

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 06 July 2018
at 10am in the Council Chamber, County Hall**

Present:

Mr M Wilby - Chair

Mr M Castle

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr T Smith

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr S Eyre

Mr C Foulger

Mr A Grant

Mr T Jermy

Mrs C Wilker

Ms J Oliver

Mr A White

Also Present:

Cllr A Kemp

Cllr T Adams

Cllr B Spratt

1. Apologies and Substitutions

1.1 There were no apologies for the meeting.

2. Minutes

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

3.1 No Interests were declared

4. Urgent Business

4.1.1 The Chairman chose to take item 9, "Hardings Way South, King's Lynn Traffic Regulation Order" under Urgent Business. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services explained that this decision had been made under consideration of section 100B of the Local Government Act 1972, subsection 4b. The Chairman believed that special circumstances existed in the case of this report as the matter had been in the public domain for a considerable amount of time and had raised a large volume of local feeling; if the Committee reached a decision at the meeting certainty could be provided to all local interests in the matter.

4.1.2 Local Member Cllr A Kemp had requested the matter was considered under a public enquiry; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services had considered the request and taken advice from the Practice Director of nplaw. Having

done so he did not consider there to be unusual or exceptional circumstances present in the proposal to consider the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which would be better informed by a public inquiry. The request was declined.

- 4.1.3 Jane Linley solicitor at NPLaw gave background to the Committee on the public sector equality duty according to the Equality Act 2010; the issues had been fully explored in the report including in the appendices and Equality Impact Assessment. Since Norfolk County Council was a traffic authority, under the Road Traffic Control act 1991 they could make an order where it was expedient to do so; she gave background to the subsection relevant to the Committee in making their decision.
- 4.1.4 The Solicitor from NPLaw advised Members to consider the desirability of maintaining reasonable access to premises reminding them of the duty under public law when exercising discretion not to act irrationally, and that they will have acted reasonably if all matters were considered.
- 4.2.1 Members saw a video presented by Cllr Kemp, about the challenges changes to the road would create voiced by a local disabled resident. The resident raised concerns about cars speeding on the road and about the increase in HGVs on the road after the changes.
- 4.2.2 Cllr Kemp spoke against the TRO, discussing her concerns about increased risks for disabled people, concerns raised by residents about traffic and against the order, and increase in HGVs. She was concerned that the Sustrans safe route to school would not be useable by children or disabled people independently if the order went ahead and felt the development plan was out of date. Cllr Kemp also raised concerns about impartiality of Members who she felt should have raised declarations of interest.
- 4.2.3 Member of the public, Mr Ray, spoke against the TRO, discussing new dangers created by the order, impact on public health and implementation of NICE guidelines, contradictions with the cycling and walking and casualty reduction strategies, concerns over site visit times, and existing access to the area from other roads.
- 4.3.1 A member queried whether the TRO was necessary and whether other options may be available; the Interim Highway Design and Development Manager confirmed that King's Lynn Borough Council had placed a condition on the planning permission of 3 new access routes being provided.
- 4.3.2 It was pointed out that issues highlighted in the Equality Impact Assessment were detrimental to disabled pedestrians and children. The Member also noted that 80 objections had been received and should be listened to.
- 4.3.3 A Member noted that the TRO referred to opening only a portion of the road for access; he noted that streets in the area were mostly narrow Victorian streets which he felt were not suitable for more traffic.
- 4.3.4 Concern was raised about interests not being declared by those involved in the original planning decision by King's Lynn Borough Council.
- 4.3.5 The Interim Highway Design and Development Manager confirmed there was a condition that Norfolk County Council must deliver the TRO for the development to go ahead. Planning permission was only granted for access at this stage.
- 4.4 With 9 votes ~~9~~ in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention the Committee **AGREED** to:
 - 1) Consider the findings of the equality impact assessment, attached at Appendix B

**This minute was amended in the meeting of the 18 January 2019. To view the amendment made, please view the minutes of that meeting*

to this report, and in doing so, note the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 2) Consider and agree the mitigating action proposed in the equality impact assessment
 - 3) To consider the objections raised and the supporting information contained within this report and decide whether or not to approve the Norfolk County Council (King's Lynn, Various Roads) (Bus and Cycle Lane) Amendment **Traffic Regulation Order**
 - 4) **Having considered the matters set out in 1), 2) and 3) above the Committee agreed that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order should be made**

