



TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2024 -

Venue:	Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon PE29 3TN	
Time:	10.00 am	
Present:	Councillor Anna Smith	Chair and Member for Cambridge City Council Huntingdonshire District Council
	Councillor Sam Wakeford	
	Dr Nik Johnson	CPCA Mayor
	Councillor Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
	Councillor Alan Sharp	East Cambridgeshire District Council
	Councillor Chris Seaton	Fenland District Council
	Councillor Angus Ellis	Peterborough City Council
	Councillor Peter McDonald	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Mr Andy Williams	Business Board Representative
Mrs Rebecca Stephens	Business Board Representative	

Minutes

1 Apologies for Absence

The Chair made two announcements to the Committee; the first regarding the unprecedented number of public questions that had been received for the meeting and her intentions in regard to the handling of them, and the second referred to the exempt appendix to the Bus Network Update which necessitated a change in the running order of the agenda. The item would be moved to the end so that should Members want to discuss the appendix they could move into private session.

The agenda items were therefore held in the following order:

1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,7.

No apologies were received.

2 Declaration of Interests

Cllr Seaton declared two interests as he was a trustee of FACT Community Transport and also Chair of the Hereward Community Rail Partnership.

3 Minutes of the previous meeting and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting of 18 September 2024 were approved as an accurate record.

The Action Log was noted by the Committee

4 Public Questions

Ten public questions had been received. These had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting and were published as part of the meeting documents. Please see here: [Public Questions.pdf \(cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk\)](#)

Some of those who had submitted questions were not in attendance so in order to accommodate all of

	<p>the questions in the allotted time the Chair stated her intention to take those questions as read and simply refer to Q1,2 etc in the published questions document. Present were Ms Sophie Corcoran (Question 4), Andrew Jones (Question 6 – attending virtually), Clive Freeman, on behalf of Bramley Line Heritage Railway (Question 7) and Sarah Nicholls, on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future (attending virtually). All questions were taken in the order they were submitted, with those in attendance being asked to ask their question in turn. The Chair gave a verbal response to each question (and also invited officers to respond) and assured all present that a full written response would be published on the website after the meeting.</p> <p>Supplementary questions were asked by 1. Andrew Jones (resident) 2. Sarah Hughes (on behalf of the Sustainable Travel Alliance) and 3. Sarah Nicholas (on behalf of Cambridge Past Present and Future). Responses were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was acknowledged by the Chair that many users, particularly young people, relied on bus apps for real-time information and that incorrect data undermined public confidence in bus services, which could in turn discourage public transport use. It was emphasised that this data was held by the bus operators and that the CPCA did not have the power to compel sharing. It was agreed that steps would be taken to encourage bus operators to supply the necessary data but was it was also noted that the effectiveness of IT systems relied heavily on the quality of the input data and much of this is commercially sensitive data held by operators. A commitment was made to review the quality of the monitoring, with any further details provided in a written response. 2. Confirmation was given that public engagement, including with community campaigning groups would indeed take place prior to the formal consultation on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy. The engagement would aim to ensure high-quality, inclusive outreach, allowing community members and groups the opportunity to contribute their input. 3. It was clarified that the strategy for the consultation process on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy would be a public document and tabled at this committee.
5	<p>Forward Plan</p>
	<p><u>RESOLVED</u> A. That the Combined Authority Forward Plan be noted</p>
6	<p>Director's Highlight Report</p>
	<p>The Executive Director, Place and Connectivity introduced the report which provided the Committee with a general update on the key activities of the Place and Connectivity Directorate in relation to Transport and Infrastructure, which were not covered in other reports to this meeting.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Members requested an update on timelines following the submission of the Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy on 15 November. b) Officers provided an update on the integration plans and phase development for the Peterborough Station Quarter (PSQ) stressing the collaboration with the City Council. The delay in submitting the Outline Business Case was attributed to Department of Transport (DfT) procedural considerations, not project issues. c) The Chair reaffirmed commitments to robust data analysis and performance metrics, particularly concerning the Local Transport and Connectivity Strategy (LTCS). These efforts, supported by the Policy Insight and Performance Team, aimed to ensure transparent impact assessments and data-driven strategies. A framework for these improvements was expected in early 2025, with further updates anticipated in the January or March meetings. d) Officers clarified that the A505 project was led by the County Council and included provisions for sustainable transport. The A505 report was not yet public but would be shared once completed. e) It was reiterated that the CPCA was committed to securing government funding for the Ely Area Enhancement Scheme which was seen as critical investment. <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p>

