

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee: Minutes

Date: 8th November 2021

Time: 10.00am – 11.20am

Present: Nik Johnson (Mayor and Chairman), Councillors Ian Bovingdon, Neil Gough, Peter Hiller, Jon Neish, Chris Seaton, Neil Shailer, and Katie Thornburrow.

Apologies: Councillor Jocelyne Scutt

24. Apologies and declarations of interest

Apologies were received from Councillor Scutt, substituted by Councillor Thornburrow.

There were no declarations of interest.

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Ian Bovingdon to the Committee who replaced Councillor Joshua Schumann as the East Cambridgeshire District Council representative on the Committee.

25. Minutes – 8th September 2021 and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting on 8th September 2021 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor subject to a minor amendment where the phrase 'horse before the cart' should read 'cart before the horse'.

The action log was noted.

26. Combined Authority Forward Plan

The Combined Authority Forward Plan was noted.

Commenting on the forward plan a member highlighted the A141 and St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case noting that there had been delay. Officers explained that following a meeting with Huntingdonshire District Council officers there was technical information that needed to be finalised ahead of a formal report being presented.

With regard to comments contained within the 'Riverporter' local publication, work would be undertaken with the Communications Team to ensure clarity was provided.

ACTION

With regard to zero emission busses, Members noted that there would be 30 buses that would be zero emissions that represented around 9% of the fleet. The routes chosen were based on making the most impact on air pollution and would replace the most polluting vehicles in the fleet. The proposal represented the beginning of the electrification of the network.

A question relating to the Forward Plan had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as follows:

Could the Forward Plan be refreshed? Evidence of the need to do this is in next Monday's meeting where the majority of items that were to be discussed had been deferred.

The Mayor explained that the forward plan was refreshed monthly to ensure sufficient notice of decisions being taken. The Head of Transport commented further regarding the items that had been deferred, informing the Committee that items had been deferred in order to ensure that the reports presented contained all the information required for a decision and to ensure the Committee had sight of them before presentation to the Board.

27. Public questions

There were no public questions received. Three questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and were taken under the relevant agenda item.

28. Performance and Finance Report

The Committee received the November Performance and Finance report which presented the progress to date made against budgets set in January 2021.

Two questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as follows:

In the Performance Report there would appear to be the likelihood of significant underspends. Will this money be lost?; and

In the Performance Dashboard in some cases the data seems significantly out of date. What is the benefit of presenting this and can we be reassured the new Chief Exec will review the data that is circulated?

Responding to the questions the Head of Transport informed the Committee that there was a risk of significant underspend and was reported as such that showed the performance monitoring was effective. There were many reasons as to potential underspends such as slippage in project timescales and how risk was factored into the cost of projects. The money resulting from an underspend would not be lost. If there was a slippage in a scheme, then it would be reported to the relevant Committee and Board. Projects would follow the gateway process at Committee and Board at significant milestones for decision as to whether the project proceeds to the next stage. Therefore, there were underspends associated within the gateway process, the

reporting of which were being reviewed. Efficiencies that had been found would be spent on other areas including promoting sustainable transport.

In presenting the report the Committee noted that within the revenue programme:

- Bus service implementation that was showing no spend to date was deliberate choice and reflected that the improvement plan had only just been submitted to the Department for Transport.
- The cessation of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) programme had been approved by the Board and there was no revenue expenditure anticipated.
- Local transport connectivity was progressing as planned for delivery. No spending had been reflected due to the August outturn; however, spending had taken place since then.
- Figures relating to passenger transport were again on profile due how the timing of invoices and payments were administered.

Members noted the variances within the Capital Programme including:

- The A10, where there was a delay in the funding decision from the Department for Transport (DfT). A way forward now being developed with Cambridgeshire County Council for the next gateway review with DfT in September 2022.
- Expenditure relating to the CAM was reported in error.

