

---

**TITLE: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE BUS, CYCLE, WALK WORKING PARTY**

Committee: Finance & Assets Committee

Date: 22 July 2021

Author: Infrastructure and Strategy Manager

[W44]

---

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To consider recommendations from the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party and to receive the minutes of the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party meeting held on 10 March 2021

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 Members are requested to:

- i) Approve the recommendation made by the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party, as set out in 4.4 of this report;
- ii) Approve the amendment to the Terms of Reference for the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party at 4.5 and Appendix 1; and
- iii) Note the minutes of the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party meeting held on 10 March 2021 and the draft Minutes from the meeting held on 24 June 2021 provided at Appendix 2.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 At its meeting on 25 March 2021, this committee considered a request from the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party for funding for feasibility studies for new cycle routes. It was resolved that quotes for a number of route feasibility studies be requested to ensure any funds utilised can be maximised and a report be presented to a future Finance & Assets Committee meeting.

3.2 At its meeting held on 24 June 2021, the Members of the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party agreed an amendment to the Terms of Reference for the group, to include reference to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan refresh.

#### 4.0 ARGUMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

4.1 The Working Party has identified priority cycling routes and has obtained quotes from Sustrans, the charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle, for the cost of producing feasibility studies for the following routes:

- Fordham – Burwell
- Haddenham – A142
- Little Downham – Ely
- Littleport – Chettisham – Ely
- Swaffham Prior – Reach – Burwell

4.2 Sustrans could also update the construction costs for the remaining works to complete the Wicken to Soham cycle path included in the report they produced in 2013.

4.3 The feasibility studies will give the Council a better understanding of the factors that need to be considered to deliver the cycle routes and an estimate of the cost. This information will be used to seek funding from external sources to enable delivery of the schemes.

4.4 The total cost of this work is £103,165. This can be met from the Cambridgeshire Horizons funding so it is recommended that the Council commissions Sustrans to produce all five feasibility studies and to refresh the Wicken to Soham route costs.

4.5 Regarding the Terms of Reference, the objectives of the Working Party have been expanded to include the following at 2.4: "*To contribute to the active travel and bus services sections of the Council's response to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan Refresh consultation*". A revised Terms of Reference is attached as Appendix 1.

#### 5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 The cost of the feasibility studies will be met from the Cambridgeshire Horizons funding.

5.2 Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

5.3 Carbon Impact Assessment (CIA) not required.

#### 6.0 APPENDICES

6.1 Appendix 1: Revised Terms of Reference for the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party.

- 6.2 Appendix 2i: Minutes of the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party meeting held on 10 March 2021.  
Appendix 2ii: Draft Minutes of the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party meeting held on 24 June 2021

---

<b><u>Background Documents</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Contact Officer</u></b>
Minutes of the meeting of the Finance & Assets Committee held on 25 June 2021.	Room 13 The Grange, Ely	Sally Bonnett Infrastructure and Strategy Manager (01353) 616451 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Sally.bonnett@eastcambs.gov.uk">Sally.bonnett@eastcambs.gov.uk</a>

## **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE BUS, CYCLE, WALK WORKING PARTY TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **1.0 CONSTITUTION**

- 1.1 The East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party, appointed by Finance and Assets Committee, shall comprise 6 elected Members. A Chairman will be elected at the first Working Party meeting. The Chairman of the Working Party will be elected from the Conservative Group Membership.
- 1.2 The Working Party will continue until it completes the work set out in the Terms of Reference.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

- 2.1 To oversee the East Cambridgeshire Bus Services Review process.
- 2.2 To oversee the development of the East Cambridgeshire Cycling and Walking Routes Strategy.
- 2.3 To oversee the Council's response to County Council's Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan consultation.
- 2.4 To contribute to the active travel and bus services sections of the Council's response to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority 's Local Transport Plan Refresh consultation.
- 2.5 To ensure effective and meaningful dialogue and consultation during the Review.

### **3.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 3.1 The Working Party's terms of reference shall be
- 3.2 To advise the Finance and Assets Committee in relation to:
  - The progress towards the Bus Services Review and Cycling and Walking Routes Strategy in accordance with agreed timetable and project plan.
  - Recommendations related to key issues requiring Committee direction in the formulation of the Review and Strategy
- 3.3 To advise and support the Director, Commercial with the Review, specifically:
  - Liaison with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council.
  - Other relevant issues as they arise during the Review process.
  - Progress reports to Finance and Assets Committee, where appropriate.