5. Public Questions

5.1 Three public questions were received; see Appendix A.

5.2.1 Mr Raab asked a supplementary question: "When nitrogen dioxide goes back up will the Council have the money to change it back"

5.2.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that the Council, together with borough councils, had access to a monitor to keep track of nitrogen dioxide levels. There were various measures in place including abolition of diesel cars to get the various levels of emissions down.

6. Member Questions

6.1 Two Member questions were received; see appendix A.

6.2.1 Mr M Castle asked a supplementary question: There were 3000 parking spaces in the Yarmouth Seafront area, 1050 in Borough Council Pay & Display Car Parks and about 1250 in Norfolk County Council "on street" Pay & Display and Visitor Voucher Parking spaces in the Residents Permit Zone. He reported there was less parking here in winter because the Borough Council closed St Nicholas and North Drive car parks, and over time Borough Charges had become more expensive, noting Norfolk County Council Parking spaces were free in the evening and overnight, while Borough Council ones were payable until 9pm and £1 thereafter. A new winter charging scheme was due to start in winter 2018-19 to on-street parking in the busiest section of the Golden Mile between Sandown Road & Kings Road; the Borough Council charged for its 5 car parks in that area; all spaces north of Sandown Road & south of Kings Road were free during winter; the spaces between Sandown Road & Kings Road were free in the evening and overnight. As local Member he felt there should be a seamless approach between both Councils and was concerned by the Borough Council's plans to block winter charging by Norfolk County Council in the central seafront area. He felt the lack of coherent strategy caused confusion for the public. He requested a thorough review of seafront parking after the first year of operation and consideration to ensuring greater compatibility of parking fees, feeling that on street parking should be more expensive.

6.2.2 The Chairman replied that Officers were working with districts to come to an agreement.

- 6.3.1 Cllr Adams asked a supplementary question: “are you aware of the petition against the DIY waste charges, which received 6600 signatures?”
- 6.3.2 The Chairman was aware of the petition in question.

7. Verbal update/feedback from Members of the Committee regarding Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.

- 7.1 An update on the Norwich western link Member Working Group was circulated and an update given by the Vice Chairman; see appendix B.
- 7.2 A Rail update was circulated and discussed; see appendix C
- The Interim Team Leader for Transport updated members that discussions were ongoing with Greater Anglia about improving Yarmouth Station
 - A Yarmouth Station Development meeting would be held the following week
 - Norwich to Nottingham options were discussed; benefits of a split service would be looked at. The Norfolk rail group would discuss this.
 - The community rail group were looking at a proposal to turn the Norwich to Ely line to a community line, noting improvements to services across Norfolk
 - Follow through on delivery of promises Anglian Rail was discussed; the Chairman was due to meet with them, but updated Members that new trains were being built and they were positive about delivering on promises

8. Market town transport network improvement strategy

- 8.1 The Committee received the report providing an update on the 2017-18 programme of market town transport strategies and proposing towns for the second year's programme 2018-19.
- 8.2.1 The Chairman supported going ahead with the next 5 towns in the report.
- 8.2.2 Mr P Duigan thanked the team for the work done in Dereham noting the money also put in by Dereham council.
- 8.2.3 Mr T East had received comments from Liberal Democrat members Cllrs Maxfield and Seward; they commented that North Walsham was behind schedule. Growth of the Broadland Northway and popularity of the East Cromer coast were increasing pressures on narrow roads north of the town, impacting on parking in villages, speeding, volume of traffic, and bus routes. The comments would be passed to the Interim Team Leader for Transport to provide a response.
- 8.2.4 It was queried what would be done to improve access for the aging population and disabled community in North Walsham; the Interim Team Leader for Transport replied that Officers were looking at public transport access into towns and access from towns to services and facilities. The council's ability to improve access was limited by resources and was outside the remit of the market town work.
- 8.2.5 It was suggested that more ambitious targets were needed to fund transport measures; the Interim Team Leader for Transport replied that studies would identify what was needed to mitigate impacts of growth and secure funding.
- 8.2.6 It was queried whether there was funding to carry out the recommendations for each town; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that it was useful to have schemes prepared so bids could be applied for quickly when

funding streams became available. Growing council tax base and investing in the right infrastructure would be beneficial

8.2.7 Mr P Duigan noted that in Dereham, the Mayor went around the town with Guide Dogs for the Blind to support improving disability access of the town.

