



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Wednesday, 25 January 2017 at 4.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in attendance:

Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Joint Assembly Chairman)
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca

Officers/advisors:

Hilary Holden	City Deal Partnership
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Rachel Stopard	City Deal Partnership
Victoria Wallace	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence. The University of Cambridge provided the following comment on its absence at the Board meeting and its plans to appoint a new Executive Board member:

"The University is committed to its partnership with the City Deal and looks forward to continuing to bring its contribution and expertise to secure the right infrastructure improvements for Greater Cambridge. The University is currently searching for the most appropriate representative to sit on the City Deal Executive Board in place of Professor Slater. As this process is ongoing, there will be no University representative on the City Deal Board meeting on 25th January".

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman clarified the Executive Board's Standing Orders regarding public questions since these had been modified by the three City Deal partner councils. The changes had been made to improve the handling of public questions. The key things to be aware of were:

- That public questions needed to be received by 10am three working days before the relevant meeting.
- There was a suggested limit of 300 words to a question.
- Questions should relate to items on the agenda for discussion although the Chairman had discretion to accept questions that did not relate to agenda items.

The Chairman pointed out that he had exercised his discretion at this meeting to accept several questions that did not relate to agenda items, as did the Joint Assembly Chairman at the meeting which took place on 18th January 2017. Flexibility had also been shown on word limit as this was the first meeting since the changes had been made. The Chairman stated that the Standing Orders would be applied more rigorously for future meetings. Chairman's discretion would continue to be used to allow questions relating to items that were not on the agenda and that were not programmed for future agendas, that were considered of particular importance to address. This sought to fairly balance the public's right to participate with the need to carry out business efficiently and effectively. He also said he had offered to meet people from Coton who had asked specific questions, to hear their concerns.

The Chairman set out the order of public questions, with questions addressing the same issues being grouped together and a collective response given. Other questions would be taken under the relevant agenda item.

Councillor Susan van de Ven was invited to speak and addressed the Executive Board with the following statement:

"The A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme is continuing to attract match funding opportunities. As you know, the scheme has already received several lots of Department for Transport Cycling Ambition match funding, totalling £2.5 million, plus one lot of City Deal funding, totalling £550K.

AstraZeneca, whose employees living along the A10 will use the cycle path to get to work in Cambridge, has committed two years' worth of funding to maintain the path over and above what Cambridgeshire County Council can afford, in order to ensure a high standard.

A grant from the Department for Transport Local Sustainable Transport Fund to carry out a Personalized Travel Planning exercise has already evidenced modal shift away from single car use.

All of this match funding has enabled most of what is a shovel-ready scheme to be delivered quickly. The City Deal-funded segment will be completed in February and a local business has offered to host and provide refreshments for the grand opening in March. In order to complete the scheme we must find a way of funding the Melbourn-Royston missing link, which traverses the Hertfordshire border. The Greater Cambridgeshire/Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership, which includes North Hertfordshire in its economic zone, discussed the case for funding the Melbourn-Royston link at their December Board meeting. A report by cross-border, cross party councillors was presented to the LEP for consideration and is published on the A10 Corridor Cycling

Campaign website.

The LEP authorizes to me to say to you:

- The Board was supportive of finding a multi-agency route to finalise delivery
- The Board understood the commercial and environmental advantages of the link
- That local sources should be utilised alongside private sector support
- The Board would be prepared to consider a financial ask provided other mechanisms were supportive too.

I would like to ask the City Deal Executive Board to consider joining forces with the LEP to fund the final link, which is shovel-ready and could present a finished product even this year, all sticking to City Deal core principles of collaboration, match-funding, economic growth and modal shift to reduce car use on key corridors into Cambridge.”

In response to this the following points were made:

- Councillor Van de Ven’s input was welcomed and the scheme’s benefits were recognised. She was asked about the total funding sought; about £1 million was needed for the last section of cycleway and around £1.5 million to build a bridge to connect Royston.
- The first tranche of City Deal funding had already been prioritised and the capital programme was fully committed, therefore a commitment to fund the Melbourn to Royston link from this tranche was not advised. The link should be considered as part of the tranche two programme.
- Officers would continue to work with Councillor Van de Ven and to engage in discussion with her and the Local Enterprise Partnership to look at funding sources for the link.

Questions from Stephen Coates, Carolyn Postgate and Edward Leigh were grouped together:

Question from Stephen Coates:

Stephen Coates read out his pre-submitted question:

“When will the independent review of the City Deal by Mouchel become an agenda item for both the City Deal Assembly and the City Deal Board so there will be a full discussion and full Q&A session in both forums on the report? Many people who should have been consulted for the preparation of this report were not, including some Assembly members. Will there be a mechanism for residents groups or councillors to share further concerns on governance issues that either flow from this report or should have been included in this report?”