When undertaking the actions referred to above, the Working Party may invite interested parties, stakeholders, Members and co-optees to address it, deliver presentations and / or answer questions.

### **4.0 OPERATION OF THE WORKING GROUP**

- 4.1 The Working Group will agree a programme of work and a frequency of meetings that reflects the priorities it identifies.
- 4.2 The Group will be supported by Officers from the Council's Infrastructure and Strategy team.
- 4.3 Minutes will be recorded for all meetings.

**Notes of a remote meeting of the East Cambs Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party held on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March at 6.00pm.**

**PRESENT**

Cllr Alan Sharp (Chairman)  
Cllr David Ambrose Smith  
Cllr Charlotte Cane  
Cllr Lorna Dupré  
Cllr Lis Every  
Cllr Simon Harries

**OFFICERS**

Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure & Strategy Manager  
Tracy Couper – Democratic Services Manager  
Caroline Evans – Democratic Services Officer

**48. APOLOGIES**

No apologies for absence were received.

**49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**50. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

A Member commented that there were several ideas and suggestions within the Notes that had no clear follow up process. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager informed Members that she had addressed several of them and would be reporting her findings later in the meeting. The Chairman stated that the aim would be to address them either in this meeting or at a future date.

The Notes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 were then agreed as an accurate record.

**51. REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Working Party received the revised Terms of Reference, previously circulated, as agreed by the Finance & Assets Committee at their meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

A Member commented that since the last meeting it had become known that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority were planning to refresh their Local Transport Plan during the next municipal year. She suggested that the Working Party should have input into the District response

to the Active Travel component of the refresh and that the Terms of Reference should be further updated to reflect that.

There was some discussion as to whether that would already be covered under the first bullet point of section 3.3 of the revised Terms of Reference. However, since the refresh encompassed all forms of travel, and the Working Party may have concluded its other business before the refresh was complete, it was agreed that the Terms of Reference should be amended to specifically include the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan refresh.

**It was agreed that it be RECOMMENDED TO FINANCE AND ASSETS COMMITTEE:**

**To add into the objectives of the Terms of Reference for the Working Party a responsibility to contribute to the Council's response to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan refresh.**

**52. NEW BUS SERVICES FOR EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE PROPOSALS DOCUMENT – UPDATE**

The Working Party received a verbal report from the Infrastructure and Strategy Manager regarding her discussions with Oliver Howarth, Bus Strategy Manager at CPCA, since the last Working Party meeting. She explained that he had shared the previously-supplied information with Stagecoach and was looking at the routes into Cambridge to determine what could be feasible. She reminded Members that there was no national bus strategy and that all bus operators were facing large financial pressures.

She also reported that the demand responsive pilot in Huntingdonshire had been postponed until the end of lockdown, June 2021, and that no decision had yet been made regarding a similar scheme elsewhere.

Members noted the Infrastructure & Strategy Manager's update.

**53. CYCLING AND WALKING ROUTES CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

The Working Party received a report (V152, previously circulated) presenting the feedback from the Cycling and Walking Routes public consultation. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager explained that she had merged the emailed comments and responses with the questionnaire submissions and that the resulting data had been split into four separate spreadsheets for walking and for cycling:

- strategic A-B routes linking settlements
- shorter "internal" routes within settlements
- comments regarding disrepair
- requests for crossing points

She also provided updates on queries raised at the previous meeting as follows:

- Regarding shared- or single-use pathways: she reported that the likelihood was for more rural pathways to be wider and designed for shared-use but that was not certain and design decisions would be made nearer the time. (Minute 44)
- Regarding short-, medium-, and long-term aims: she reported that the time frames were up to 3 years, up to 5 years, and greater than 5 years respectively. (Minute 45)
- Regarding the maximum lengths for walking and cycling routes: she explained that the “propensity to cycle/walk” tool prescribed by the DfT set cycling as 1-5km and walking as up to 2km. (Minute 45)
- The LCWIP consultation launch had originally been reported as 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021 but more recently as 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021. (Minute 47)

Finally, she reported that she had been liaising with the County Council Lead Officer for the LCWIP who had confirmed that it was not intended to include all possible routes across the District. Rather, the DfT tools should be used to determine priorities.

