



Agenda Item No: 1.2

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY TRANSPORT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Friday 6th March 2020

Time: 10.00am – 11.42am

Present: James Palmer (Mayor and Chairman), Councillors Ian Bates, Graham Casey, Nicky Massey, Jon Neish, Chris Seaton, Joshua Schumann and Aidan Van de Weyer

Apologies: Councillor Peter Hiller (Councillor Graham Casey substituting)

60. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Apologies were received from Councillor Peter Hiller. There were no declarations of interest.

61. MINUTES – 9TH JANUARY 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were two public questions regarding minute number 71, for which the responses are contained at Appendix A to these minutes. There were two questions received from the Combined Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committee relating to minute 65, Wisbech Rail and minute 70, Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Progress Report. The questions and responses are contained at Appendix B to these minutes.

63. COMBINED AUTHORITY FORWARD PLAN – FEBRUARY 2020

It was resolved to note the Forward Plan.

64. BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The Committee considered the Budget and Performance Update. In presenting the report the Committee's attention was drawn to changes and variances within the capital and revenue budgets contained at paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.6 of the report.

During discussion of the report Members clarified the capitalisation process for Strategic Outline Business Cases. Officers explained that there was a significant amount of guidance that governed the process. Once a project had reached a credible

stage that would mean it moved forward to a delivery phase then a review would be undertaken with regards to the capitalisation of costs.

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the March budget and performance monitoring update

65. WISBECH RAIL PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received a report that provided a summary of the progress on the Wisbech Rail project to date and outlined the next steps. The outcome of the Options Assessment Report (OAR) was highlighted to the Committee with the key objective offering direct passenger transport services between Wisbech and Cambridge, which was currently constrained at Ely on which work was progressing through the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Study.

During discussion Members:

- Expressed their support for the project and drew attention to the integration with the Wisbech Garden Town project that needed to be considered as Wisbech Rail developed further.
- Questioned whether discussions were taking place with potential train operators regarding services. Officers explained that train operators had not yet been engaged with. The project was currently focussed on infrastructure and discussions with operators would follow at a later stage of the process.

The Mayor concluded the discussion by emphasising his conviction that the scheme was right for Wisbech in order to address both deprivation and opportunity in the area. The Mayor called on the Government to provide a link for trains to travel to Cambridge and London. Towns with high quality infrastructure had better opportunities and better health outcomes. It was imperative that the project moved forward in a positive manner and the Mayor looked forward to receiving the full business case.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the content of the report and proposed next steps; and
- b) Identify any issues which the Committee would wish to escalate to the Combined Authority Board.

66. ST NEOTS RIVER GREAT OUSE NORTHERN CROSSING CYCLE BRIDGE

The Committee received a report that summarised the work undertaken on the St Neots Foot and Cycle Bridge, and Regatta Meadows to date. The report confirmed that the projected construction costs for the project now exceeded the allocated budget and sought a recommendation from the Committee to the Combined Authority Board that

the scheme should not proceed as it no longer met the Value for Money requirements set out in the Combined Authority's Assurance Framework.

During the course of discussion a Member noted that the scheme was not viable and welcomed the recommendation for the remaining funding to be re-allocated to projects within the St Neots Masterplan.

The Mayor emphasised that the intention for the Masterplan was for it to be shaped by the community and was not a prescriptive document from the Combined Authority. It was fundamental that although the proposed bridge no longer represented value for money, the funding allocated be returned to the Masterplan for use in the St Neots area.

It was proposed by Councillor Neish and seconded by Councillor Seaton to move the recommendation.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) note the report
- b) Recommend to the Combined Authority Board that work on the St Neots Foot and Cycle Bridge should cease and the project be removed from the Combined Authority's Business Plan; and
- c) Recommend to the Combined Authority Board that the remaining funding allocated to the project be re-allocated to projects within the St Neots Masterplan.

67. A47 DUALLING

Members considered a report that provided a summary of the A47 dualling project to date and outlined the next steps.

In discussing the report Members:

- Expressed their support for the scheme, drawing attention to the benefits to the additional river crossing by not progressing the development of banking such as commercial shipping and leisure. The proposal would also benefit the Wisbech Garden Town scheme and assist in the reduction of flood risk to the area.
- Expressed concern that the project was drifting in terms of timescales and that the Government did not fully appreciate the significance and importance of the route. The Mayor responded by informing Members of a meeting that took place in late 2018 with the Chief Executive of Highways England at which agreement was reached for collaborative working and that now a review had been undertaken and green rating achieved for the project which was hugely significant. The Mayor and the Combined Authority would continue to argue for the route.

The Mayor concluded the item by drawing attention to the estimated £300m cost of banking and raising a road that was not fit for purpose and saw fatal road traffic collisions on a regular basis. It was unacceptable that major cities such as Peterborough and Norwich were served by such a poor road. The Mayor also highlighted the environmental benefits provided by the barrier as it created wetland habitats and the links created with Wisbech Rail.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the content of the report and proposed next steps.