Question from Carolyn Postgate:

Carolyn Postgate read out her pre-submitted question:

“I have read the Mouchel's Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review. I can see that some of the recommendations have already been put in place, such as limiting questions at public meetings and recruiting dedicated staff to the City Deal. However, the report also highlighted that the officers were unclear of the GCCD objectives, the Board reports were not “fit for purpose” and that recommendations have been made on out-of-date evidence. Therefore can the Board explain why it is still progressing with recommendations based on out-of-date evidence and why is option 3/3a still being worked up?”

Question from Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh read out his pre-submitted question:

“Question 1: Will the Board move quickly to commission an external review of the appropriateness and rigorousness of the procedures used to prioritise and develop schemes?”

Question 2: Will you as members of the City Deal Board, and representatives of the local authorities, LEP and Cambridge University, commit to developing this year a clear vision for the Greater Cambridge region in the 2030s, along with a new, coherent transport strategy?"

In response to these questions, the following points were made:

- The Mouchel report was an external assurance review to assess delivery confidence in the transport workstream and to make recommendations to ensure high delivery confidence. Implementing these recommendations was a priority and progress updates would be covered in the regular progress reporting to the Board.
- There would be an agenda item for the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on the Mouchel report in June 2017, as an extended progress report.
- Residents' groups, councillors and residents had provided views through a survey that had been undertaken as part of the communications review. This review would inform the updated communications strategy.
- Outside formal meetings, there would continue to be regular and publicised opportunities for public engagement.
- In response to comments regarding vision, the City Deal Programme Director explained that the City Deal played a key part in delivering the vision for Greater Cambridge set out in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans and the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. She provided some slides setting out that vision for Greater Cambridge in 2030.
- The business case for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme was an outline business case, the development of which would continue. The evidence and business case development followed Department for Transport Guidance.
- It was pointed out that the transport strategy was adopted at the start of the Local Plan process and the strategy supported and complemented the Local Plans.
- It was intended that the tranche two prioritisation project review transport priorities for 2020-2030. Beyond 2030, a longer term vision should be developed.
- The Local Enterprise Partnership welcomed the Mouchel report. A strategic economic plan would be put together by quarter two 2017. This would go beyond the geographical area covered by the City Deal and would help inform future plans and decisions.

Question from Councillor Bridget Smith

Councillor Smith read out her pre-submitted question:

"Does the City Deal Executive Board agree that the new Combined Authority, instead of working in collaboration with the City Deal, might actually pose a threat to its future? Might public criticism and the recent external report result in future tranches of money being paid directly to the CA? What is the GCCD Board going to do to mitigate this risk?"

In response to this question, Councillor Herbert said that work was being undertaken to mitigate and eliminate risks. The Chairman referred to two paragraphs (2 and 23) of the devolution deal document that referred to the City Deal and showed subsidiarity and continued delivery of the existing City Deal. There was no evidence to suggest that there was going to be a takeover bid of the City Deal by the Combined Authority. It was felt that the larger geography of the Combined Authority opened up opportunities and dialogues, particularly with key Government agencies. Discussions were ongoing with officers taking forward the Combined Authority.

The remainder of the public questions were dealt with at the relevant agenda item.

5. PETITIONS

Councillor Hickford fed back that the Joint Assembly had received and considered petitions against Peak Congestion Control Points and against Adams Road forming part of the Cambourne to Cambridge bus route. The City Deal Executive Board **NOTED** the petitions received by the City Deal Joint Assembly.

6. FORWARD PLAN

The City Deal Programme Director presented the City Deal Forward Plan, which the Executive Board **NOTED**. The Board asked that the following items be added to the Forward Plan:

- To the June 2017 agenda – progress implementing the Mouchel report.
- To the July or September 2017 agenda – Cambridge City Access.

It was noted that the three City Deal partner councils would be looking at the new homes bonus, which would impact on City Deal budgets.

In response to clarification being sought by the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Board was informed that:

- Rural transport hubs would be put forward for a decision in March 2017.
- Cambourne to Cambridge would come forward in July 2017.
- Follow up conversations were taking place with Highways England regarding the Western Orbital.

Reports and recommendations from the Joint Assembly

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly provided an update following the Joint Assembly meeting which had taken place on 25th January 2017.

Councillor Hickford advised that the way in which petitions were dealt with be reviewed as it was difficult for the Joint Assembly to respond. Councillor Hickford felt that petitioners were looking for a response from the Executive Board. The Chairman of the Executive Board agreed that this would be looked into.

Councillor Hickford provided a written update following the Joint Assembly, copies of which were submitted to Board members at the meeting.

7. CITY ACCESS CONGESTION REDUCTION PROPOSALS: CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES AND NEXT STEPS

Hilary Holden, City Access Programme, delivered a presentation to introduce the report which informed the Executive Board of the results from the consultation on 'Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge', which were informing the work of the City Access project team and influencing the emerging work programme.