A Member queried how the volume of responses compared to other District Consultations since that could provide an indication of how important the subject was to East Cambs residents. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager stated that she was not aware of comparable extensive District-wide consultations that had taken place, but would contact the Communities and Partnership Manager.

There was general agreement that the volume of data was enormous and making it difficult to process and prioritise. One Member summarised that in essence the overarching response was that where a road connection existed residents would also like a cycle path, often a footpath, and in some cases an equestrian route.

Following lengthy discussions it was agreed that:

- The lists needed to be streamlined by collating duplicate entries where different respondents had described the same route slightly differently. Local knowledge would be vital here and Ward Councillors and Parish Councils would be best placed to tackle this.
- Grouping the data by geographical area would help to give a more coherent sense of the issues and also to determine where multiple small routes connected to give a greater overall benefit than the sum of their individual parts.

- Maps to indicate the focal point of services, and the surrounding settlements relying on those services, would help to understand the significance of different routes.
- Developer obligations and other local commitments such as the County Council's TIP list should be checked in order to determine what may already be in the pipeline. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager committed to adding this information to the spreadsheets.

**54. CYCLING AND WALKING ROUTE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Working Party received a report (V153, previously circulated) to determine route evaluation criteria to inform the East Cambs Cycling and Walking strategy work, and to progress the disrepair items highlighted in the consultation feedback.

Regarding the responses in the "Disrepair" spreadsheets, a Member highlighted that the different issues were the responsibilities of different bodies and therefore questioned if further data was available to separate out disrepair, street clutter, and insufficient lighting. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager replied that unfortunately there were no further details. Another Member pointed out that some responses were unclear as to what/where the issue was, and all were approximately one year old meaning that some repairs may already have been completed. It was suggested that rather than sending the whole list to the County Council, Parish Councils may be better placed to identify what each entry referred to, if the problem still existed, and if it was already in hand.

Several Members stressed the importance of considering the impact of rural isolation, employment opportunities, and social engagement opportunities. As a rural district it was crucial to consider rural isolation and sustainability, as well as responding to other consultations. A Member suggested that a fifth bullet point be added to the quantitative evaluation criteria in section 4.7 of the report in order to reflect a more qualitative element relating to social good, in particular with regard to reducing rural isolation.

Referring back to the earlier commitment to investigate existing developer obligations, it was suggested that some routes could be earmarked for future developers to take on and CIL funding could be used for important routes that were not approved via the LCWIP. It was felt to be important to identify and understand which routes would be likely to receive funding and which would not, but would still be considered important by local residents.

There was general agreement that the project included many policy and strategy decisions both for the East Cambs District Council and to feed into wider policy such as the Transport Authority. Parish Council feedback would be essential for informing local policy.



Responding to a question by the Chairman, the Democratic Services Manager stated that she believed that consulting the Parish Councils would be permitted during the forthcoming pre-election 'purdah' period, since it would be considered part of the ongoing business of the Council and no outcomes would be formulated for further consideration until after the elections. It was agreed that the Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would formally confirm that with the Chief Executive.

Members stressed the importance of District Councillors working together with Parish Councillors and sharing the vision of not just looking at routes within their own Parish but also the bigger picture of linking short routes together. A Member pointed out that a reasonably long timeframe would be necessary for the Parish Council responses in order to accommodate their meeting frequencies, since some only met every two months.

Discussion then moved on to the issue of longer more strategic routes linking larger settlements. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager reminded Members that funding would need to be in place before she could arrange the commissioning of feasibility studies from Sustrans. The exact cost for a route would depend upon many factors, including the route length, but she had been advised that £5-£20k per route was likely. It was agreed by all Members that Finance & Assets Committee should be asked to approve a funding allocation for preliminary feasibility studies at their next meeting rather than delay until the June meeting. However, there was further discussion as to whether the Working Party should specify the routes at the same time as requesting the funding, or make that decision at a later date once further information was available.