8.3 The Committee:

1. **NOTED** the progress that has been made for the current market town Network Improvement Strategies in Dereham, Swaffham, North Walsham, Thetford and Diss
2. **AGREED** a programme of market town Network Improvement Strategies looking at the transport impacts of growth in market towns and large villages in Norfolk in 2018/19

9. Highway Asset Performance

9.1 The Committee reviewed the report highlighting performance of the highway asset against current service level priorities, based on previous Member decisions and covering planned capital structural maintenance of the assets only.

9.2.1 Mr East queried how much Norfolk County Council paid out in 2017-18 in relation to non pothole related highway claims; the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste agreed to look into non pothole related insurance claims and circulate information to the Committee.

9.2.2 The drop in repudiation rate was queried; it was clarified that this could relate to the time insurance claims were received in the year, or repairs not completed in time resulting in the insurance claim being upheld. More insurance claims were to be expected over winter due to the conditions.

9.2.3 A Member suggested that the decrease in public satisfaction in Public Rights of Way showed that the strategy needed revising; the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste reported that funding for this had reduced over the years; when questioned, the public had put Public Rights of Way low on their priorities for use of funding.

9.2.4 the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste confirmed that weed spraying was not immediately included in the highway asset funding, but confirmed that standard treatment was 2 per year.

9.2.5 Mrs C Walker reported that work begun on western bypass was good on the new sections, however other parts were in poor condition; the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste **agreed** to raise this with Highways England

9.3 The Committee:

- a) **NOTED** the progress against the Asset Management Strategy Performance framework and the continuation of the current strategy and targets
- b) **NOTE** the progress against the implementation of Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure a Code of Practice item
- c) **NOTE** the performance against Key Performance Indicator's in Highway Contracts (Tarmac, WSP & Dynniq)

10. Hornsea Project Three offshore Wind Farm and onshore supporting infrastructure – submitted application.

10.1.1 The Committee discussed the report outlining the formal Development Consent Order

(DCO) application consultation under Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008. This was the final opportunity to make any formal representations on the merits of the proposal prior to the statutory Examination, although the County Council would have an opportunity to submit a Local Impact Report under S60 (3) of the Act ahead of the Examination.

- 10.1.2 Issues regarding establishing a community benefit fund had been addressed, and construction duration time reduced to a maximum of 8 years, aiming for 6 years. The developer had agreed to support the local fishing community and work closely with Highways England and Norfolk County Council regarding the A47 and Western Link. They had also recognised the need to feed electricity into the local grid network.
- 10.1.3 Outstanding issues were highway issues related to access to the substation and potential booster station, flood and drainage risk issues, and ornithological investigative work.
- 10.2.1 It was queried how the cable would cross the railway; The Principal Planner confirmed that digging would be horizontal to the railway line and there would be no disruption.
- 10.2.2 It was **suggested** there should be recommendations to emphasise that the project should benefit Norfolk; the Principal Planner had stressed the need for secondary connections, which the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) would take forward to legislative law. It was important to ensure appropriate conversations were held with businesses who would be adversely affected by digging.
- 10.2.3 The Committee also agreed that there should be penalties imposed on the developer of Hornsea Three in the event that the project over-runs beyond the timetable set out in the Environmental Statement accompanying the DCO application. Such penalties should include financial compensation to be paid into a Community Benefit Fund; The Principal Planner **agreed** to take this back for consideration.
- 10.2.4 Mr Jermy **suggested** that that the recommendation should be amended to show that the Council enthusiastically supported the principle, to be leading the way in renewable technology.
- 10.2.5 Mr East was keen for the comments from the Member for Melton Constable to be incorporated into the response, and to see proposals from the developer on how it would benefit local communities in the long term. The Principal Planner confirmed that this would be taken forward, and was covered at paragraphs 2.39-2.44 of the report; Officers would continue to lobby for benefits for local communities.
- 10.2.6 As Local Member for Swardeston, Mr C Foulger raised concerns about the substation proposed here, including access on Horstead Road, increase in lorries during construction and about the height of the substation.
- 10.3 The Committee **AGREED** to inform the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of state that the County Council:
 - (1) Supports the principle of this offshore renewable energy proposal, which is consistent with national policy, subject to the detailed comments set out in this report being resolved satisfactorily through the DCO process;
 - (2) Has a series of holding highway objections to the proposed onshore infrastructure (see Appendix 1);
 - (3) Seeks a number of / "Requirements" (conditions) relating to highway; flood risk; and archaeological matters being agreed and attached to any final DCO