Councillor Roger Hickford updated the Executive Board on the Joint Assembly's views of the recommendations set out in the report:

- There had been much debate by Joint Assembly members regarding omitting the word 'physical' from recommendation (a)(i) regarding physical demand management measures. A vote was taken on this, which was split six against and six in favour of removing the word 'physical'. As the vote was split, the word 'physical' was not removed from the recommendation.
- The Joint Assembly felt that there should be more evidence-based assessments

by officers. Officers had agreed that there was more than enough data for them to assess and evidence desired access between destinations to create an overview of measures that would increase access while reducing congestion. This was incorporated by the Joint Assembly into a new recommendation (a)(ii).

- There was concern from some Joint Assembly members that the workplace parking levy would be seen as another tax, urging care regarding what funds raised would be used for.
- Regarding on-street parking controls, there was almost unanimous agreement that this should not proceed until there were mitigating alternatives in place for those currently driving into the city and parking. There was concern that rather than reducing vehicles in the city, this would lead to the dispersal of vehicles further out to avoid paying the high parking charges in the city. Councillor Hickford advised that the park and ride parking charge be removed as a key mitigation.
- It was pointed out and noted by the Joint Assembly that smart technology consistently appeared at the bottom of lists and objectives, implying that it was an after thought and not as important as other measures. The Joint Assembly was a robust supporter of smart technology and requested as much emphasis as possible be put on this.
- Councillor Hickford pointed out the Joint Assembly's addition to recommendation (c)(iv) of '...and those impacted if changes are not made', which was to emphasise that 'doing nothing' would have adverse consequences and that, in considering the consequences of actions, it was also important to look at the impacts of inaction.

Councillor Tim Bick was invited to speak and addressed the Board with the following points:

- Councillor Bick asked the Board to envisage a scenario of bus services increasing by 50% with new services to the villages in and out of the city, bus fares being halved and the park and ride parking charge being removed. Councillor Bick advised that the only way of achieving this was with peak time congestion charging, the benefits of which he advised could be great if implemented with the revenue generated being used to fund better public transport and cycling infrastructure and to subsidise bus travel. He felt that no other demand management measure was likely to be as efficient at achieving modal shift. Councillor Bick pointed out that the Executive Board had not publically debated congestion charging.
- Councillor Bick asked the Executive Board to debate congestion charging, to consider its direction and to give people an opportunity to have a say on congestion charging.

Councillor John Hipkin was invited to speak and addressed the Board with the following points:

- There was strong support in Councillor Hipkin's ward for on-street parking controls.
- In response to the view of on-street parking controls failing the test of fairness, Councillor Hipkin pointed out that residents of Cambridge had the right to park outside their homes, as those travelling into Cambridge had the right to park outside their homes outside Cambridge.
- Councillor Hipkin believed that on-street parking controls should be trialled and tested over large sections of the city and on large arterial roads. During the trial there should be no charge to residents in order for them to see how the scheme affected them.

- Councillor Hipkin called for an extension of the principles of the core traffic scheme to a wider area of the city, urging the Executive Board to work up this scheme, believing that an increasing number of Cambridge residents supported it.

Question from Pete Howard

Mr Howard was not in attendance at the meeting. The Chairman read out Mr Howard's pre-submitted question in his absence:

"Given the concerns raised from the 10,000 plus residents and businesses who signed the petition against the planned road and traffic restrictions, will the council now agree to consult and listen to all stake holders regarding its planned roads closures or traffic congestion measures, well before any degree of implementation?"

In response to the question, the following points were made:

- Following the public consultation in the second half of 2016, public engagement would be maintained. Business input would be coordinated with the assistance of the Local Enterprise Partnership.
- The consultation had shown there was real concern from businesses regarding the potential dispersal of vehicles that may result from the implementation of peak congestion control points and the impact on staff.

Question from Neil Mackay

Neil Mackay read out his pre-submitted question:

" Given that Cambridge small businesses were at the heart of the recent protests against the introduction of peak time road closures by the use of PCCP cameras. Why is it that small business is not now being fully consulted with, in an attempt to find a solution to the problem.

The future of a considerable number of small businesses and the livelihoods of all those employed by those businesses depend on the correct solution being implemented. We feel that rather than you simply concocting an 'even more Scary City Deal' and then effectively paying 'lips service' to consultation once more. It is our opinion that you should be inviting the 'involvement' of all the small business potentially effected, to be included in the process of developing the proposals. Are you willing to do so?"

In addition to this Mr Mackay pointed out that the Mouchel report was not prominent on the City Deal's website.