Several Members reiterated the principle of connecting the major settlements of Ely, Littleport and Soham with the surrounding smaller settlements which fed into them for employment, health and leisure purposes. And similarly, connecting villages in the south of the District to Newmarket and Cambridge was discussed. Members emphasised that when the maps (Minute 53) had been prepared they could show strategic routes that had not previously been considered because the service centres had not been obvious. They also urged a focus on shorter journeys that could reasonably be undertaken by an average member of the public, and consideration of interconnectivity and appropriate cycle storage facilities to enable users to mix modes of transport. The example was given of sixth formers being willing and able to cycle from a small village to a larger settlement in order to catch a bus into Cambridge for college but currently having nowhere secure and weatherproof to store their bicycle near the bus stop.

Members referred to cross-border routes from Newmarket to Cambridge, and Burwell to Newmarket *via* Exning, and it was highlighted that these would need to be discussed with neighbouring Councils. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager stated that the Burwell to Newmarket route might already be allocated for Section 106 funding, and agreed to confirm that. Long routes solely within

the District were identified as Burwell to Cambridge *via* Lode and Bottisham, Ely to Soham, Ely to Littleport, and Witchford to Ely. A Member suggested that it would be important to recognise where paths already existed, even if improvements were needed, and where there was currently no provision. As an example, a cycle route in need of repair was in place between Burwell and Lode, whereas some of the other routes had nothing at all.

*Due to a localised power cut, the Democratic Services Manager was absent from the meeting 7:25-7:43pm, during the discussion on longer routes.*

*Cllrs Cane and Dupré left the meeting at 7:28pm due to other commitments and did not return.*

After continued discussion regarding whether or not specific routes should be included in the funding bid to Finance & Assets Committee on 25<sup>th</sup> March, the remaining Members present agreed to specify Ely to Soham and Ely to Littleport (via the old A10 route) in the first instance. Members stated that they wanted to progress both the consideration of long routes and the detailed study of shorter routes – with the added importance of linking shorter routes together – and that securing the initial funding to explore the feasibility of Ely to Soham and Ely to Littleport routes would allow that work to continue in the background while the Working Party focussed their attentions on deeper analysis of all the consultation data.

It was agreed:

- That confirmation be sought from the Chief Executive that consulting Parish Councils on the route data would be permitted during the pre-election period.
- That Parish Councils be asked to check and update the disrepair lists to clarify what needed to be done.
- That social good, particularly relating to addressing rural isolation, should be added to the evaluation criteria.
- That the Strategy & Infrastructure Manager confirm whether or not a Burwell to Newmarket route had been allocated Section 106 funding.

**It was also agreed that it be RECOMMENDED TO FINANCE AND ASSETS COMMITTEE:**

**To approve a funding allocation of £30k for Sustrans to conduct feasibility studies on strategic cycle and walking routes within the District, specifically Ely to Soham and Ely to Littleport in the first instance, with authority for specification of the brief and agreed programme of work being delegated to the Strategy & Infrastructure Manager in consultation with the Members of the Working Party.**

**55. WORK PROGRAMME – MARCH 2021**

Members received and noted the Work Programme to September 2021.

**56. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed to meet again in April to discuss and agree a programme of work for the feasibility studies, if funds were approved by the Finance & Assets Committee on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

The meeting closed at 7:53pm.

**Notes of a remote meeting of the East Cambs Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party held on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> June at 6.00pm.**

**PRESENT**

Cllr Alan Sharp (Chairman)  
Cllr David Ambrose Smith  
Cllr Lorna Dupré  
Cllr Lis Every  
Cllr Simon Harries

**OFFICERS**

Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure & Strategy Manager  
Tracy Couper – Democratic Services Manager  
Caroline Evans – Democratic Services Officer

**57. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Cllr Alan Sharp was nominated by Cllr David Ambrose Smith, seconded by Cllr Lis Every, and duly appointed as the Chairman for the 2021/22 municipal year.

**58. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Charlotte Cane.

**59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**60. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Notes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

**61. DRAFT REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Working Party received the revised Terms of Reference, previously circulated, which included a new reference to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan Refresh consultation at 2.4.

**It was agreed to RECOMMEND TO FINANCE AND ASSETS COMMITTEE:**

**That the revised Terms of Reference attached as an Appendix to these Minutes be approved.**

## **62. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL LCWIP**

The Working Party received a draft version, previously circulated, of the Council's potential response to Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) consultation. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager explained that, in drafting the response for discussion, she had focussed on the previously-generated lists of the most proposed routes from the ECDC consultation. She had compared these lists with those proposed by the County Council, and any not already included in the LCWIP had been detailed in the draft response for consideration by the County Council. She explained that the LCWIP included a Soham to Wicken cycle route in its maps but not its tables and she had therefore included that route in the response with the request that it should be part of the LCWIP. She informed Members that the Council's response to the LCWIP would need to be submitted before the 13<sup>th</sup> July closing date of the consultation.