68. MARCH AREA TRANSPORT STRATEGY PROGRESS REPORT

Members considered a report that summarised the work on the March Area Transport Strategy to date and outlined the next steps for consultation and early delivery of options. Consultation would begin at the end of March 2020 and the Committee was informed of the intention to progress a number of schemes in the current financial year. There were currently two schemes ready for progression and a further six in the background.

It was proposed by Councillor Seaton and seconded by Councillor Bates that the recommendation be moved.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the progress report;
- b) Approve the study outcomes for consultation with the public;
- c) Comment on the emerging options and plan for early delivery of “Quick Wins” during the first half of 2020/21 budget period; and
- d) Approve use of £220,000 from the existing approved budget agreed previously by the Combined Authority Board towards Quick Wins delivery

69. LANCASTER WAY A10/A142 IMPROVEMENTS

Members were presented a report regarding the Lancaster Way A10/A142 improvements.

The Committee noted and approved the request by officers to amend recommendation c) of the report as set out below:

To grant the Director of Strategy & Delivery, in consultation with the Mayor, delegated authority to approve a reduction in the scope of the scheme to enable delivery of the BP Roundabout alone in the event of the risks set out at paragraph 2.7 of the report materialising.

The presenting officer drew attention to amended tables 2.5 and 2.6 circulated to the Committee that detailed the current budget and cost estimate. Members noted that the contribution from East Cambridgeshire District Council was towards Lancaster Way and the contribution from Cambridgeshire County Council was in the form of a loan and would be paid back.

Members noted the risks associated with the scheme. In particular, a gas main at the BP roundabout where it was unclear at present the degree of protection that would be required to be installed.

In discussing the report:

- Support for the scheme was expressed by a Member as it was essential for growth in the area. The section of road was of poor quality and caused issues onto the A10. Commenting further, it was of the upmost importance that the scheme progress swiftly in order to ensure continuity of funding.
- A Member expressed concern that significant barriers to cycling and walking remained with the proposed scheme. Officers commented that there was a cycle route available and the detailed design work would follow at a later stage at which provision for pedestrians and cyclists would be considered.

It was proposed by Mayor Palmer and seconded by Councillor Schuman that the recommendations as amended be moved.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Note the report.
- b) Recommend to the Combined Authority Board a new additional budget of £1,168,243.20 from the single pot allocation to reflect current cost estimate, including a 20% risk allowance.
- c) To grant the Director of Strategy & Delivery, in consultation with the Mayor, delegated authority to approve a reduction in the scope of the scheme to enable delivery of the BP Roundabout alone in the event of the risks set out at paragraph 2.7 of the report materialising.

70. ELY AREA CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Members considered a report that provided a summary of the work undertaken on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement project to date, potential outcomes and next steps.

Introducing the report, the Mayor highlighted the significance and importance of the junction that was ignored by the Government. Freight was being transported from Felixstowe via London which was inefficient and costly. The costs of improving the capacity were substantial. However, the impact of the current situation could be felt across East Anglia. Significant pressure was being exerted on the Government putting the case for improved passenger and freight transport through the area.

The Mayor drew attention to Queen Adelaide and highlighted the commitment to maintaining access to Queen Adelaide.

In discussing the report Members:

- Welcomed the priority to safeguard the residents of Queen Adelaide as there was a risk that it could be lost by Network Rail.
- Emphasised the importance of Network Rail's engagement with the project and the road crossings. Freight travelling from Felixstowe was also highlighted, suggesting that Suffolk County Council could contribute to the lobbying effort to move the project forward.
- Highlighted the role of the Port Authority and the contribution they could make to the development of the project.
- Suggested involving Local Enterprise Partnerships and Business Boards in collaborating to deliver a financial package to support the proposals.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the progress report;
- b) Provide officers any necessary guidance on further engagement with Network Rail and other partners about the scheme; and
- c) Express a view on the objectives for any further funding for this project from the Combined Authority's budget in 2020-21.

71. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN AND THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTONOMOUS METRO

The Committee received a report that sought agreement that the existing Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) CAM schemes be considered in the context of a Local Transport Plan (LTP) sub-strategy setting out the vision for the CAM Metro as a whole; and for provision of short-term public transport improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge.

The Interim Monitoring Officer informed the Committee that contrary to the published report that indicated it was a key decision it was not.

In discussing the report:

- The Member for South Cambridgeshire District Council and Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board emphasised how crucial the issue was for South Cambridgeshire, the implications for the Local Plan and the GCP. The report followed a letter from the Mayor to the GCP and public statements that

expressed concerns regarding GCP proposals for the Cambridge to Cambourne route but had been unable to ascertain what those concerns were. The Mayor confirmed that his concerns related to the GCP and whether as an organisation it understood the wider strategy necessary to solve the transport issues in the county. The transport problems primarily affected areas surrounding the city and were not in the city. The Mayor explained that when the joint working policy was agreed it was for a metro route and he stated at that time his serious concerns about Coton, Hardwick, Cambourne and Adams Road shared by residents that did not appear to have been considered by the GCP. Residents had been told that the CAM would not happen and that a busway was therefore the only option. The Mayor expressed doubt that the GCP intended to deliver a metro route especially in Cambourne. The Mayor underlined the Combined Authority's commitment to the delivery of a metro system that encompassed Cambourne and west Cambridge, commenting that the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge busway would not alleviate transport problems around Cambridge. The Mayor drew attention to the proposed additional bus routes to Cambridge North Station and Addenbrooke's that would be funded by the Combined Authority.

