

Date	Details	Details
26/01/2021	Road Traffic Safety Zoom meeting	Millbrook Parish Councillors & Cormac Highways
27/01/2021	Extract of Email from Parish Clerk to Paul Allen / Will Glassup - Cormac Highways	I shall be typing up the notes from the meeting this week. Meanwhile could you supply us budget costs for a traffic study in Millbrook. The full scope would need to be discussed and agreed in more detail but initial requirements would include updated traffic data, professional recommendation on whether there are likely to be drainage and noise issues relating to speed tables in Hounster Hill, recommendations regarding restrictions on articulated vehicles.
29/01/2021	Email from Paul Allen (former / retired Cormac Highways Manager)	<p>Paul then emailed the Engineering Design Group within Cormac on the 29/01/21 the below email.</p> <p>'Millbrook Parish Council have asked for a cost estimate for a feasibility study.</p> <p><i>There have been recent incidents in which large HGVs have hit and damaged buildings in the narrows of Hounster Hill/West Street and around the 90 degree bend at Dodbrook.</i></p> <p><i>Residents have also asked for large vehicles to be restricted from this road and for traffic calming measures as they report incidents of pedestrians being hit by wing mirrors etc.</i></p> <p><i>The Rame Peninsula Traffic Management Feasibility Study (2014) carried out by Robin Jamison mentions about a voluntary one way system for Millbrook and Kingsand/Cawsand.</i></p> <p><i>This newly requested study would build on this older study to see what specific options might now be available and their costs. They are also keen for speed tables down Hounster Hill and again wish to know if these would be viable taking into account drainage and noise and how much they would cost.</i></p>
29/03/2021	Email from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager	The feasibility study requested by Millbrook PC will go into depth about the possible restrictions. We have spoken with our consultancy team today and they will be getting back to us as soon as possible with a cost estimate. (Query was sent regarding the possibility to "implement weight restrictions coming into Millbrook / The Rame Peninsula and whether there would be an option to declassify the B3247 so it is not a B road."
01/05/2021	New County Councillor	Change in administration at Cornwall Council
23/06/2021	Email to CC Kate Ewert from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager	I have again yesterday chased up the study, I had the response 'I will be looking to finalise and issue the proposed project plan for the Millbrook scheme to you this week. This will be based upon the discussions previously held regarding the scheme and will take into account the contents of the previous feasibility report that we now have a copy of, as well other proposed schemes within the peninsula.'
29/06/2021	Extract of email from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways.	I do not have any update on the study, but I have asked again for another update and sent them your email today.

01/07/2021	Email from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager to parishioner	The Parish Council, Local Member and Cormac are currently working together to fund a feasibility study for HGV's / traffic within the Rame / Millbrook area.
05/07/2021	Email from CC Kate Ewert to Parishioner	As previously reported, the feasibility study is going to be done in the very near future. It will be really in-depth with, I am assured, emissions studies, cameras to record traffic use and other technical things. This study will, I hope, provide us with solutions to the problems on the road there. But, and I hate to say it, it wont be quick. Whatever the solution is, it is likely to be costly and probably quite complex but I can absolutely promise you that people do care, very much so.
08/07/2021	Extract from CC Kate Ewert's monthly report.	Residents have been contacting me about the continuing issues with the West St narrows – the Clerk and I have been pushing highways for a timeline for the feasibility study.
08/07/2021	Email extract from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways	Hounster Hill I have chased up the feasibility study again, as soon as I have information I will relay.
21/07/2021	Email response from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager	'I will be looking to finalise and issue the proposed project plan for the Millbrook scheme to you this week. This will be based upon the discussions previously held regarding the scheme and will take into account the contents of the previous feasibility report that we now have a copy of, as well other proposed schemes within the peninsula.' I have since chased again, but my contact is on holiday this week.
21/07/2021	Clerk's email response from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager	Aecom have been commissioned to price up the study and have been chased.
13/08/2021	Clerk, Chair and Vice Chair had a meeting with CC Kate Ewert and Catherine Thomson, Community Link Officer	To chase an update on the progress of the study (which we were told was underway) and to receive a quotation.