A Member suggested that the road names or route should be added to each suggestion, where known, for clarity and that reference could be made to relevant content of the Local Transport Plan of the Combined Authority.

Members were all in agreement that a safe crossing for cyclists and pedestrians on the A10 at the Witchford Road roundabout should be a priority in order to connect routes to the south west of Ely with the city, and should be independent of future plans to dual the A10. The lack of a safe crossing point there had been highlighted in the ECDC consultation as the most dangerous crossing in the District and Members considered it to be an urgent matter of safety that should be prioritised and could not wait for completion as part of potential longer-term road improvements. A Member commented that the recent widening of the northbound exit on the roundabout to two lanes had increased the danger to pedestrians because the traffic travelled faster and drivers were more aware of the adjacent vehicles, to the detriment of pedestrians or cyclists attempting to cross. Several Members mentioned a recent new crossing in a similar location next to a roundabout on the A10 near Waterbeach, and suggested it could be highlighted to the County Council as a precedent in support of the feasibility of placing a crossing at the Witchford Road roundabout.

A Member commented that some of the scoring parameters on the LCWIP were poor and could lead to large numbers of routes receiving the same score so further information, such as Sustrans feasibility studies, would be needed to determine priorities. (See Minute 63.)

It was agreed that:

- The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would expand the "Lack of a safe crossing point..." paragraph on page 2, in line with the discussions above, to emphasise the need for a crossing at the A10/Witchford Road roundabout junction and also highlight the promised A142 crossing at Stuntney that had not yet been delivered.
- Road names and/or specific route details would be added to the routes listed.

- After making the above agreed changes, the Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would re-circulate the document to Working Party Members for comment and agreement via email by 2<sup>nd</sup> July. The final document would then be circulated to all Council Members before submission, as was standard practice for transport consultations.

### **63. CYCLING AND WALKING ROUTES CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

The Working Party received a report (W9, previously circulated) presenting a summary of the Cycling and Walking Routes consultation that was undertaken in early 2020. The routes that were suggested in the responses to that consultation were presented in tables and on maps.

Members reiterated the discussions from the previous meeting regarding finding a balance between the importance of linking the major towns in the District to each other, and linking the towns to the villages and more rural communities surrounding them. Consulting the Parish Councils would be vital in terms of understanding the needs of local communities as well as recognising where routes already existed but needed maintenance. Members recognised that the data from the consultation would be more than a year old, and much had changed in people's outlooks due to the pandemic, so the Parish Councils would be well-placed to consider both the results of the consultation and the new realities of their local communities. Members also agreed that all Council Members would need to be informed about the process and work to encourage engagement of the Parish Councils in their own Ward. An advantage to the Parish Councils would be that they would have detailed information to form the basis of their own bids for funding for small projects, perhaps with one or more neighbouring Parish Councils, or to utilise any CIL/S106 funding they may already have.

The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager explained that she had identified potential routes that could be submitted to Sustrans with a request for quotes for feasibility studies. The quotes would be provided free of charge and would detail the cost and timescale for providing a feasibility study. The studies themselves would look in detail at each route and identify things like utilities, land ownership, rights of way, and indicative cost. Having the results of a feasibility study could help gain financing for a route when funding opportunities arose. There was general consensus that quotes should be obtained for the following six routes, all of which could demonstrate links to towns and/or bigger routes and/or public transport:

1. **Littleport to Ely**, stopping just past Chettisham. The remainder of the route from south of Chettisham to the centre of Ely had already been committed to as part of the North Ely development.
2. **Burwell to Swaffham Prior**. This would link with other existing or proposed routes to reach Soham, Fordham, Isleham, NCN routes 51 and 11, and some Greenway routes proposed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
3. **Burwell to Fordham**. This would link with 2 above.
4. **Haddenham to the A142**. This would link with routes to Sutton and Witchford and on to Ely.

5. **Ely to Little Downham.** This would link up the Leisure Village as well.