During the course of discussion:

- A Member welcomed the Soham Station scheme that was being delivered ahead of schedule and hoped that it would encourage further railway stations to be developed, however, expressed disappointment that a line to Haverhill was not agreed as part of the funding review.
- Clarification was sought regarding Wisbech Rail and the way forward for the scheme. It was confirmed that the CPCA remained committed to the line. There had been a slight delay due to a report from Network Rail. It was anticipated that a report would be brought to the Committee and the CPCA Board in the new year.
- It was noted that the Snailwell Loop had been discussed with Network Rail. Engagement would continue with Network Rail as it was important that such resilience was built into the network.
- The Committee noted that the LTCP had been presented to leaders at various events and engagement planned for the coming weeks.
- A Member highlighted forward connectivity as a sustainable transport issue. Access across the river Nene for cycling was difficult and therefore parents had no

real alternative to driving children to school in Wisbech. It was noted that LTN 120 was being incorporated within projects and segregated cycling and walking routes should be considered fully when projects were developed so that sustainable transport options were promoted.

- A Member highlighted the increasing costs of construction and labour costs where large contractors were struggling to find the necessary labour. It was essential that the Government extend its visa scheme to construction workers. Need to work more collaboratively as consortiums in order that construction companies could spread risk more effectively.
- Noted the support for the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements and Fen Road. Engagement was undertaken with Network Rail. The Combined Authority were committed to continuing to influence to protect the Queen Adelaide environment. Development at Fen Road was currently a proposed development and had not been committed to by Network Rail. The Combined Authority would continue to engage with Network Rail on such schemes.
- Noted that it was anticipated the Fenland Walking and Mobility Strategy was being developed and would likely be ready in the new year.

It was resolved to:

Note the November Budget and Performance Monitoring Update.

29. March Area Transport Study Outline Business Case

The Committee received a report that summarised the work on the March Area Transport Strategy (MATS) project to date and outlined the next stage for the project, including a Full Business Case and a Detailed Design.

Commenting on the report Members:

- Highlighted the renovation of March High Street.
- Noted the importance in relation to the delivery of the Local Plan. The delivery of infrastructure was essential for successful delivery of housing and jobs and the wellbeing of the area.
- Noted the links with the Future Highstreets Fund, as there were areas of minor deprivation in March the proposals would assist in addressing.

The Mayor, in conclusion highlighted the report as an example of the Combined Authority identifying alternative funding streams to deliver on its objectives. The Mayor also drew attention to a minor amendment to recommendation b) that should have sought the approval for the drawdown of £1.51m.

It was proposed by Councillor Seaton, seconded by Councillor Thornburrow, and resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the March Area Transport Study Outline Business Case outcomes
- b) Recommend that the Combined Authority Board approve the drawdown of £1.51 million for production of the Full Business Case and detailed design.

30. A1260 Nene Parkway Junction 15

The Committee received a report on the outcomes of the Full Business Case (FBC) regarding the A1260 Nene Parkway Junction 15. Provides access to major employment centre. Business case is at Appendix 1.

During discussion, the following points were raised:

- Peterborough had an enviable parkway system. However, it was designed and built for the traffic levels of 40 years ago. The growth of the city together with wear and tear on the roads made the work essential.
- Noted and welcomed improvements for nature, biodiversity and provision for disabled people using sustainable travel.
- Attention was drawn to the primary objectives of the scheme, commenting that they could be achieved through a trams scheme or other mass transit methods. Officers explained that the scheme represented one element of an overall connectivity strategy. The junction was a vital link for through traffic and congestion had a significant impact on the wider area. The scheme was partially congestion relieve but also part of an overall vision that was being developed that would seek to address other challenges.
- Noted the compelling economic case and the support of the local community outlined in the report, highlighting that there had been no objections to the proposals or comments received during the consultation.
- Attention was drawn to the proposed relocation of the footbridge, that while appearing sensible, did impinge on several residents and sought assurance regarding the communications that had taken place with them. Officers informed the Committee that those affected residents had been contacted and although there was no requirement to hold a consultation, further communications with residents were being developed.
- Noted the comments of Councillor Hiller whose Ward was close that affected and provided assurance that local Members had shared designs for the proposed bridge relocation with residents and productive discussions had taken place

It was proposed by Councillor Hiller, seconded by Councillor Seaton, and resolved unanimously to:

- a) Recommend that the Combined Authority approve the Full Business Case
- b) Recommend that the Combined Authority Board approve an allocation of £3.014m from its capital reserves to increase the current subject to approval budget from £5m to the forecast construction cost of £8.014m
- c) Recommend that the Combined Authority Board approve the total £8.014m for the construction phase of the project including the re-profiling of the project budget.

Mayor