19/08/2021	CC Kate submitted email with queries to Cormac Highways Manager	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is initial work that needs to take place to know what the study needs to include and consequently quote for. We are waiting for the quote for the study, then the study can take place as soon as possible. The approximate study length will be 3months. 2. Will Glassup had met with AECOM (MPC were recently advised they were producing the study) and said the quote would be with MPC by the end of the week. 3. Will Glassup advised " The study to the best of my knowledge was to be paid for by the MPC, this would provide a platform for future funding by Cornwall Council when there are the options from the study." 4. A ball park figure of between 8 - 10K was quoted.
21/09/2021	Full Parish Council meeting Agenda item "To consider the quotation from Aecom, via Cormac Highways, for a West Street / Hounster Hill feasibility Study"	The Chair read an extract of an email from Cormac which stated, "This newly requested study would build on this older study to see what specific options might now be available and their costs. It was unanimously agreed by all Councillors to progress with feasibility study with a budget of up to £12,000.
30/09/2021	Email from CC Ewert with Project Plan summary and Terms and Conditions attached	Email from Aecom's Principal Engineer sent to Cormac "Please find attached the awaited Project Plan proposal for Millbrook. Please could you advise when you hear if the Parish wish to progress?", which was forwarded to CC Kate Ewert (date not shown on the email) and then sent to the Parish Clerk)
04/10/2021	Email from Parish Clerk to Cornwall Highways Manager 04/10/2021	<p>In an email you sent to Kate on 20th August you estimated the timescale for completion of the study would be three months. Please could you ask Aecom if the timeframe is still likely to be the same? Apologies, if this is on the document but I couldn't see it.</p> <p>Can you also tell me when Aecom has planned to start the work on the study please? The reason for asking is whilst MPC have agreed the budget, the Full Council need to formally approve the quotation before I have the authority to sign the document. All Councillors have been forwarded this email the below sent via CC Kate Ewert on 30th September. The Parish Council remains, in principle, supportive of the study, however, legally the Framework Project Plan summary / quotation has to be approved in a Full Council meeting. Our next Council meeting is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 19th October 2021. If the work is scheduled to take place before this date, and this email is not sufficient to proceed with the work, then I shall make arrangements to call an extra ordinary Parish Council meeting, which would be called purely for this item.</p> <p>If the work is not scheduled to commence until after the 19th October 2021, then the Framework Project plan will be signed within 24 hours of the Parish Council meeting</p>

06/10/2021	Email response from Will Glassup, Cormac Highways Manager	I have contacted AECOM, they have issued the following. “We can be flexible, we were anticipating around a week to mobilise from approval so if we assume a final decision on 19th we can plan resource to start that week (subject to the approval).”
19/10/2021	Full Parish Council meeting. Agenda item 9, Hounster Hill Feasibility Study.	The Council considered the Terms and Conditions and Framework Project Plan summary, which include a quotation of £10,628 from Aecom Ltd, the lead delivery organisation appointed by Cormac Solutions Ltd, to produce a feasibility study. Extract of proposal received: Approved during the Full Council meeting held on 16th November 2022, Minute 102a Page 3 Millbrook Parish Council, The Village Hall, The Parade, Millbrook, Cornwall, PL10 1AX Telephone 01752 823128 Email theclerk@millbrook-pc.gov.uk Website: millbrook-pc.gov.uk “The study will include a review of previous work undertaken and will look to build upon this when identifying potential measures. The findings of the study will be presented as a technical report.: The high-level review will focus on the following issues that have been identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number and class of HGVs passing through Millbrook. • The speed of all traffic passing through Millbrook. • The impact traffic is having on pedestrians throughout the village. • Intelligent systems for freight routing.” It was proposed by Cllr Mattholie, seconded by Cllr Taggart and unanimously agreed by all Councillors to accept the proposal, full details of which had been circulated by the Clerk).. Cllr Taggart suggested the Council follows Mr Bews recommendation and requests interim reports.
20/10/2021	Clerk sent email to Cormac Highways confirming quotation.	Please find signed copy of the Hounster Hill Feasibility proposal attached. The quality is not great please let me know if you would like to post a paper copy. MPC Purchase order number 1020TT/MIN86 The Councillors have asked me to find out if the report could be sent to the Council in stages and the Council can see the report in draft.
18/11/2021	Email received from CC Ewert	Just to let you know, Will Glassup has now had confirmation that the study is under way. Could you please let your members know?
12/01/2022	Email forwarded from CC Ewert	Email contained historic communication from Highways and Aecom. Will Glassup's email from 15/12/21 stated "I'm gauging the response for additional costs to the feasibility study. The CCTV costs have come back far higher than expected, they will focus on viewing first had the issues with HGV's on the Hounster Hill bend. AECOM believe this will aid in any work going forward. Happy to have a discussion on it, I feel MPC will not want any increase in costs but I thought id ask. If they decide against it, they will just continue with the traffic count. A Compensation vent quotation of £2,631 was received.

