to amend the southern route with additional tunnelling. Officers explained tunnelling had not been discussed with the GCP at any great length. There were potential benefits that could be realised through tunnelling such as mitigating the impact on Coton and other villages, however, it would come at significant financial cost.

The Mayor proposed the following additional recommendation:

- c) Subject to recommendation (b) being approved by the Combined Authority, propose that the alternative northern route for the C2C (as proposed in appendix 2 to this report) be proposed for consideration by the GCP Executive Board in December to be adopted in preference to the southern C2C route.

There was no seconder for the proposal, and therefore the additional recommendation fell and was not put to the vote.

- A Member sought clarity regarding what was being requested of the GCP. It was explained that it was recommended to request that the Combined Authority Board amend the terms of reference of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to enable it to comment and consider key items of the GCP Board in order that the Mayor could effectively represent the views of the Committee at the GCP Board. The alternative route proposed contained at Appendix 2 of the report was an alternative and it was requested that the GCP considered it as an alternative route with a view that it eventually became the preferred route.

It was proposed by the Mayor that the recommendation be put to the vote. No seconder was found and therefore the recommendations were not approved.

~~It was resolved to:~~

- ~~d) Note the updates set out in this report.~~
- ~~e) Support the Mayor in his representative role on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board by recommending that the Combined Authority expand the Terms of Reference of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to enable it to consider and comment on key business items for the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) related to CAM schemes by amending Chapter 8 of the CPCA Constitution (Transport and Infrastructure Committee), Section 3, to include:~~

~~3.2.13 Review matters related to the CAM scheme prepared by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and make representations to the GCP Executive Board related to CAM matters.~~

## 120. Fenland stations regeneration

Members received a report that provided an update regarding the Outline Business Case progress for the Fenland Stations regeneration project. The report also provided information on the changes to the delivery programme for each station improvement.

During discussion of the report:

- A Member thanked officers for the work that had been undertaken to date and the progress made.
- A Member queried how the COVID-19 pandemic had affected the design of station improvements, such as waiting shelters. The presenting officer advised that station shelters had been installed prior to the first national lock-down. COVID-19 safe risk registers had been provided. Timescales had not been severely impacted as most design houses continued working during lock-down.
- The presenting officer noted the comments of a Member regarding COVID-19 adaptations and welcomed further information that could be provided.

It was proposed by Councillor Seaton and seconded by Councillor Bates that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the progress of this project.

## 121. March Area Transport Study

The Committee received a report that summarised the work undertaken on the Quick Wins programme as part of the March Area Transport Study, including construction timescales and requested release of funding for the remaining schemes.

Programme of quick wins a full list came out. Improving pedestrian crossing footways signage etc. Since March and July target costs and designs have progressed. In terms of the list of quick wins there are 2 that are already being delivered 15 and 16.

During discussion:

- The presenting officer noted the comments regarding Quick Win 16, Improve signage for HGV drivers to reduce poor route choice and the request of Councillor Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) on the Committee to engage with CCC officers on the proposed Quick Win.



It was proposed by Councillor Bates and seconded by Councillor Seaton that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note this progress report;
- b) Note the updated Quick Wins programme;
- c) Agree the commencement of construction of the remaining Quick Win schemes, subject to the Board agreeing (d) below;
- d) Recommend to the CPCA Board that it approve the drawdown of £900,000 for construction of the remaining Quick Win Schemes.

## 122. A47 dualling

The Committee received a report that provided an update on discussions that had taken place with Highways England on the project to dual the A47 and outline the proposed next steps.

During the course of discussion:

- A meeting of the A47 Alliance that was held recently was highlighted to the Committee, at which considerable concern and anger was raised regarding the project not being included in the RIS programme when it was anticipated it would do so. Modifications to the roundabout at Guyhirn would do little to improve traffic flow. Dualling of the A17 was vital to the area and the A47 Alliance would be contacting the Mayor to seek his continued support in providing a solution.
- A Member sought further information regarding the Highways England scheme, Wansford to Sutton. The presenting officer undertook to provide the information following the meeting. **ACTION**

It was proposed by Councillor Seaton and seconded by Councillor Neish that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the contents of the report and proposed next steps.

## 123. Coldhams Lane roundabout

The Committee received a report that summarised the assessment of partner funding and the outcome of the independent review of the construction costs since the presentation of the scheme at the 29 April Transport and Infrastructure Committee.

The presenting officer informed the Committee that no further funding partners were forthcoming. Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) commissioned an independent review of the scheme and concluded that the cost estimates were robust for the current stage of the project. The value for money scores of each design option for the roundabout were highlighted to Members.

During the course of discussion Members:

- Drew attention to the Transforming Cities Fund and question what impact there would be on that fund. The primary point of the fund was to increase sustainable journeys including cycling and walking. It appeared that the budget had been set prior to the scoping work. The links with works on Cherry Hinton Road and the impact on Fendon Road and questioned what the impact would be on Chery Hinton Road. The Mayor commented that when the scheme was proposed there was a significant number of residents that were of the view that a more expensive scheme was required in order to get it right. The commitment to the scheme remained and it would be taken forward when fully financed following the spending review.

It was proposed by Councillor Seaton and seconded by Councillor Hiller that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved by majority [5 in favour: 0 Against: 2 Abstentions] to:

- a) Note this progress update on the potential for additional contributions from partners other than the Combined Authority
- b) Authorise pausing the project until the Comprehensive Spending Review has been concluded and the value for money report is reviewed as part of the Combined Authority's assurance processes.

## 124. New Peterborough bus service and other bus projects

The Committee received a report that provided information regarding a new bus route for Peterborough funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) and updated the Committee on the initial bus trails funded through the Combined Authority's bus reform budget.

During discussion Members:

- Noted that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic was being taken into account and ensuring the safety of passengers was paramount.
- Requested that officers remained mindful of embracing technology as it could be detrimental to certain groups.

It was proposed by Councillor Hiller and seconded by Councillor Neish that the recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note and comment on the proposed Mayoral decision to fund a new bus service in Peterborough
- b) Note and comment on the proposed Mayoral decisions on trialling new ways to achieve public transport integration.

## 125. Date of next meeting

It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting of the Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee – Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2021

Mayor