In response to this Mr Mackay was informed that:

- Businesses, including small businesses, would be consulted. Work would be undertaken with the Local Enterprise Partnership regarding how best to consult with businesses.
- Thinking had altered regarding peak time congestion control point (PCCP) cameras in response to the concerns raised by small businesses.
- The need for small businesses to be able to access their clients as well as their clients accessing them, was recognised.
- The Mouchel report would be made more prominent on the City Deal's website.

Question from Dr Joanna Gomula

Dr Gomula read out her pre-submitted question:

- "Among the "number of projects to help to achieve" the transport vision set out by the

Greater Cambridge City Deal, what new bus routes have been planned or are being considered (in addition to the bus route from Cambourne to Cambridge along the A1307) to ensure better bus services into, out of and around Cambridge?

- Are there any new bus routes under consideration that would allow the area of Newnham to be properly linked with the rest of Cambridge by bus?
- Do the projects related to the vision of the Greater Cambridge City Deal include new bus routes and services, which would allow students of schools located in the areas subject to traffic congestion to reach and leave their respective schools by bus? Have the schools been consulted regarding this issue and have any co-operative arrangements or projects been proposed to the schools by the City Deal team?"

The following points were made in response to this question:

- Buses were a core part of the transport strategy. Working collaboratively with bus operators, enhanced and additional services could be introduced as development took place, linking the city more effectively with surrounding areas.
- It was recognised that to make the bus the first choice for many journeys, it needed to be more attractive than other options and include consistent and reliable journeys. This could only be enabled as part of the wider transport strategy that restrained vehicle movements in favour of buses, walking and cycling.
- For the new settlements to be built outside the city, it was recognised that a regular bus service needed to be in place throughout the day and during evenings and weekends in order to offer an attractive alternative to car use. These services would benefit from new busways and on-street bus priority measures.
- In response to Newnham being linked with the rest of Cambridge, Dr Gomula was informed that the universal bus service, which was financially supported by the university but could be used by everyone, linked Newnham with the railway station. The City Deal proposed improvements to services across and beyond the city, which included operating the core urban services more frequently, building on the established 'citi' network.
- Regarding bus routes and services for schools, Travel for Cambridgeshire had worked closely with private schools on travel planning. Private minibus services have been put in place by many of these schools for their students to reduce car journeys.
- The workplace parking levy offered the opportunity for further dialogue with schools.

Question from Andrew Dutton

As Mr Dutton was not in attendance at the meeting, the Chairman read his pre-submitted question:

"I note that you still intend to introduce the non progressive parking tax on those who work in Cambridge. Whilst £1.75 might not be significant to many of the well paid workers in Cambridge (Most companies will pass this charge on to their employees) for the low paid or disabled this is a significant and unfair burden. Many of these people have no option but to drive due to physical disability or time constraints of running a family i.e getting children to schools and working. I am surprised a socially responsible party such as yourselves have not considered the negative implications of this.

How do you plan to resolve this unfair burden on some of the lowest paid workers in Cambridge? These people have to drive due to housing costs and cannot use public transport or cycling due to physical disability or time constraints and the need to both work a full day and take children to schools. Would you consider a wage limit below which it

cannot be passed on or an exemption for those below a certain wage or for those with disabilities?”

The Chairman advised that a response would be provided to Mr Dutton outside the meeting and the response would be made available on the City Deal website.

Question from Dr Drew Milne

As Dr Milne was not present at the meeting, the Chairman provided an overview of his question which addressed the tackling of air pollution in Cambridge and diesel cars. The Chairman advised that a response would be provided to Dr Milne and this would be made available on the City Deal website.

Question from Magda Werno

Ms Werno was not present at the meeting. Her pre-submitted question related to closing Cambridge city centre to traffic during peak hours, the quality of public transport and the poor value for money offered by city buses, the park and ride and guided buses.

In response to the issues raised in Ms Werno's question, Hilary Holden responded as follows:

- Recommendations 3.a.i and 3.1.ii in the report prepared for the meeting state that: *It is recommended that the Executive Board agrees that officers should work up and assess options for a package of physical demand management measures. These measures should make the best use of the limited road space and capacity in Cambridge, in order to improve bus reliability, cycling and walking, particularly within the designated Air Quality Management Area.*
- This aligned with Policy TSCSC 2 of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy which stated that Pedestrians, cyclists and buses will be prioritised for trips across the city. General vehicular traffic will not be prohibited and accessibility will be maintained, but a car journey may be longer and more time consuming than at present for many trips.
- The petal diagram used in the Joint Assembly meeting was purely conceptual and showed one of the draft ideas behind the work we are doing to develop options for managing general traffic - to retain access for those who need it while restricting cross-city through movement. It tries to show that the areas between the main routes coming into the city centre are surrounded by quieter residential streets where rat runs need to be prevented. This idea is less disruptive than the PCCPs, as it restricts access on local streets, rather than on main radial roads.
- We want to turn the vicious circle of low bus use leading to high fares into a virtuous circle where high bus use leads to lower bus fares. This will only be achieved by making bus the first choice for many journeys, which requires consistent and reliable journeys, working collaboratively with bus operators. In the near term there will be a need for the public sector to continue to financially support off-peak bus services so that a reasonable level of service is maintained. The funding available from the County Council has declined over recent years which has seen a contraction in the level of bus service. The City Access plan contains a potential revenue source through a workplace parking levy. This will provide an income stream that the City Deal may wish to invest in local bus services and/or in making buses more affordable for local residents.