14/01/2022	Clerk's email to CC Ewert	<p>Thank you Kate. Hopefully, Aecom will respond to the other queries before the Parish Council meeting on Tuesday 18th January. It does state on point 17 of the Framework project plan " It is assumed that any questions or requests for information sent to the client or other council officers will be answered within 7 days".</p> <p>Also on point 15 it say " It is expected that a representative of the AECOM team is required to attend one stakeholder engagement workshop (via MS Teams)." Do you know if this will be arranged once the study has been completed and forwarded to the Parish Council? It will just be useful to know so that we can plan in our next Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group meeting. On my email sent on 20th October I said 'The Councillors have asked me to find out if the report could be sent to the Council in stages and the Council can see the report in draft.'</p>
14/01/2022	Email update from CC Ewert	<p>I have just spoken to Will – he has confirmed that Aecom have said they can do the video at a later date and add it as an appendix to the report. Secondly, he assumes you can have the draft report, but will confirm. Thirdly, he will find out about Aecom attending a meeting, he is assuming as I am that they will come to a meeting to talk us through the report! Will's contact at Aecom has changed 3 times in the last few weeks which has made things trickier!</p>
18/01/2022	Email from Aecom, via CC Ewert	<p>I have just spoken to Will – he has confirmed that Aecom have said they can do the video at a later date and add it as an appendix to the report. Secondly, he assumes you can have the draft report, but will confirm. Thirdly, he will find out about Aecom attending a meeting, he is assuming as I am that they will come to a meeting to talk us through the report! Will's contact at Aecom has changed 3 times in the last few weeks which has made things trickier!</p>
18/01/2022	Full Council meeting Agenda item 13.	<p>Minute 125: CC Kate Ewert provided responses from Aecom which had been received from the Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aecom have confirmed following issue of the Feasibility Study Report / completion of the study an invitation will be sent to the Parish Council to engage the stakeholders on the findings of the study. • To view the report in draft would likely involve more work from AECOM, as they would likely be required to address comments through the development. This would lead to an increase in costs and could delay production of the final version. • CC Kate Ewert was concerned having the traffic video survey completed in January or February would not provide the data required and it would be better if it was completed during busier periods. AECOM responded to this saying “it is not an issue to undertake the traffic surveys in the summer months when it is busier. The surveys aren't integral to the study; however, they will inform us of the extents of the problem which will aid in further work. <p>My contact at Intelligent Data Collection who provided the preferred traffic survey quote has confirmed that there are no additional costs as a result of undertaking the surveys later than originally envisaged. Once the Compensation Event has been signed off, I can go ahead and provisionally book this in – we can always move it closer to the time if required.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Council decides not to have the survey, there will likely be a reduction in costs from the original quotation. <p>Following discussions, it was proposed by Cllr Roberts that a request is made for the draft report as soon as possible, with the video survey to be completed for a week around Easter and the Council therefore approve the additional cost of £2,631.05. The motion was seconded by Cllr Wood and unanimously agreed by all Councillors. Resolved.</p>

May 2022	CC Ewert's monthly report	"In Millbrook we are looking forward t the final report on the feasibility study into West Street narrows being issued at some point in May - we are really hopeful that this will give us a good way forward in dealing with serious concerns that we have in the area.
09/06/2022	Aecom emailed what they referred to as the 'Final' Hounster Hill Feasibility Study.	Email from Aecom: Final Millbrook Feasibility Study Report vP02 addressing comments from P01, issued for information. Study forwarded to Millbrook Parish Councillors
14/06/2022	TEAMs meeting set organised by CC Ewert	Traffic & Transport Study reviewed. Presentation from Aecom. Queries raised and it was highlighted this was the first time MPC had seen the study.
17/06/2022	Email from Cormac with Compensation Event quote	Please find attached a Compensation Event request relating to work requested for the Millbrook Town Study being completed by our partners, Aecom. Please contact me if there is any clarification required.
17/06/2022	Email sent from the Clerk (adapted from a draft produced from the Chair and adapted following involvement with Traffic & Transport Working Group	<p>Hello Chris</p> <p>Thank you for your email. I had intended to email you today but shall now amend my draft email to incorporate a response regarding the Compensation Event Quotation submitted to me today. Is this a quotation for Millbrook Parish Council's approval? If it is, I would need you to take the following into consideration:</p> <p>You will be aware that Millbrook Parish Council (the client) commissioned, through Cormac, and wholly at MPC expense, the feasibility study report recently completed by AECOM.</p> <p>It would appear from your email that you are not aware that Millbrook Parish Council (MPC) did not get sight of the report at all until Friday 10th June (it was sent after business hours on the previous evening.) The Compensation Event Quotation states, "AECOM presented the Draft Report on 11th March 2022 and following the meeting, the Client and Cormac provided AECOM with comments to be addressed prior to the surveys being undertaken." I do not have any records of Millbrook Parish Council being present in a meeting held on 11th March 2022. Please could I ask you to check your records and provide evidence of MPC providing comments.</p> <p>MPC were given a very short time to read and process the 87 pages of the report before having a remote meeting on Tuesday 14th, and during that meeting a number of amendments were suggested, including the correction of one or two errors.</p> <p>To be told that all the budgeted time for amendments had already been used up and that you had had the report for a full week before we, the organisation footing the bill with local taxpayers' money, even had sight of it, has come as a complete surprise. MPC has not had any input to the apparently now final report, even though we had clearly stated much earlier in the process that</p>

we expected to see the draft before it was completely signed off (please refer to the attached email sent 20th October 2021). We were not even given the courtesy of being advised that a draft report had been issued to you and that you were making amendments to it without referring to us at all.

None of the suggested amendments are major and require nothing other than some changes to the wording of the final report - there are, for example, concerns that no specific reference is made to why Military Road cannot be used for rerouting HGVs and why it is not feasible to reroute traffic through West Street car park. As a council, we understand the reasons, but anyone revisiting this report in years to come could easily end up proposing such solutions and spending further taxpayers' money on exploring them again if their discounting is not explained in the document.

Similarly, the removal of any mention of mirrors, while we understand why their use was discounted, leaves anyone referring to this document in years to come under the impression that nobody even considered it as an option, so the fact that Cornwall Council categorically does not use them should be stated. There was also a request for the inclusion of the possibility of using a change in road surface to alert drivers to the "shared space" nature of the area, and the explicit discounting of speed tables and cushions needs to be explained for future readers.

As the body for whom the report was commissioned and by whom the cost is being met, the Council should have the opportunity to input into the final version. This is standard practice and the email of 20th October to Will Glassup highlights that this was important to councillors. MPC feels these amendments should be made without further charge, and if a fee is required by AECOM, that Cormac should pay it as it was Cormac that took up the budget allowed for amendments.