	<p>A. That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee note the report.</p> <p><u>ACTIONS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officers to provide status updates on electric vehicle initiatives at upcoming meetings. 2. The A505 project report to be circulated to Members as soon as it was made public
7	<p>Bus Network Update</p>
	<p>The Chair announced that initial discussion on this item would start in open session but that if Members wished to comment on the exempt appendix to the report then a vote would be taken and depending on the outcome, the meeting would move into private session. With that in mind, the Executive Director for Place and Connectivity introduced the report and asked for general comments from the Committee.</p> <p>During the public session the following comments were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The importance of collecting metrics to measure the success of the improvements, particularly in terms of passenger uptake and route effectiveness, was emphasised. The marketing and publicity for these services were also discussed as a crucial factor in maximising usage. This had been evidenced with the Wittering-Castor-Stamford Route which had been very well publicised by the local community. b. The Executive Director urged Members and residents to complete the consultation on bus reform, which would help inform the final decision on the matter. <p>At this point, having noted the general consensus in the room, the Chair moved that the meeting be moved into private session.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> (Unanimous) On being proposed by the Chair and Seconded by Cllr Ellis the Committee resolved to:</p> <p><i>Move into private session with the press and public to be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that discussions are at risk of disclosing exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, namely paragraphs 3 and 5 relating to the financial or business affairs, and information that is subject to legal professional privilege</i></p>
8	<p>Fen Roads: Economic Impact Assessment for Peat Soil Affected Roads</p>
	<p>Anna Graham, Transport Manager introduced the report which provided members of the Committee with an opportunity to review the scope of the Economic Impact Assessment for Peat Soil Affected Roads and provide feedback.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The impact of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) on rural roads that were not built to support such weight, and therefore led to further deterioration, was highlighted. Farm equipment, although heavy, was generally designed to spread weight over a larger area, which lessened the impact compared to HGVs. b. Members noted the progress at the County level, including trials with in-house design methods using recycled materials, which had shown positive results for road resilience. c. The Mayor stressed that the project aligned with the Combined Authority's priority to invest meaningfully in the Fens, aiming to correct years of underinvestment. d. The project's importance in highlighting the unique challenges of the region and its potential to serve as a model for other areas with similar issues was highlighted e. The Chair noted recent insights from discussions about rail freight, underscoring that each fully laden freight train could replace up to 129 lorries, which highlighted the potential of rail as a way to reduce road wear from HGVs. f. Officers commented on emerging road renewal technologies, including the use of geogrids to reinforce road structure with minimal material usage. <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p>

	<p>A. To note the draft scope for the Economic Impact Assessment for Peat Soil Affected Roads and Members are invited to provide feedback.</p>
9	<p>Ely to Cambridge Corridor Study</p>
	<p>Matthew Lutz, Transport Manager introduced the report which provided an update on the work on the Ely to Cambridge Corridor Study and the strategic gateway review scheduled for later in 2024.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Members welcomed progress on the project as they noted the considerable congestion issues along this corridor, worsened by ongoing development in areas like Waterbeach. b. While the relocation of the rail station at Waterbeach might reduce A10 pressure, residents in areas like Foxton still experienced significant delays at crossings, and Members urged the Authority to consider further improvements there. c. The importance of an integrated approach was highlighted. Traffic inflow from surrounding areas, including roads such as the B1050 and B1381, which served as alternative routes and could benefit from upgrades, should be considered. d. The Chair emphasised the importance of prioritising road safety across all project aspects, reinforcing the need for an integrated approach in planning. e. The impact of any changes on the Milton Interchange should be included within the project's scope to avoid transferring congestion issues from one point to another. f. The Mayor cited the A10 BP roundabout near Ely as a key safety concern, advocating for an accelerated approach in implementing safe crossings. He also referenced the personal impact and local advocacy efforts following the tragedy at Cardyke, emphasising the moral priority of the Combined Authority to focus on road safety and Vision Zero. <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. To note progress on the Ely to Cambridge Corridor Study. B. To note that CPCA and partners will commence a strategic gateway review in November 2024.
10	<p>A141 and St. Ives Improvement Study – Update on Progress and Public Consultation</p>
	<p>Matthew Lutz, Transport Manager introduced the report which provided an update on the project's progress to date. David Mitchell from Cambridgeshire County Council was also in attendance (virtually) and provided an update on the public consultation which was currently in progress.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The consultation, hosted on the County Council's website, had seen nearly 6,000 visits, with approximately 3,000 individuals engaging in the process. As of the meeting date, around 300 surveys had been completed b. Common themes highlighted from public feedback included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over potential impacts on the broader road network and local commuting routes, including RAF Wyton. • Support for enhanced physical infrastructure, such as bus fleets, bus stops, park-and-ride facilities, and mobility hubs. c. The Member for Huntingdonshire noted the project's potential to unlock economic and other opportunities within his area. d. Officers acknowledged the importance of road safety and confirmed that it was included in project documents, although it was embedded alongside other strategic priorities. Further efforts would be made to ensure this aspect was explicitly highlighted in the second phase of consultation e. An issue frequently raised by constituents was the need for improved passenger transport links between the guided busway in St Ives and Huntingdon train station. <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p>