decision (see Appendix 1).

- (4) Considers that the applicant should ensure that the proposal brings real socio-economic benefits to both (a) the individual communities directly affected by the planned infrastructure works and (b) the County as a whole.

11. Tri-LEP area Local Energy Strategy

- 11.1 The Committee considered the report discussing the Tri-LEP Energy East Project which would form the basis for a new energy hub in the Greater South East of England, funded through the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy to unblock some of the challenges concerning grid connectivity, and capitalise on opportunities for local energy generation, storage, distribution and supply.
- 11.2 The Committee **ENDORSED** the Strategy on behalf of NCC

12. Finance Monitoring

- 12.1.1 The Committee received the finance monitoring report reflecting the budgets for the 2018-19 budget and forecast outturn position as at the end of May 2018.
- 12.1.2 The Finance Business Partner for Community & Environmental Services reported that reserves would be reviewed.
- 12.2.1 The Finance Business Partner for Community & Environmental Services reported that data for the first 2 months of the DIY charge policy showed income to be a significant increase from April/May 2017. The policy, to encourage householders to use commercial operators to dispose of DIY waste, was delivering as expected. Delivery of the full amount would be assessed when more data was available.
- 12.2.2 The Finance Business Partner for Community & Environmental Services confirmed that there were conditions from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in terms of timescales for delivery of money.
- 12.2.3 Mr Jermy requested that DIY charge data was circulated to Members when confirmed, as requested in his Member question from 18 May 2018.
- 12.2.4 It was queried whether money was set aside for problems with Haven Bridge in Yarmouth; the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste clarified that no money was set aside however people could make a claim with the Council to be considered by the risk and assurance team as appropriate.
- 12.3 The Committee **NOTED**:
- a) The 2018-19 revenue budget the Environment, Development and Transport Committee and the current forecast outturn position
 - b) The Capital programme for this Committee
 - c) The balance of reserves brought forward to 2018-19

13. Risk management

- 13.1.1 The Committee considered the report containing information from the latest EDT risk register as at July 2018, following the latest review conducted in June 2018.
- 13.1.2 It was reported that the title of risk RM14248 had been updated to take into account

the change in name of the Northern Distributor Road to the Broadland Northway, and to take “construction” out of the title, as it was now complete.

13.2 The Committee **CONSIDERED** and **NOTED**:

- a) The changes to EDT departmental risks since the last Risk Management report was reported to this Committee in March 2018, in Appendix A of the report
- b) The risks reported by exception in Appendix B of the report
- c) The summary of EDT departmental risks in Appendix C of the report
- d) The list of possible actions, suggested prompts and challenges presented for information in Appendix D of the report
- e) The background information to put the risk scoring into context, shown in Appendix E of the report

14. Performance management

14.1 The Committee received the report based upon the revised Performance Management System, which was implemented as of 1 April 2016 and providing data against the new 2018/19 vital signs list

14.2 A Member queried performance for buses, which was behind other target areas, and why the target for “% parishes that meet their designated target level of service” was not higher; The Head of Support and Development (Community and Environmental Services) agreed to find out this information and circulate to the Committee.

14.3 The Committee **REVIEWED** and **COMMENTED** on the performance data, information and analysis presented in the body of the report.