Several issues were identified before and during the meeting and although the meeting was recorded, the members of MPC Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group committed to providing a summary of our feedback to enable the report to be finalised. Both the Chair and Vice Chair of the Council are away for the next ten days, with this in mind, I have drafted a timeframe:

1. The Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group meets w/c 4th July 2022 to finalise recommended feedback
2. The feedback is submitted to the full council for approval (the Council meeting is on 19th July 2022).
3. The approved feedback is submitted to Cormac by Friday 22nd July 2022.
4. Aecom provides the final report
5. MPC & Cormac approve the final report.
6. Invoice is issued and the payment made by 25th September 2022 (In accordance with the law, proper practices and the Council's financial regulations).

		<p>The Traffic & Transport Advisory Group is not a committee. The group has Terms of Reference which require recommendations to be made to the full Council. It does not have delegated powers to approve the report. The report must, therefore, be approved by the full Parish Council. The Parish Council does not usually meet in August but to improve on the above timeframes it may be necessary to have an August meeting.</p> <p>A lot of time and effort has been spent producing the report. I am aware that some of the delays have been due to a change of Aecom staff. As the report will be reviewed in many years to come it is important we get it right. Discussions regarding the study have been going on since the summer of last year. Any organisation paying for a product or service approval would be expected to scrutinise what has been provided prior to approval but more so with local authorities. Back in September 2021, MPC agreed in principle to proceed with the Feasibility Study. Once the proposal with full details of the costs were received an order was placed.</p> <p>I have had enquiries from members of the public asking when the report will be ready. It is my intention that the document will be made publicly available on the Council website.</p> <p>Should you have any queries or require any further information from me please get in touch.</p>
20/06/2022	Email from Chris Sentence - Cormac	<p>Given you concerns, I would like to propose that we hold a Risk Reduction meeting to discuss the issues that have arisen and to seek a way forwards to resolve them. This would include a discussion about any final items required within the report. I am aware that Jason is on leave but perhaps we could arrange something for next week when he returns?</p>
04/07/2022	Clerk's communication with Jason Fricker, Aecom Design Engineer	<p>Morning Karenza,</p> <p>No problem. Can discuss in more detail later today. Councillor Ewert was my main contact outside of Cormac from the start of my PM role on the project. I wasn't made aware of anyone else I needed to be in touch with, otherwise I would have invited them to the appropriate meetings. Councillor Ewert drove the project from the beginning when I met her on site on 17 February 2022.</p> <p>Kind regards, Jason</p> <p>From: Karenza Heald <theclerk@millbrook-pc.gov.uk> Sent: 04 July 2022 18:12 To: Fricker, Jason <Jason.Fricker@aecom.com> Cc: Chris Sentence <chris.sentance@cormacltd.co.uk>; ed.maguire <ed.maguire@cormacltd.co.uk>; William Glassup <william.glassup@cormacltd.co.uk> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Re: 0384 Millbrook Feasibility Study - Millbrook PC Meeting</p> <p>Thank you Jason. I shall respond to your email in more detail but just to let you know there is no one from Parish Council was present or invited to the TEAMS meeting on 11th March 2022.</p>

Kind Regards
Karenza

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Fricker, Jason** <Jason.Fricker@aecom.com>

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 2022 at 17:45

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: 0384 Millbrook Feasibility Study - Millbrook PC Meeting

To: Karenza Heald <theclerk@millbrook-pc.gov.uk>

Cc: Chris Sentance <chris.sentance@cormacltd.co.uk>, ed.maguire <ed.maguire@cormacltd.co.uk>, William Glassup <william.glassup@cormacltd.co.uk>

Hi Karenza,

Firstly, please excuse this email being late. I was on annual leave and have been catching up on projects. In addition, it has taken me time to gather evidence to issue a formal response.

In advance of tomorrow's meeting, I'd like to address some of the information raised in your email sent to Chris Sentance on 17 June 2022 at 15:28, regarding the Millbrook Feasibility Study.

The Compensation Event, *CE-0384_002 - Additional Tasks from Survey Delays and Draft Report*, submitted by me and Chris relates to additional work AECOM had to undertake (and additional time AECOM had to spend on the project) as a result of a delay to the traffic and camera surveys at the request of MPC on 21 January 2022. The work defined in the CE relates to the EWNs, EWN-0384-002 and EWN-0384-003, issued by AECOM to Cormac on 7 February 2022 (see email attached). The additional completed tasks set out in CE-0384_002 are:

1. Addressing preliminary comments from draft report review prior to receipt of the traffic and camera survey data

At the request of MPC, AECOM held a draft report review meeting on 11 March 2022 and comments from MPC & Cormac were provided. These were subsequently addressed. This work was outside of the original scope.

2. Rework of draft report following receipt of traffic and camera survey data

Due to the need to provide a draft report prior to the traffic and camera surveys being undertaken, AECOM had to rework some of the report following receipt of the data.

3. Project management prolongation due to delay of traffic and camera surveys

The programme delay was 4 weeks. Therefore, there were PM prolongation costs involved over that period. A conservative estimate is 2hrs per week on PM tasks. These include meetings, calls, progress reports, programme updates, emails and general management of an active project.