Question from Nichola Harrison

Nichola Harrison asked her pre-submitted question:

“Will you please confirm whether your plan for physical demand management measures, illustrated by the flower petals drawing with the title "Concept diagram of local area accessibility" that was tabled at last week's Assembly meeting, might involve partial or full road closures at peak times in Cambridge?”

In response to this question the following points were made:

- There would be no road closures at peak times in Cambridge. There would be a prioritisation of uses on these roads but there would be no full road closures for all vehicular movements.

Ms Harrison went on to ask the Executive Board to consult the public on congestion charging, pointing out that the poorest had the most to gain from the improved bus service that congestion charging would fund.

Question from Cambridge Past, Present and Future

A pre-prepared statement was read out by a representative from Cambridge Past, Present and Future:

“We all agree that to improve access and reduce congestion we need a modal shift from cars to public transport. We also all agree that such a modal shift cannot emerge unless we can provide a high quality public transport service that is sufficiently attractive to get drivers out of their cars. So, how is this high quality service going to emerge?”

The City Deal can provide the tarmac on which the buses will run, but it cannot subsidise or underpin the operation of a quality public transport system. The only realistic option for substantial additional funding is the income derived from some of fiscal demand management which can be reinvested into creating an improved public transport system.

Most people agree that demand management must form part of the congestion package, with options for both physical measures- such as road closures and parking restrictions, but also for fiscal measures, such as workplace parking levies and congestion charging. The problem is that the City Deal is seeking to select from a basket of measures that include options based upon inadequate analysis and evidence demonstrating their likelihood of success. Do we know what effect a workplace parking levy will have on future inward investment? Do we know if the business community in the area would support this? Do we know what the level of transport investment a congestion charge might generate? Do we know what the effect on car use will be of progressively removing the existing 40,000 on street parking spaces?

We simply do not have the quantitative information on which to base a rational decision on at this time. Yet, the decision (whatever combination of measures is eventually adopted) will have a profound impact on the future prosperity of Cambridge. We are dealing with very high, indeed the highest, stakes of all and yet the decision on how to proceed is being based largely on supposition, subjective opinions and preconceived thinking, which we believe is irresponsible and inappropriate for the significance of the proposal.

The Assembly, last week, recognised that a decision of such magnitude must be informed through an even-handed comprehensive comparison of existing information and evidence

of all of the options- including both physical and fiscal demand measures.”

Question from Lynn Hieatt

Edward Leigh read out the pre-submitted question on behalf of Lynne Hieatt:

“In three 'zones' surveyed, 3,612 non-residents' cars parked on residential streets in the morning. That's higher than the capacity of our 5 multi-storey car parks and parked at Park/Rides. 42,149 vehicles come in between 7am-10am[4] – commuter parkers = 8.5% of all morning traffic. Add in areas not surveyed, and that's 10%. CJAC policy for parking controls is a start. The City Deal could propose alternatives for commuters:

- Increased P/R capacity
- Improved bus frequency, directness, start/end times
- Deter residents from filling de-congested streets
- Employers could create 'travel-to-work' plans.
- Rail commuters should be able to use Cambridge Leisure carpark for the same price as at the station.

A 'carrots & sticks' package could be developed – and it could work. Will the City Deal Board seize this opportunity for a joined-up plan to tackle congestion and the problems commuters face?”

In response to this question, the following points were made:

- The City Access plan was a balanced 8 point plan that was designed to be joined up and which included travel planning, demand management and bus improvements. All elements of the plan needed to be progressed in parallel. The City Deal transport programme included investment in several new Park and Rides.
- If there was a significant number of areas in favour of residents parking, the existing policy enabled consultation on residents' parking zones and the proposed new policy would simplify the process.
- It was acknowledged that if there were going to be residents parking zones, that complementary mitigating measures needed to be in place.

Question from Robin Heydon

Robin Heydon read out his pre-submitted question:

“With regard to Agenda item 7, paragraph 3.b.v, we believe that the Greater Cambridge City Deal is missing a long term vision of the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure that it will need to accommodate the modal shift expected. As shown with the proposed City Deal Design Guide there is a significant lack of ambition for the high quality of infrastructure needed to enable the modal shift required. Our estimates have determined that the number of people cycling will double within the city and the surrounding area by 2031. This vision would provide the Greater Cambridge City Deal Board with a strategic view of what is needed to accommodate this increase in cycling and walking traffic so that the city doesn't grind to a complete stop and help validate the cycling provision delivery plan.