	<p>A. To note the update on A141 & St. Ives Improvement Study project progress and delivery including public consultation exercise.</p>
11	<p>Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS)</p>
	<p>Lynne Miles, Director of City Access at the Greater Cambridge Partnership introduced the report which provided an update on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy and next steps. Emma White, Acting Transport Manager was also in attendance to answer Members' questions.</p> <p>During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Chair stressed the importance of aligning the Transport Strategy with the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The alignment was crucial to ensure that the local plan progressed effectively and meaningfully, particularly in terms of infrastructure support. b. Officers reassured Members that, while the strategy was named for Greater Cambridge, its influence extended beyond this area, encompassing a broader travel-to-work area and the functional economic area of Cambridge. This broad reach had been at the core of ongoing officer-level discussions, with full acknowledgment of its importance. The consultation process, including engagement with all relevant democratic bodies and organisations within the affected area, would be given careful consideration. c. The Director reassured members that this was the early stages of the process and that the feedback from this meeting would be incorporated as the strategy progressed. The importance of keeping all stakeholders informed and involved as the strategy was developed and refined was emphasised. d. Detailed planning and updates would continue to come through the Committee for review and input before moving to the next stage. <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> On being proposed by the Chair and seconded by Cllr Ellis the Committee resolved (with 6 votes in favour and 1 abstention) to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Note the update on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS). B. Recommend to the Combined Authority Board to delegate authority to the Assistant Director - Transport in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to enter into one or more contracts or Grant Funding Agreements with the relevant delivery body (consultancy or Cambridgeshire County Council), as needed to continue the development of the GCTS
12	<p>Wisbech Rail (also known as March to Wisbech Modal Appraisal)</p>
	<p>The Transport Manager introduced the report which provided an update about the Wisbech Rail project following the completion of the Strategic Option Appraisal report by Network Rail. Rob Russell from Network Rail was also in virtual attendance to support this item.</p> <p>During discussion the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There was a collective disappointment that the current report did not offer a definitive "yes" to proceed. However, Members acknowledged that the report's scope should be considered more broadly, with a willingness to explore additional significant connections beyond the immediate recommendations such as a potential extension to Chatteris. b. It was highlighted that ongoing discussions with Anglian Water and other stakeholders, including connectivity benefits, were essential for ensuring the integration of transport infrastructure with future developments. c. Several members stressed that the proposed rail link should not merely be viewed as a shuttle service between two towns. Instead, it should be seen as a critical part of a connected transportation network. d. The committee supported keeping options 1 and 2 open for further evaluation. It also supported exploring interim measures, such as additional bus services, to improve current connectivity, particularly in the short term, whilst longer-term solutions were being discussed <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p>

	<p>A. To note the Wisbech Rail project and the Network Rail Strategic Option Appraisal Report. B. Agree the Committee's preferred next steps.</p> <p><u>ACTION:</u> 1. A report outlining the revised scope to be presented in the Spring, focusing on the extended rail network and interim measures for improving current connectivity.</p>
13	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Framework - Update</p>
	<p>The Executive Director for Place and Connectivity introduced the report which updated the Committee on the final draft of the Infrastructure Delivery Framework. This report had been first presented to the Environment and Sustainable Communities Committee During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Although the report was not initially part of the local growth plan process, it had now become an essential piece of evidence that fed into the Plan. The report considered current and future needs within the infrastructure areas mentioned and would continue to inform discussions related to the Growth Plan. b. Officers clarified that hospital infrastructure was not covered in the report, but was being addressed in other contexts, particularly in the local planning process. c. Concerns were raised about water scarcity and the recent joint regulatory letter to Cambridge Water, which indicated that Cambridge Water may be required to revise its draft Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP 24) due to performance issues. The Executive Director confirmed that this development occurred after the report was finalised but noted that the report was a snapshot of the situation at that time. The issue of water scarcity was being considered in the ongoing review of Local Plans. d. The report referred to the current headroom in the energy system and did not account for future needs beyond those outlined in Local Plans. Unfortunately, the regulatory framework design did not require infrastructure providers to ensure sufficient capacity for planned growth. e. Members requested an update on the status of flood alleviation schemes, specifically those listed in the report, including future schemes in locations such as Dogsthorpe Ward in Peterborough. Officers promised to provide a more detailed response in due course. <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>ACTION:</u> 1. Officers to provide an update on the status of flood alleviation schemes</p>
14	<p>Budget Report</p>
	<p>The Finance Manager introduced the report which provided an update of the financial position for 2024/25 and provided analysis against the 2024/25 budgets, up to the period ending September 2024.</p> <p>No further questions or comments were raised by Members.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> A. To note the financial position of the Transport Division for the financial year 24/25 to September 2024.</p>
15	<p>Work Programme</p>

	<p>No questions or comments on the Work programme were raised by Members</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u> A. That the Transport and Infrastructure Committee Work Programme be noted.</p>
16	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p>
	<p>The date of the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 10 January 2025 but this was yet to be confirmed.</p>