I am aware your email is addressed to Chris and as such Chris may want to respond directly (or discuss tomorrow), but since some of it relates to AECOM's involvement, there is a clear need for AECOM to provide clarification of activities and timelines. See below:

MPC:

It would appear from your email that you are not aware that MPC did not get sight of the report at all until Friday 10th June (it was sent after business hours on the previous evening).

AECOM response:

The final report was delivered on time and in accordance with the programme which was updated and issued monthly to Cormac & MPC, along with a progress report (see version P05, May-22's issue in the email attached). MPC had sight of the first draft report issued on 20 May 2022 (see email attached).

MPC:

The Compensation Event Quotation states, "AECOM presented the Draft Report on 11th March 2022 and following the meeting, the Client and Cormac provided AECOM with comments to be addressed prior to the surveys being undertaken." I do not have any records of Millbrook Parish Council being present in a meeting held on 11th March 2022. Please could I ask you to check your records and provide evidence of MPC providing comments.

AECOM response:

See calendar invite for meeting held on 11 March 2022 attached. I believe the following were in attendance: Jason Fricker (AECOM), Cllr Kate Ewert (MPC), Chris Sentance (Cormac) & William Glassup (Cormac). I think Catherine Thomson (MPC) was unable to attend, but was invited. I took notes of the comments and sent them to our Engineer (email attached). Note some of the bullet points listed were ideas considered which did not make it into the final report.

MPC:

MPC were given a very short time to read and process the 87 pages of the report before having a remote meeting on Tuesday 14th, and during that meeting a number of amendments were suggested, including the correction of one or two errors.

AECOM response:

The delivery date of the final report and the date of the MPC meeting were programmed in since Programme P05 was issued to Cormac & MPC on 23 May 2022. No objections or concerns were raised. The date of the MPC meeting was then brought forward a day to 14 June 2022 at the request of MPC (email attached). AECOM raised the concern of this short time period and were reassured by MPC that it will give the stakeholders enough time to read the report (stated in the same email).

MPC:

MPC has not had any input to the apparently now final report, even though we had clearly stated much earlier in the process that we expected to see the draft before it was completely signed off (please refer to the attached email sent 20th October 2021). We

		<p><i>were not even given the courtesy of being advised that a draft report had been issued to you and that you were making amendments to it without referring to us at all.</i></p> <p>AECOM response: This is incorrect. The draft report (P01) along with the ATC data (for info) was issued on 20 May 2022 by AECOM to both MPC and Cormac for comment (see emails attached). In addition, as stated above, a first draft (without the traffic and camera survey info) was presented to MPC and Cormac on 11 March 2022.</p> <p>I assume on Page 3 of the meeting minutes, the initials 'JP' should read 'JF'. I was unable to present my full presentation due to being cut off to allow time for Professor May to comment. AECOM were not provided with adequate notice of Professor May's attendance or role in the study and in addition seeing Professor May's response on the day of the meeting did not provide any time for AECOM to digest any of the information enclosed. The approach taken was highly unconventional and personally I found it disrespectful, especially given the time and effort I took to prepare a presentation for the meeting for the purpose of benefitting the council members.</p> <p>As detailed above and combined with the supplementary evidence provided, it is clear that AECOM provided MPC with plenty of time and opportunities to distribute the report to any other stakeholders and provide all comments to be addressed prior to the report being finalised and issued on 9 June 2022. Following the meeting, a final programme was issued highlighting the project close out for AECOM (programme attached). Any further work required is therefore subject to an additional fee. This was emphasised by me in the meeting on the 14 June 2022.</p> <p>I trust this provides clarification on some of the items in the email relating to AECOM's involvement.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing this in greater depth on the call scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.</p> <p>Kind regards, Jason</p>
<p>05/07/2022</p>	<p>Clerk's email response to Jason Fricker, Aecom</p>	<p>Dear Jason and Chris</p> <p>Thank you for your email and taking the time to send all the email attachments (which I have not seen before), Jason.</p> <p>There still appears to be an ongoing misunderstanding that Millbrook Parish Council were involved in meetings regarding the draft feasibility study and putting forward any comments.</p>

I am not sure how or why this misunderstanding has arisen but neither myself or any of the Millbrook Parish Councillors were copied into the emails you have attached. In one of your responses you have put in brackets next to Catherine Thomson 'MPC'. Catherine Thomson is an officer of Cornwall Council not Millbrook Parish Council.

On receipt of your email I spoke briefly with CC Kate Ewert. I understand that Will Glassup has Covid. As Will has been involved in the process since MPC (the client) first expressed an interest in progressing with the study, I think it is important Will is given the opportunity to attend the next meeting and a chance to review the communication. In view of this, I suggest we postpone today's Zoom meeting and rearrange a date once Will returns.

Depending on your availability I suggest we go for a date towards the end of July or the first week in August. If possible I would also like Kate Ewert to be present.

At present these are the dates that are suitable for myself and the Councillors: Evenings or late afternoons are generally better for the Councillors.

Tuesday 26th July 2022

Thursday 28th July 2022

Friday 29th July 2022

Monday 1st August 2022

Tuesday 2nd August 2022

Wednesday 3rd August 2022

Thursday 4th August 2022

I have responded further to your comments below in red.