We would like to offer to work in partnership with the members of the City Deal, the County Council officers, and other stakeholders and partners to create this long term walking and cycling vision, and help create the delivery plan that could over the next 15 years provide infrastructure that caters for people walking and cycling of all ages and abilities. Is this possible?”

In response to this question, the following points were made:

- Reference was made to recommendation (b)(v) in the report. The recommendation included measures that contributed to the long term vision of the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure that would be needed to accommodate the modal shift expected.
- The City Access Team would be working with the County Council Cycling Projects Delivery Team that was delivering on the elements proposed in Policy TSCSC 12 of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy. The schemes being delivered accorded with this policy. It was anticipated that this discussion would lead to workshops including officers, members and stakeholder groups to seek views on the issues and interventions needed. A specific strand of this work could be a working party to investigate cycle parking and in particular a new large covered cycle park.
- The City Deal had to date approved investment of £17 million in cycling.
- The City Deal welcomed the offer of partnership working and the Chairman confirmed he would follow this up with Robin Heydon directly.

Following the public questions, the recommendations were discussed and debated. The following points were made:

- Support was expressed for the recommendations as amended by the Joint Assembly.
- It was clarified that a delivery plan was a way of packaging up a work plan for each of the elements listed at recommendation (d). Lead and support roles would be assigned to each plan.
- Support was expressed by Executive Board members for the removal of the parking charge at park and ride sites. Councillor Bates informed the Executive Board that he was actively looking at the £1 parking charge to be taken off the park and ride. This was welcomed by Executive Board members.

Congestion charging:

- Executive Board members did not believe that congestion charging was the right solution. It was felt that congestion charging would not be fair, particularly to those outside Cambridge without alternatives and people on lower incomes.

Peak time congestion control points:

- The concept of six peak-time congestion control points to restrict all vehicles except buses and bicycles raised significant concerns, although there was some support for it in consultation. The Board agreed that this should not be proceeded with.

On street parking controls:

- The Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) had recommended changes to parking policy in Cambridge. Whilst this was supported by Executive Board members, the potential issue of the dispersal of vehicles was recognised.
- Executive Board members agreed with the Joint Assembly's recommendation that complementary mitigating measures needed to be in place before on- street parking control measures were implemented. The likely impact of on- street parking controls needed to be known in order to better understand the potential mitigation required.
- It was felt that city residents should not be prevented from parking outside their homes.
- Regarding figure 2.1 of the Mott MacDonald Cambridge on-street residential parking study, a plea was made for officers to think about implementing a dedicated bus stop for students attending sixth form college in Area 4 on the map.

- Support was expressed for the parking proposals which had been considered by the Cambridge Joint Area Committee on 24th January 2017.
- A vision for better bus services was supported, however it was not felt that a revenue generating blanket congestion charge was the way to achieve this.
- Executive Board members did not support a city wide residents parking zone.
- It was advised that residential parking zones needed to follow similar policies.

Smart technology:

- Support was expressed for the Joint Assembly's recommendation that greater emphasis should be put on smart technology.
- The Executive Board was informed that a smart technology proposal was likely to be presented to the Executive Board in March 2017 as part of the 2017/18 budget proposals.

Better bus services:

- It was highlighted that there were a considerable number of traffic lights in areas around Cambridge, which it was felt caused congestion. Officers were urged to look at this.

Workplace parking levy:

- A timeline for this was requested. In response to this, the Executive Board was informed that a two to four year programme was estimated. The Board was informed that it had taken 11 years to implement the scheme in Nottingham.
- The Executive Board was informed that consultancy support would help to develop options, which would come back to the Executive Board, potentially in July 2017, before going out to public consultation. The Vice Chairman requested this be added to the Forward Plan for the July 2017 meeting.
- Reference was made to the Mott MacDonald non-residential parking study and the following points were made:
 - Officers were urged to think of how this compared to Nottingham and to take account of and adapt to local circumstances.
 - It was felt that the number of parking spaces in the health sector may be skewed by the number of spaces at Addenbrooke's hospital.
- It was clarified that the workplace parking levy would only apply to those who were working and therefore those attending places of worship, school and hotel guests for example, would not be affected.
- Support was expressed for making the park and rides free. It was felt that this was a potential attraction of the workplace parking levy, if a deal could be done with the County Council to make park and rides free.

