



# Transport and Infrastructure Committee

**4 November 2024**

Title:	Infrastructure Delivery Framework – final report
Report of:	Judith Barker, Executive Director of Place and Connectivity
Lead Member:	Cllr. Bridget Smith, Lead Member for Environment Cllr Anna Smith, Chair of Transport and Infrastructure
Public Report:	Yes
Key Decision:	No
Voting Arrangements:	No vote required

## Recommendations:

A	To note the report, first presented to the Environment and Sustainable Communities Committee, recommending that the CA Board approve the final report of the Infrastructure Delivery Framework (IDF).
B	To note the next steps of the CPCA working with Place Directors across the constituent authorities to develop projects to address infrastructure issues.

## Strategic Objective(s):

The proposals within this report fit under the following strategic objective(s):

	Achieving ambitious skills and employment opportunities
X	Achieving good growth
X	Increased connectivity
X	Enabling resilient communities

## 1. Purpose

1.1	To ensure that the Committee has time to consider the report and raise queries and clarifications about the report and next steps.
-----	--

## 2. Proposal

2.1	The initial proposal is for the adoption of the report by the Combined Authority. This report will then act as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Growth Plan and its implementation.
2.2	The work has been developed by a steering group of officers reporting to Place Directors since its inception in Autumn 2023. Place Directors have been working with colleagues and as a group to ensure that the final report represents a position and narrative that works for all individually and collectively.

2.3	The intention is to build on that collaborative approach in terms of next steps. We are therefore holding a Place Directors workshop in mid-November to bring forward proposals for next steps on the report which will align with the Shared Ambitions and Local Growth Plan work and will look to develop project concepts and business cases or update those that already exist to develop a group of investment opportunities for public and private sector. Other actions may also include using the convening powers of the Mayor and CPCA to see how key partners and others can work together in this space to accelerate or deliver improved outcomes.
-----	---

### 3. Background

3.1	<p>The original scope for the IDF was as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Use existing approved growth (or draft Plans proposed by authorities) as a baseline, extrapolated if needed to assess potential infrastructure barriers over appropriate investment planning cycles;</li> <li>b. Focus on selected priority infrastructure themes (to deliver early recommendations);</li> <li>c. Coordinate with reviews of strategic policy (e.g thematic strategies such as LTCP, Economic Strategy);</li> <li>d. Be resourced with additional capacity;</li> <li>e. Engage with a Task &amp; Finish working group of relevant officers across constituent authorities to progress alongside external support. Place Directors would be the sponsor group.</li> </ol> <p>Stantec were commissioned to complete the work, and work with the local authorities and steering group to the above brief. During the tender there was considerable change particularly in July when the new government was elected, and we needed to pivot the report to align to their missions and be ready for the development of the Local Growth Plan.</p>
3.2	<p>The IDF considered the following priority infrastructure themes in its initial phase:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Energy</li> <li>b. Water (public and commercial needs), water environmental quality, and managing flood risk</li> <li>c. Green/Blue Capital</li> <li>d. Connectivity including transport and digital</li> </ol> <p>Other infrastructure needs are considered through existing thematic work, for example, the Integrated Care Board is looking at health and care infrastructure.</p>
3.3	<p>Although the scope is on physical infrastructure themes, the IDF is not limited in terms of appropriate interventions and therefore can consider behaviour change or demand management responses.</p>
3.4	<p>The IDF is envisaged as tackling infrastructure barriers to sustainable growth (as defined in the Corporate Strategy Objectives). The IDF process would therefore include impacts across the Six Capitals.</p>
3.5	<p>The scope of evidence would include both immediate/short term infrastructure issues that we are already aware of that have the potential to adversely impact growth (such as the water supply for Greater Cambridge or the energy grid capacity/energy security in the Fens) and longer-term issues to require advance planning (flood resilience, low carbon transition). Local Plans have different end dates. The longer-term horizon should at least cover the period to 2041, but 2050 would provide consistency with the national legal duty to reach Net Zero. Policy on the amount and distribution of future growth is not within scope of the IDF, as that remains the core function of Local Plan reviews.</p>
3.6	<p>A core outcome of the IDF is to go beyond the identification of infrastructure issues to influence the acceleration of actual infrastructure solutions. These 'system-change' aspects (including funding, procedural or capacity-building) would also provide evidence for the advocate role of the Combined Authority, working alongside public and private sector partners, and feed into discussions on future devolution opportunities. It will complement the Corporate Strategy action to refresh the evidence base through a state of the region review.</p>

3.7	Delivery mechanisms would take account of the Combined Authority's Single Assurance Framework and prioritisation of the Combined Authority's own projects.
3.8	For ease of reference, we have attached 2 appendices: 1. the full report and 2. a slide deck of the executive summary and findings. If it is helpful for the Committee we can run through the slide deck at the meeting to ensure a discussion on the 4 key areas.

#### 4. Appendices

4.1	Appendix A – Full Report Infrastructure Delivery Framework. Appendix B – Slide Deck of Research Findings
-----	---

#### 5. Implications

##### Financial Implications

5.1	The MTFP had £130k in the NSSF Subject to Approval revenue budget line for 23/24 available for this programme. The invoice from Stantec remained within this budget. We have provision in the 24/25 and 25/26 MTFP to do the development of projects arising from the report and workshop.
-----	--

##### Legal Implications

5.2	Any further consultancy will need to be procured through the usual processes.
-----	---

##### Public Health Implications

5.3	Delivery of sustainable growth has major public health benefits (including as a result of access to housing, enhanced employment opportunities and improved environment).
-----	---

##### Environmental & Climate Change Implications

5.4	Strategic Infrastructure solutions can have wider environmental and other benefits, including flood resilience, water management, carbon sequestration and storage. The transition to a low carbon future requires system-change in terms of major utilities, particularly the production and use of energy.
-----	--

##### Other Significant Implications

5.5	None
-----	------

##### Background Papers

5.6	Towards a Sustainable Growth Strategy (NSSF Phase 1), <a href="#">link to document</a>
-----	--