I shall be in the Council office today on 01752 823128 should you or Chris wish to have a conversation about this email or have any queries regarding MPC's involvement.

Hi Karenza,

Firstly, please excuse this email being late. I was on annual leave and have been catching up on projects. In addition, it has taken me time to gather evidence to issue a formal response.

In advance of tomorrow's meeting, I'd like to address some of the information raised in your email sent to Chris Sentance on 17 June 2022 at 15:28, regarding the Millbrook Feasibility Study.

The Compensation Event, *CE-0384_002 - Additional Tasks from Survey Delays and Draft Report*, submitted by me and Chris relates to additional work AECOM had to undertake (and additional time AECOM had to spend on the project) as a result of a delay to the traffic and camera surveys at the request of MPC on 21 January 2022. The work defined in the CE relates to the EWNs, EWN-0384-002 and EWN-0384-003, issued by AECOM to Cormac on 7 February 2022 (see email attached). The additional completed tasks set out in CE-0384_002 are:

1. Addressing preliminary comments from draft report review prior to receipt of the traffic and camera survey data

At the request of MPC, AECOM held a draft report review meeting on 11 March 2022 and comments from MPC & Cormac were provided. These were subsequently addressed. This work was outside of the original scope. **Millbrook Parish Council (MPC) did indeed request a draft review meeting. However, the Parish Council were not invited, did not know the meeting on 11th March had taken place and therefore would not have submitted any comments. MPC are not included on the circulation of the email recipients for the attached email.**

2. Rework of draft report following receipt of traffic and camera survey data

Due to the need to provide a draft report prior to the traffic and camera surveys being undertaken, AECOM had to rework some of the report following receipt of the data.

Project management prolongation due to delay of traffic and camera surveys

The programme delay was 4 weeks. Therefore, there were PM prolongation costs involved over that period. A conservative estimate is 2hrs per week on PM tasks. These include meetings, calls, progress reports, programme updates, emails and general management of an active project.

I am aware your email is addressed to Chris and as such Chris may want to respond directly (or discuss tomorrow), but since some of it relates to AECOM's involvement, there is a clear need for AECOM to provide clarification of activities and timelines. See below:

MPC:

It would appear from your email that you are not aware that MPC did not get sight of the report at all until Friday 10th June (it was sent after business hours on the previous evening).

AECOM response:

The final report was delivered on time and in accordance with the programme which was updated and issued monthly to Cormac & MPC, along with a progress report (see version P05, May-22's issue in the email attached). MPC had sight of the first draft report issued on 20 May 2022 (see email attached). **MPC did 'not' have first sight of the first draft report issued on 20th May**

2022. Below is a screenshot of the email you attached. There are no Millbrook Parish Council email addresses in the email. This is the first time I have seen this email. The circulation list includes Cornwall Councillor Kate Ewert, and Chris Sentance and Will Glassup from Cormac.

Attached in email

MPC:

The Compensation Event Quotation states, "AECOM presented the Draft Report on 11th March 2022 and following the meeting, the Client and Cormac provided AECOM with comments to be addressed prior to the surveys being undertaken." I do not have any records of Millbrook Parish Council being present in a meeting held on 11th March 2022. Please could I ask you to check your records and provide evidence of MPC providing comments.

AECOM response:

See calendar invite for meeting held on 11 March 2022 attached. I believe the following were in attendance: Jason Fricker (AECOM), Cllr Kate Ewert (MPC), Chris Sentance (Cormac) & William Glassup (Cormac). I think Catherine Thomson (MPC) was unable to attend, but was invited. I took notes of the comments and sent them to our Engineer (email attached). Note some of the bullet points listed were ideas considered which did not make it into the final report. **Catherine Thomson, Cornwall Council's Community Link Officer is not a representative of MPC.**

MPC:

MPC were given a very short time to read and process the 87 pages of the report before having a remote meeting on Tuesday 14th, and during that meeting a number of amendments were suggested, including the correction of one or two errors.

AECOM response:

The delivery date of the final report and the date of the MPC meeting were programmed in since Programme P05 was issued to Cormac & MPC on 23 May 2022. No objections or concerns were raised. The date of the MPC meeting was then brought forward a day to 14 June 2022 at the request of MPC (email attached). **It would be useful to have a copy of this because to my knowledge MPC were not involved in deciding the date of the meeting.** AECOM raised the concern of this short time period and were reassured by MPC that it will give the stakeholders enough time to read the report (stated in the same email). **I am not aware of any reassurance provided by MPC but it would appear in hindsight that your concerns were valid and the meeting should have been postponed.**

MPC:

MPC has not had any input to the apparently now final report, even though we had clearly stated much earlier in the process that we expected to see the draft before it was completely signed off (please refer to the attached email sent 20th October 2021). We were not even given the courtesy of being advised that a draft report had been issued to you and that you were making amendments to it without referring to us at all.