Air quality:

- Officers were asked to carry out further assessments and to undertake work on clean air zones.
- Support was expressed for issues of air pollution and air quality to be investigated and it was advised that Public Health be engaged with on these issues. Assurance was sought that this would happen.
- Executive Board members asked for examples of other places with clean air zones. In response to this the Executive Board was informed that to date only London had a clean air zone, however five cities were being put forward as pilots and had been asked by the Government to look at a clean air charge. An air quality action plan steering group was undertaking work and a feasibility study was being developed.
- It was pointed out that air pollution was a sign of queueing vehicles as well as the types of vehicles in the city.

- In the vision for tackling air pollution, the residents who were breathing polluted air needed to be focussed on.
- Given the importance of transport in tackling air quality and that air quality was a key theme emerging from the consultation, including when caused by congestion, Executive Board members agreed that an Air Quality Management Zone including the potential for fiscal intervention through pollution charging should be investigated.

The Joint Assembly's recommendations were discussed:

- Recommendation (a)(ii) – the Executive Board agreed with the addition to this recommendation regarding the assessment of existing data and evidence.
- Recommendation (a)(iii) – the Executive Board noted the reason for the addition of the word 'physical' to this recommendation, which was due to syntax with the insertion of the additional recommendation (a)(ii).
- Recommendation (b)(ii) – following discussion, the Executive Board noted the Cambridge Joint Area Committee's recommendation of changes to parking policy on 24th January 2017, and requested that officers bring forward a report on complementary measures to be implemented at the same time as changes to on-street parking controls.

The City Deal Executive Board unanimously:

a) **AGREED** that:

- i. Officers should work up and assess options for a package of physical demand management measures.
- ii. Officers should assess existing data and evidence of desired access between destinations to create an overview of measures that will increase access while reducing congestion.
- iii. Physical demand measures should make the best use of the limited road space and capacity in Cambridge, in order to improve bus reliability, cycling and walking, particularly within the designated Air Quality Management Area.
- iv. No further work is undertaken on the package of six peak-time congestion control points consulted upon.

b) **AGREED** that officers should continue to work up and assess options for the other seven elements of the eight-point plan consulted on, including:

- i. A Workplace Parking Levy: Co-design a workplace parking levy (WPL) scheme with employers with more detail available for Board and public review later in 2017:
 1. To work with individual employers and groups of employers during 2017 on the details of the scheme.
 2. To determine the local transport priorities that will receive the revenue raised, building on employer evidence of transport needs and coordinated with Council infrastructure planners.
 3. To be coordinated with and if feasible form a part of the City Deal and the Local Enterprise Partnership's broader engagement with the business community.
 4. The roll-out to include practical support for employers looking to manage their parking demand in advance of the levy coming into

effect.

5. It is recommended that as far as possible, the Cambridge WPL should resemble the Nottingham template. However, there will need to be agreement on how to charge, the price, its geographical extent, exemptions and how it will be administered and enforced.
- ii. On-Street Parking Controls: **NOTED** that the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (CJAC) recommended changes to parking policy in Cambridge. The Executive Board **REQUESTED** that officers bring forward a report on complementary measures to be implemented at the same time as changes to on street parking controls.
 - iii. Improved Public Space and Air Quality: **AGREED** that officers should:
 1. Assess the possibility of establishing a Clean Air Zone and the potential for the introduction of a pollution charge in central Cambridge within the existing Air Quality Management Area. Key criteria for assessing this should be its impacts on: health; the local environment, including air quality and public realm; bus reliability and cycling; business and the economy; deliverability and value for money.
 2. Ensure that initiatives to improve city centre access should continue to consider opportunities for improving the city centre experience and economy and that this should be coordinated with other work across the Partnership that has similar objectives, including planning policy.
 - iv. Better Bus Services and Expanded Park & Ride: **AGREED** that officers should continue work to identify how to reduce bus delays on key bus routes by engaging bus operators and finalising the Bus Network Review.
 - v. Better Pedestrian and Cycling Infrastructure: **AGREED** that officers should continue to work with other partners to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.
 - vi. Travel Planning: **AGREED** that officers should continue to work with Travel for Cambridgeshire to support employers to adopt sustainable policies and practices with regard to travel to work and travel during work.
 - vii. Smart Technology: **AGREED** that officers should continue to work with Connecting Cambridgeshire to develop smart technology solutions and that there is more emphasis placed on Smart Technology by the Greater Cambridge City Deal going forward.
- c) **AGREED** that officers, with partner assistance, should deliver a City Access communication and engagement plan to support these recommendations. The plan will focus on communicating:
- (i) Factual information about the vision for the future;
 - (ii) Statistics and research results;
 - (iii) The need for a package of complementary measures to ensure productivity growth without commensurate growth in congestion;
 - (iv) How we are developing workable solutions by designing them in partnership with those who will be impacted and those impacted if changes are not made;
 - (v) The plan will also set out how the City Access programme fits into the broader plan for city centre revitalisation, and the wider City

Deal transport vision and housing plan.