6. **Reach to Burwell.** This would link with 2 and 3 above.

It was agreed that:

- Parish Councils would be consulted on the routes identified in the consultation and be asked to report back by the end of October. They would be encouraged to provide qualitative information about the needs of their local residents, to complement the quantitative data already held.
  - The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would draft a suitable document to send to Working Party Members for comment by email.
  - All Council Members would be given advance notice and outline details of the proposed Parish Council consultation when the LCWIP response was circulated to them (Minute 62).
- The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would submit to Sustrans the six routes detailed above, with a request for quotes for feasibility studies. Once received, the quotes would be considered by the Working Party Members to prioritise for recommendation to the Finance & Assets Committee for funding

#### **64. CYCLING AND WALKING ROUTE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Working Party received a report (W10, previously circulated) to determine route evaluation criteria to inform the East Cambs Cycling and Walking strategy work. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager explained that the criteria were needed in order to prioritise which routes would be put forward for delivery, and when. Decisions on delivery would need to be made when funding was available and therefore evaluation criteria would be needed at that stage.

A Member expressed concern that the criteria in paragraph 4.7 of the report were mostly quantitative and would therefore skew attention towards larger settlements and away from smaller routes that may have very significant benefit within a small community but overall would affect fewer individuals. Three criteria were related to the scale of each route, two were related to “added value” of linking with existing routes and providing safe routes where no public transport existed, so a more general criterion regarding routes demonstrating social and wellbeing benefits, and a high level of support from the local community, should be added for balance. The more qualitative criteria could be particularly important when differentiating between routes with equal scores based on the quantitative criteria.

*6:57pm Cllr Lis Every left the meeting and did not return due to other commitments.*

It was agreed that:

- Parish Councils would be sent the consultation responses which related to disrepair and be asked to determine which still required attention.

- The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager would add a further bullet point to the criteria in paragraph 4.7 of the report, relating to enhanced social and wellbeing benefits and importance to a local community, and circulate it to Members.

**65. WORK PROGRAMME – MAY 2021**

Members received and noted the Work Programme to September 2021.

**66. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed to adopt a flexible approach to the next meeting date according to need. It was suggested that a meeting was likely to be needed in late October/early November to discuss the Parish Councils' responses and, depending on the outcome of the Sustrans quotes, another meeting may be required before then. The Chairman committed to keeping Members updated.

The meeting closed at 7:11pm.

DRAFT



# **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE BUS, CYCLE, WALK WORKING PARTY TERMS OF REFERENCE**

## **1.0 CONSTITUTION**

- 1.1 The East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party, appointed by Finance and Assets Committee, shall comprise 6 elected Members. A Chairman will be elected at the first Working Party meeting. The Chairman of the Working Party will be elected from the Conservative Group Membership.
- 1.2 The Working Party will continue until it completes the work set out in the Terms of Reference.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

- 2.1 To oversee the East Cambridgeshire Bus Services Review process.
- 2.2 To oversee the development of the East Cambridgeshire Cycling and Walking Routes Strategy.
- 2.3 To oversee the Council's response to County Council's Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan consultation.
- 2.4 To contribute to the active travel and bus services sections of the Council's response to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority 's Local Transport Plan Refresh consultation.
- 2.5 To ensure effective and meaningful dialogue and consultation during the Review.

## **3.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 3.1 The Working Party's terms of reference shall be
- 3.2 To advise the Finance and Assets Committee in relation to:
  - The progress towards the Bus Services Review and Cycling and Walking Routes Strategy in accordance with agreed timetable and project plan.
  - Recommendations related to key issues requiring Committee direction in the formulation of the Review and Strategy
- 3.3 To advise and support the Director, Commercial with the Review, specifically:
  - Liaison with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council.
  - Other relevant issues as they arise during the Review process.
  - Progress reports to Finance and Assets Committee, where appropriate.

When undertaking the actions referred to above, the Working Party may invite interested parties, stakeholders, Members and co-optees to address it, deliver presentations and / or answer questions.

## **4.0 OPERATION OF THE WORKING GROUP**

- 4.1 The Working Group will agree a programme of work and a frequency of meetings that reflects the priorities it identifies.
- 4.2 The Group will be supported by Officers from the Council's Infrastructure and Strategy team.
- 4.3 Minutes will be recorded for all meetings.