AECOM response:

		<p>This is incorrect. The draft report (P01) along with the ATC data (for info) was issued on 20 May 2022 by AECOM to both MPC and Cormac for comment (see emails attached). In addition, as stated above, a first draft (without the traffic and camera survey info) was presented to MPC and Cormac on 11 March 2022. MPC did not see the ATC data or the email dated 11 March 2022. MPC is not included on the email dated 11 March 2022.</p> <p>I assume on Page 3 of the meeting minutes, the initials 'JP' should read 'JF'. Thank you for highlighting this. My apologies I shall make sure this is corrected. I was unable to present my full presentation due to being cut off to allow time for Professor May to comment. AECOM were not provided with adequate notice of Professor May's attendance or role in the study and in addition seeing Professor May's response on the day of the meeting did not provide any time for AECOM to digest any of the information enclosed. I fully appreciate more notice should have been given to you regarding Professor May's involvement. As MPC only received the Feasibility study after close of business (17:42hrs) on 9th June 2022, this gave us very little to time to review the document. Due to short timescale given to MPC to review the document the involvement of Professor May's volunteer time was beneficial. The approach taken was highly unconventional and personally I found it disrespectful, especially given the time and effort I took to prepare a presentation for the meeting for the purpose of benefitting the council members. I am sorry the format of the TEAMS meeting on 14th June was not approached in way a that allowed you to present your full presentation. When we spoke earlier during the day you had indicated you would be giving a brief presentation. Although I appreciate this was short notice, I am sure I mentioned Professor May would be attending the TEAMS meeting but needed to leave early so would not be present in all the meeting. I received an email from you on 14th June at 17:04hrs with the details of the your high level overview of the study. Unfortunately, although circulated to MPC representatives who were attending the meeting, I believe your email was not received in time for them to read prior to the TEAMS meeting.</p> <p>As detailed above and combined with the supplementary evidence provided, it is clear that AECOM provided MPC with plenty of time and opportunities to distribute the report to any other stakeholders and provide all comments to be addressed prior to the report being finalised and issued on 9 June 2022. Following the meeting, a final programme was issued highlighting the project close out for AECOM (programme attached). Any further work required is therefore subject to an additional fee. This was emphasised by me in the meeting on the 14 June 2022.</p> <p>I trust this provides clarification on some of the items in the email relating to AECOM's involvement.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing this in greater depth on the call scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
<p>13/07/202</p>	<p>Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group meeting</p>	<p>To note follow up communication from Cormac and Aecom representatives and to put forward recommended Hounster Hill Feasibility Study and agree next steps. • The members reviewed the objectives from the Rame Peninsula Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An impact table was produced, and the scoring table titles were based on the original decision to request the Hounster Hill feasibility study. • The study should have a table with the recommendations evaluated, either included in the study or as an appendix.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elements which have been discounted should be included in the study with the reasons why they have been discounted detailed.
20/07/2022	Clerk's email to CC Ewert	<p>Good morning Kate</p> <p>At the Council meeting last night the Council approved the Traffic & Transport Task Group's recommendations from the group's recent meetings.</p> <p>The Parish Council would request:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study is amended to include measures discounted from the study (please see attached document) and the reasons why these have been discounted. The Council feel this is important as when the document is reviewed in 10 years time (when there could be a change of Councillors and/or Parish Council Officers) all the information is available in one place without having to refer back to other documents. 2. The study should include an inclusion to show how the original proposals have been measured against the criteria for the study. 3. The Parish Council should not be liable for any additional costs other than those quoted for. 4. I shall get back to Chris Sentance and Jason Fricker (hopefully Will Glassup will also be available) with a Zoom link for a meeting by the end of the day tomorrow. We are looking at either 2nd or 3rd August (but if 3rd August it would be early afternoon so it doesn't clash with Chris's meeting). I appreciate August is difficult for you. <p>I am just about to go to a meeting with our caretaker in the tractor park but if you have any queries please get in touch. .</p> <p>Best Regards</p>
02/08/2022	Meeting with Cormac & MPC Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group members	<p>Extract from notes:</p> <p>1. Welcome / introductions Apologies received from Cllr Don Wood and Chris Sentance, Cormac Principal Engineer. Cllr Roberts opened the meeting.</p> <p>Introductions: Cllr Nicky Roberts Chair of the Parish Council and temporary Chair of Millbrook Parish Council Traffic & Transport Cllr Sharon Lewis – Vice Chair of the Parish Council Jason Fricker – Project Manager of Aecom (has been project managing the study) Ed – Design Delivery Manager for Cormac</p>

Will Glassup – Highway Manager

CLr Roberts said Millbrook Parish Council was concerned, given MPC were paying for the study and had asked to see the draft before it was finalised, they were not given the opportunity to review the study. NR was aware there had been some feedback via Cornwall Councillor Kate Ewert and there was some confusion, particularly from Aecom that CC Kate Ewert and Cornwall Council's Community Link Officer, Kate Ewert was presenting Millbrook Parish Council. NR explained the purpose of this meeting was to (i) how does MPC get the report it was hoping to get so that it can be taken to a decision-making process (ii) if things cost money to amend the report who pays for it.

2. To consider Millbrook Parish Councillors recommendations to include options which have been discounted within the Hounster Hill Feasibility Study.

JF apologised for the confusion.

JF shared MPC's document with proposed recommended charges on the screen and said they generally happy with the changes at no further costs to MPC.