- d) To take these recommendations forward, the Executive Board **AGREED** that proposed work on the individual elements of the City Centre access work be developed through a series of delivery plans. Proposed plans are:
- (i) Data analysis and joined up strategy
 - (ii) Bus improvement delivery plan
 - (iii) Communications and engagement delivery plan
 - (iv) Cycling provision delivery plan
 - (v) Demand management delivery plan
 - (vi) Parking management delivery plan including a workplace parking levy and on-street parking controls
 - (vii) Public space & air quality delivery plan including pedestrian infrastructure
 - (viii) Smart technology delivery plan
 - (ix) Travel planning delivery plan

8. CHANGE CONTROL AND ISSUE MANAGEMENT

The City Deal Programme Director presented the report which set out in a consolidated way the approach to change control and issue management across the City Deal programme.

The City Deal Executive Board:

- a) **NOTED** and **ENDORSED** the codification of the principles used in the City Deal for change control and issue management.
- b) **AGREED** the proposed approach for reporting issues and change control.

9. PROGRESS REPORT

Question from Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor read out his pre-submitted question regarding this agenda item:

“When the board next considers plans for Milton Road will it receive a report: Collating the results of responses to the initial public consultation which ran until February 2016.

- Identifying who attended the private workshop events, and the basis on which they were invited.
- Addressing the 200 responses from 300 families to a Milton Road Primary School consultation on the Milton Road plans, and if the school representative reflected the views expressed when participating in the private workshops.
- Clarifying if the report on private workshops stating: “The majority of attendees were keen to retain as much green verge and as many trees as possible”, is referring to the retention of the existing trees and verges?

I was surprised the public consultation responses do not appear to have been used to inform the private workshop events or the local liaison forum meetings. I would like to take this opportunity to stress to the Board that while the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum meetings took place in public they largely spent their time discussing arrangements for workshop sessions which then took place behind closed doors with

selected invitees.

When the board next considers Milton Road will it formally endorse the letter dated 14 September 2016 from the board chair to the LLF and Assembly chairs?

Could a Local Liaison Forum (or Cambridge City Council North Area Committee) meeting be held between publication of the next City Deal Board report on Milton Rd and its consideration by the board so recommendations get discussed locally, by the area's councillors, before decisions are made? Such a meeting could include a detailed public presentation of, and opportunity for the public to ask questions on, the LLF endorsed "Do Optimum" plan."

In response to this question the following points were made:

- A report would be presented to the Board in March 2017 looking at the outcomes of workshops and setting delivery priorities.
- Milton Road Primary School's views were taken into account in a report presented to the Board in June 2016 that summarised responses to the consultation on the Milton Road scheme in January and February 2016.
- A local liaison forum (LLF) meeting was being arranged by the LLF Chair for 8 February 2017.
- Whilst it was agreed that there should be openness and transparency, it was not felt necessary to hold local community workshops in the public gaze as this may stifle people's contribution to these. The Executive Board Chairman paid tribute to the local work that had been done.

The Vice Chairman asked for an update on progress regarding the letter written to Heidi Allen MP regarding Foxton. The Board was informed that a letter in response had been received from Heidi Allen who was arranging a meeting with senior Network Rail staff. A further update was requested for the March 2017 meeting.

The Vice Chairman requested an update on progress regarding a letter sent to Highways England regarding the M11 junction 11 and 13. In response to this the Board was informed that the letter had been sent and that receipt had been acknowledged, however a meeting had not yet been set up. The Board was informed that Highways England would be consulting on a five year plan at the end of this year. The Vice Chairman requested that at the meeting with Highways England, they be asked specifically to consult on the specifics of the M11. The Vice Chairman also requested that the minutes of meetings held with Highways England be made available. The Chairman advised that dialogue with the National Infrastructure Commission was continuing as well.

An update on the Cambridge South railway station was requested. Councillor Bates responded and informed the Board that he would be attending an English heartland economic workshop to discuss east/west issues such as the Oxford to Cambridge express route. Councillor Bates highlighted that there was a desire to link Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge by road and rail, pointing out that these issues were not just on the City Deal's agenda, which built the case to lobby the government for funding. The Executive Board was informed that a meeting with Heidi Allen MP and the Secretary of State for Transport to discuss Cambridge South Station had been arranged for the following week. AstraZeneca would also be attending this.

The Board was informed that the East-West rail annual general meeting would take place on 9th February and that funding had been confirmed to continue work on route options for east/west rail.

The Vice Chairman requested that City Deal progress reports also reported on meetings that were taking place with Network Rail and Highways England. The City Deal Interim Chief Executive informed the Board that the format of the progress report was being reviewed.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal progress report.

10. FINANCE MONITORING

The Executive Board **NOTED** the financial position for the period ending 31 December 2016.

11. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting, to be held on 8 March 2017 at 4pm, was noted.

The Meeting ended at 19.15