- The Member for South Cambridgeshire informed the Committee that in response to the Mayor's letter an invitation had been extended to the Mayor for a meeting. Legal advice had also been sought with regard to the report before the Committee that advised the report was inadequate for the decision the Committee was being asked to consider. The legal implications within the report were insufficient. The delegation of functions to the GCP had not been considered fully and addressed in the report. Highways powers were delegated to the GCP from Cambridgeshire County Council which were different to the powers of the Combined Authority. The Member then went on to draw attention to the issue of reasonableness of the decision the Committee was being asked to make and whether the information within the report was sufficient to decide that the scheme would not go ahead which was the implication of the report. In referring to page 97 of Local Transport Plan (LTP), specifically paragraphs 3.61 and 3.76 and put forward the view that the decisions the Committee was being asked to make contradicted the LTP and consideration should be given to relevant factors such as the amount of money spent thus far and the implications for stopping the project which was not addressed in the report. The decision of the Committee would not be lawful based on the information presented and would place the Combined Authority at risk of legal challenge through judicial review. Attention was drawn to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Central to the Local Plan was the development of Bourne Airfield and essential to that development was a high quality public transport route, if that was not deliverable then the Local Plan was open to challenge. Furthermore, there were implications for the 5 year land supply and East West Rail as a result of the decision. The issue of the nature of the Cambridge to Camborne scheme was addressed 18 months ago when there was a pause and Arup were commissioned to undertake a review. They provided guidance to ensure the scheme was compatible with CAM. A sub-strategy that was inconsistent with the LTP was problematic and expressed concern for the delays that would be caused to the delivery of a high quality public transport link between Cambridge and Cambourne. The Member for South Cambridgeshire and Chairman of the GCP Executive Board concluded by suggesting that the decision the Committee was being asked to make was premature and should be deferred in order to allow the GCP and the Combined

Authority to discuss further how to move forward. The Mayor responded by confirming the commitment to deliver a Cambourne to Cambridge route and was consistent with the LTP.

- The Member for Cambridge City stated her support for the points raised by the Member for South Cambridgeshire and commented that significant investment would be required in buses in order to achieve modal shift. Within the report there was a key decision to be made and there was insufficient information on which to make a decision.
- The Interim Monitoring Officer advised the Committee that the report contained sufficient information and the legal implications explained sufficiently what Members needed to know in order to reach a lawful decision.
- A Member sought clarity regarding the proposed sub-strategy and how it linked to the LTP. Officers explained that the LTP contained a number of sub-strategies that could be updated as and when decision are made. The Mayor explained that the proposed construction period was consistent with the timescales proposed by the GCP. Direct bus routes between Cambourne and Cambridge would be provided within the next 6 months delivered through Combined Authority's budget. The development of Bourne Airfield would also provide substantial S106 money. The Mayor emphasised the commitment to the CAM project and that the proposal was consistent with the Local Plan.
- The Member for Cambridgeshire County Council provided commitment from the County Council to assist with the development of the scheme together with the A428.
- The Member for South Cambridgeshire and Chairman of the GCP Executive Board again sought clarity regarding the legality of the decision the Committee was being asked to make as the report did not mention highways powers. He suggested that under the devolution deal and working together in terms of the LTP it would not be reasonable to proceed without those powers. The Mayor stated the view of the Combined Authority that the project could not be completed using only highways powers and that transport powers were required.
- The Mayor explained that the delivery of CAM was complimentary to the timing of the original Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and therefore was compatible with the Local Plan.
- A Member drew attention to additional buses and expressed concern that there was little evidence additional buses would achieve anything or address Bourne Airfield.
- The need to be clear regarding legal implications surrounding partnership working was highlighted by a Member.

It was proposed by Mayor Palmer and seconded by Councillor Schumann that the recommendation be moved. Councillor Van de Weyer with the agreement of the Committee requested a recorded vote.

It was resolved [6 in favour: Palmer, Bates, Hiller, Neish, Schuman and Seaton 2 against: Massey and Van de Weyer] to:

- a) Commission the preparation of a LTP sub-strategy setting out the vision for the CAM Metro as a whole, against which schemes contributing to the CAM can be considered; and
- b) Authorise officers to propose short term public transport improvements between Cambourne and key employment sites in Cambridge.

59. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 29th April 2020, Incubator 2, Alconbury Weald Enterprise Campus, Huntingdon.

Chairman