- i) Although some aspects have been discounted, some of which were discussed in meetings where MPC were not present, these should be included in the study, with reasons why they have been discounted:

- a. **Military Road – issues with subsidence etc.**

Agreed, whilst not covered in the report this could be revisited showing all issues within Military Road. It was covered in the diversion options, but a few lines could be added to the report.

NR main reason for the request to include Military Road in the report was to show this had been looked at as an option but because of the condition of Military Road it would not be possible to progress.

- b. **Using West Street Car park – the bridge is not deemed strong enough to carry the extra traffic**

JF had a site meeting with CC Kate Ewert. It was agreed this option was not feasible, but JF agreed the reasons for this would be shown in the report.

NW the reasons for the inclusions are to future proof the document so that it saves time for future Councillors and Officers of the Council.

- c. **Cormac does not recommend the use of mirrors, yet they are used in other parts of the country – many people are not aware of the reasons why mirrors are not supported.**

JF agreed with a brief section on the use of mirrors in the feasibility study.

- d. **Other discounted physical traffic measures.**

JF asked for clarification.

NR – why speed tables were not feasible.

WG – unsure how this would benefit the study. He doesn't understand how it reduce congestion and limit HGV's. Speed tables are more of a traffic calming measure.

NR – one of the issues the Council looking to deal with was the risk to pedestrians in The Narrows. Initially, when the residents first approached the Council, there was a campaign for speed tables. This was because the residents felt it would slow traffic and

make the area safer for them and other residents in the area. A few lines explaining the speed tables has been discounted because of the potential damage to buildings, the potential of flood water into properties would show that has been dealt with. WG agreed to assist JF with this.

KH – Will Glassup’s predecessor, Paul Allen raised concerns over drainage issues and the suitability of speed tables in this area.

ii) **Impact tables**

An impact table, as shown on the example provided by MPC should be included on within the study. Ranks 8 & 9, shown in red should also be included in the Feasibility Study.

JF agreed to include this as an appendix.

Rank 8: Incorporate wide sustainable transport strategy. JF felt this was out of the current scope which would feed into a wider sustainable strategy.

NR one of the things which could mitigate the problem would be a much more holistic transport system which ideally would mean people wouldn’t have to use their cars so much.

EM suggested to make reference to sustainable transport in the report. ED added in terms of future funding and workload this could be passed on to the transport team in Cornwall Council.

SL even one line would be beneficial. In a few years ahead, this would save the Council, which not include current Councillors revisit options.

Rank 9: Measures to indicate shared pedestrian spaces (different colours and textures), e.g., Bodmin.

JF agreed to include in the physical highways featured section.

NR although she understands from Cormac’s point of view any different textures etc. on road surfaces have maintenance issues, road surfaces in general have maintenance issues.

JF – agreed to add to physical highways option.

EM – suggested adding cheaper options with costs than Bodmin (which was referred to and uses granite surfacing, is a significant cost)

iii) **MPC have not been given the opportunity to review the draft study, therefore, should not be charged any extra.**

Previously discussed in the meeting.

iv) Please note the comments regarding the Wig-wag. The impacts of the system are unknown. MPC would need to know the costs of a trial.

MPC noted Aecom have said this an untried method for these circumstances and without a trial it is unclear this would work.

There is the risk that outbound vehicles may struggle to leave the village at busy times. Would there be a cost to MPC to trial the wig-wag system? If yes, what would the approximate cost of the trial be?

JF – would be further work outside the study. A separate trial would need to be done to assess the impacts.

NR – the Council would need to have sufficient confidence to know if the trial is likely to work, in order to invest more funding in a trial. Would any trial be more or less the same cost as doing it?

		<p>EM – there may be options to do desktop work / transport modelling which would not necessarily mean physical measures on the ground.</p> <p>NR – the Council’s traffic & transport group’s non councillor works for Plymouth City Council. His first reaction was it sounds find but there are a concern people waiting at the wigwags would get fed up waiting and pull out.</p> <p>JF – as the give way sign is quite far away, there is always going to be the risk where there is a steady flow of traffic in one direction, there may be stacking of traffic blocking on coming traffic. A desk top study with some modelling would be advisable.</p> <p>NR – asked if JF has any idea on approximate costs for the desktop study. JF agreed to speak with Aecom’s transport planners.</p> <p>4. To agree MPC should not be invoiced any additional costs for the Hounster Hill Feasibility Study.</p> <p>KH asked JF what the timescales are likely to be for the amendments.</p> <p>JF said, depending on available resources (holidays / staff absences due to Covid) he hopes to get the report issued by the end week commencing 15th August 2022.</p> <p>NR closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their input and attendance.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 15:05hrs.</p>
<p>24/08/2022</p>	<p>Final version received from Aecom</p>	<p>Good afternoon all,</p> <p>Please see attached the final Millbrook Feasibility Study Report vP03, issued for information. This version addresses the client comments seen under point 1 in the attached document and mentions the sustainable transport strategy and shared pedestrian space.</p> <p>For point 2, since AECOM did not produce the impact table shown in the attached document, it was agreed that this can be appended to the back of the report following issue, noting the author.</p> <p>Point 4 is not covered in the scope of the Feasibility Study (as previously discussed in the meeting on 2nd August 2022).</p> <p>The issue of this report closes out the Feasibility Study. Any questions, let me know.</p> <p>Many thanks, Jason</p>