15. Forward plan and delegated decisions

15.1 The Committee reviewed the forward plan and delegated decisions taken by Officers.

15.2.1 A Member thanked Officers for adding fly tipping and charging to the forward plan; the Assistant Director of Highways & Waste confirmed this would be a written report. It was suggested that a review of the first quarter of the year would be useful.

15.2.2 Mr T Adams confirmed that he would like a response of the copy of the consultation as discussed at paragraph 2.5.

15.3 The Committee:

1. Reviewed the Forward Plan at Appendix A
2. Noted the delegated decisions set out in section 2 of the report

The meeting closed at 11.55

**Mr Martin Wilby, Chairman,
Environment Development and Transport Committee**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

MEMBER/PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE : FRIDAY 6 JULY 2018

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from Ken Hawkins

In what ways is Norfolk County Council's continuing low position (22nd of 31 this year) in regard to public satisfaction with its public rights of way, connected to the fact that its report to the EDT meeting on 6 July on Highways Asset Performance contains no other reference to their existence?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The paper on Highway Asset Management highlights performance of the highway asset against current service level priorities, based on previous Member decisions. It focuses on the planned capital structural maintenance of the assets, and uses metrics from condition surveys to evidence whether condition has changed in relation to the service level.

Customer satisfaction is important to us and a basket of indicators from the NHT survey including Rights of Way have been included in the performance framework and is referred to in Section 2.3.

The Head of Highways updated the EDT committee on the Highways annual survey of customer satisfaction at its meeting on 10 November 2017. This is reflected in the minutes, item 10.4 which directly reference Rights of way.

5.2 Question from Mr Robert Raab

Why does the Council want to Change Part of Bus and Bicycle road of Hardings Way Road back into a Polluting Road for All Polluting Traffic, in the Future Change the Rest of Hardings Way Road into a Polluting Road ?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The "Hardings Way south" report is item 9 on today's agenda for discussion, covering 125m of its length. There are no current proposals concerning the remainder of Hardings Way.

5.3 Question from Ms Lydia Hall

What can I tell my fellow residents that would resolve their confusion as to why they are now being charged for minor bits of DIY household waste and why it is being implemented differently at different recycling centres. Can you categorically confirm that there would not be a rise in fly tipping as a result of these charges?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

You can still dispose of all household waste free of charge at any of our twenty recycling centres. This includes things like freestanding furniture, electricals and white goods. The change to the charges is only for DIY type construction and demolition waste, everything else is as it was before April this year. To help customers there is a useful guide on the County Council's website at: <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/rubbish-and-recycling/diy-waste> and this is the approach that should be being implemented at all our sites.

The reason for the change is that we have to reduce the costs of our services and this change was taken in preference to closing sites or reducing opening hours further.

In terms of illegal fly tipping and the illegal dumping of waste we are aware of the concerns and are monitoring things closely. And whilst other areas that charge, such as Staffordshire, have not seen an associated increase in fly tipping it is something we are looking at very closely in Norfolk as a part of our ongoing service reviews.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.1 Question from Cllr Mick Castle

Winter car parking charges in Yarmouth central seafront area

Given the continued delay with regard to the implementation of a new winter on-street parking regime in the central seafront area (between Sandown Road and Kings Road) can the Chairman confirm that the County Council is still fully committed to ensuring a common strategic approach by both the Borough and County Councils with regard to parking charges and hours of operation within the "core" Yarmouth CPE area?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

During the process to implement winter car parking charges, NCC received a legal challenge from Great Yarmouth Borough Council. In light of this, it is unlikely that NCC will proceed with this scheme.

Supplementary info:

Norfolk County Council has endorsed the Parking Principles as a basis for making decisions related to parking management in Norfolk. In January 2012 the Environment, Transport and Development Scrutiny Panel received a report on draft parking principles for Norfolk. Panel endorsed the Parking Principles and it was suggested that they should be reviewed at some future stage to ensure they were working.

When making orders to control and/or restrict parking, officers use the principles as a guide when framing proposals, in conjunction with the different local circumstances that exist in particular places.

Norfolk's councils' Leaders and Chief Executives have agreed to sponsor a review of parking management including:

1. Agree to work together to review the current parking principles document to produce and agree something across the county and all districts.
2. Consider the introduction of on- and off-street parking charges in market towns and coastal resorts to complement the charging within the main urban areas.
3. Agree that management of on- and off-street parking should seek to balance the need to boost the economic vitality of an area alongside the need to progress local improvement schemes.
4. Agree to work in partnership and share data and information relating to parking that would help to further improve parking management.
5. Agree to review the Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) arrangements as part of a broader programme of work.
6. Agree to seek early interventions to address some of the pressing concerns which districts have raised about parking management arrangements.

At the last meeting in May, Leaders and Chief Executives agreed that a Member Task and Finish Working Group would be set up to steer the work on the review.

6.2 Question from Cllr Tim Adams

Do you accept the anger and frustration that the introduction of household DIY waste has caused people who consider these charges to be unfair, poorly implemented and will lead to increased fly tipping and increased costs to District Councils?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

I note the depth and range of concerns that have been expressed. The recent changes were made in preference to closing sites or reducing opening hours and were only made after a full public consultation. The changes also included a simplification of the pricing structure which already applied for large volumes of construction and demolition waste and also introduced the ability to take larger volumes of this type of waste to all sites – whereas previously it was only accepted at the main sites.

The changes bring us in line with legislation and other parts of the country that already charge for this type of material. And whilst other areas that charge, such as Staffordshire, have not seen an associated increase in fly tipping it is something we are looking at very closely in Norfolk as a part of our ongoing service reviews.

Norwich Western Link Project - Update for Environment Development and Transport Committee from Working Group (for 6 July 2018)

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link (NWL) project Member Working Group, the following provides a brief summary of the most recent meeting of the Group held on 4 July 2018:

1. The Group received a general progress update for the project. WSP provided details of the modelling that is being developed, using the same model base developed by Highways England for their Easton to North Tuddenham project. WSP also further updated on the options assessment, work being undertaken during 2018, using the Department for Transport's sifting tool. Work has also started on ecology and environmental reviews to inform the options assessment process. The team confirmed the project remains on programme and it is therefore hoped that a report on options, taking account of the recently completed consultation (see below), will be provided to Committee in October 2018 as planned. The Group were clear that the options work should also include an assessment of economic benefits.
2. The Group received further details from the delivery team on the consultation for the project, which started on 8 May and closed on 3 July. The exhibition events throughout the area were well attended with nearly 1200 people recorded. Meetings were previously held with the N&N Hospital and Norwich Research Park, who confirmed their support for the project, and additional consultation events were also included at both of these venues. The number of responses using the online consultation site (CommonPlace) has been good with around 1750 responses. The mapping option enabling comments to be added was also well used with around 750 comments received. All of the responses now need to be reviewed and a report produced that can be used to inform the options assessment work.
3. Highways England's (HE) latest progress for the A47 proposals from Easton to North Tuddenham was discussed with Claudia Wegener, the new project lead for the HE projects in Norfolk. Claudia set out her role is to re-engage the projects with stakeholders and maintain that contact throughout delivery. Claudia confirmed that previously published construction dates for the projects in Norfolk are still being worked to, which will see a start of construction of the Easton to North Tuddenham project in September 2021.

Claudia also confirmed that, whilst limited progress has been made recently on Easton to Tuddenham, this was due to a forthcoming change to the delivery team following a major HE procurement process. This will see a new team established that will deliver the project through all of its design, statutory processes and construction, which will benefit the project delivery. This new delivery team will be established from October and is expected to be fully delivering from January. In addition, Claudia also confirmed how HE and NCC are working together on the delivery of projects in Great Yarmouth and used this as an example of how the same close working would be applied to the NWL and Easton/Tuddenham projects.

4. The Local Plan Review process and programme was briefly discussed. An update note is to be provided to the Member Group.
5. The latest local group meeting (with parish council representatives) was held on 7 June and the details from this were discussed with the Member Group. That meeting was provided with a general update on the progress of the consultation at that time. It was also provided with a further discussion of the transport modelling and how data can be presented to assist people in understanding the outputs from the model, which will be used for the options assessment. The next meeting of the local group is planned for early August and they will receive an update on the completed consultation and the ongoing options assessment process. They will also be updated on traffic surveys completed during May at the western end of the NDR and at locations between the A1067 and A47.

For more details, please contact David Allfrey (Infrastructure Delivery Manager).

Tel 01603 223292

Rail Update
Environment Development and Transport Committee
6 July 2018

East Midlands Rail

- Members will recall that the East Midlands Trains franchise, which includes the current Norwich to Liverpool service, is being renewed
- In the consultation last year, there was a suggestion that government would be looking to split the service, possibly at Nottingham
- Norfolk County Council responded to the consultation, strongly supporting retention of the direct service and subsequently – following the May EDT Committee meeting – wrote to the Secretary of State
- In June, DfT published their response to the consultation and issued the Invitation to Tender to shortlisted bidders to run the train services
- These documents make it clear that government intends to split the service at Nottingham, with the East Midlands Franchise operating from Nottingham – Norwich and the section from Liverpool – Nottingham by either TransPennine Express or Northern.
- This change would take place from December 2021
- It is disappointing that government has confirmed it will split the service
- The county council can again express its opposition to this to government
- However, it is clear that government has committed to split the service. We are unlikely to be able to convince government to change their minds. Therefore it would be useful to consider what benefits there might be for Norfolk from the introduction of a split service. These could include:
 - Better connections at Peterborough with services to the north and Scotland on the East Coast Main Line, so that wait times are reduced
 - Retiming the service so that this service, and the Norwich to Cambridge service leave at 30 minutes apart. This would provide half hourly services to Cambridge, albeit passengers on the East Midlands services would need to change at Ely
 - Faster journey times
 - And crucially good connections at Nottingham for onward services to the north west

East West Rail

- Norfolk County Council is a member of the East West Rail Consortium, which has been supporting reinstatement of rail between Oxford and Cambridge. This would benefit the county because it would open up journeys to places such as Milton Keynes and Bedford, and further afield to the south west, without the need to go via London
- The project is progressing well. In December 2017 the Transport Secretary, Chris Grayling, announced the establishment of a new East West Railway Company. The 2017 budget also announced completion of the Central Section, linking Cambridge with Bedford, by 2030
- An Eastern Section Working Group has recently been established
- This will ensure that the interests of those authorities to the east of Cambridgeshire are taken into account in planning of the whole route, and to ensure that ultimately rail services are extended to Norwich and Ipswich

- The first meeting of this group is scheduled for next week, 12 July. One issue it will need to consider is how to react to emerging plans that the Central Section might be primarily designed for shorter distance services between Cambridge and Bedford
- The main benefits for Norfolk however are likely to be arise from faster, longer distance service connecting the major places, rather than slower, stopping services

GEML Task Force

- There was a recent meeting of the GEML Task Force on Monday 2 July
- The Task Force has agreed to refresh the business case for infrastructure improvements needed to deliver Norwich in 90
- This will include an assessment of the wider economic benefits of improved rail services as well as an assessment of the costs of the required infrastructure
- Greater Anglia, the train company, is replacing its entire fleet of trains
- New Inter City trains are being rolled out from May 2019 over an 18 month period
- Greater Anglia's new timetable will see a small number of Norwich to London journeys being done in 90 minutes from next August (2019)
- Alongside the new trains, major infrastructure improvements are required for the majority of services to run in 90 minutes. The business case refresh will provide the evidence needed to support government funding being put towards these

Ely Task Force

- The Task Force meets regularly to oversee development and delivery of major improvements in the Ely Area. These are needed for: services from King's Lynn via Cambridge to London; services from Norwich to Peterborough and Cambridge; services from Ipswich to Peterborough; and freight services from Felixstowe.
- Network Rail is undertaking development work on the rail elements, funded from contributions by New Anglia and Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnerships and the freight sector. Cambridgeshire County Council is taking forward a road study to examine potential solutions in the village of Queen Adelaide, just outside Ely, where there are three level crossings in under 1km
- Representatives met with the Chancellor on 4 July to discuss funding for scheme delivery.