

**Report by the Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly
following its meeting held on 3 June 2015**

A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme options and approval to consult

A response from the Board is requested on the points and recommendations highlighted in bold, which are labelled **A to K** below.

The Assembly received questions from 9 members of the public about this proposed scheme indicating points of view, which though answered in our session, represent a number of themes of which the Board should be aware:

- That the funding of tranches 2 and 3 of the City Deal could be critical in enabling the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, given that it would make a key contribution to the sustainability of new and enlarged settlements detached from the city, about which the Planning Inspector has expressed concern. **(A) We noted this point and explained the importance of progress and delivery of our tranche 1 programme to the access to tranches 2 and 3 funding, which we would invite the Board to reaffirm.**
- That consultation on the schemes could be premature, as the sustainability of new and expanded settlements such as those envisaged along the A428 corridor appeared to have been challenged by the Planning Inspector examining the two Local Plans. It was our view that no inconsistency arose in relation to the kind of improvement represented by Options 1 (Madingley Mulch roundabout to the city) because it was needed even in current conditions. Greater clarity about the Local Plans was likely to be available before a decision was made about funding improvements represented by Options 2 (Caxton Gibbet roundabout to Madingley Mulch roundabout) because the Board under our recommendation had deferred funding until tranche 2 of the programme. **(B) We would invite the Board to give their view on this point.**
- A series of points in relation to the detail of the options recommended for consultation, including requests for more information, suggestions for alternative routes, emphasis on the importance of incorporating high quality cycling provision, the siting of park and ride sites, and the favouring or opposing particular options. We subsequently discussed these issues with our recommendations and observations to the Board indicated below.

Our own discussion echoed a number of the points in the public statements about the strengths and weaknesses of particular options, but it was our overwhelming view that all options should go forward for consultation to enable public input before further filtering was undertaken. As we had a rare opportunity to make a significant investment which we hoped would bring an enduring benefit, it was important to ensure that bold options were included for evaluation. We therefore recommend the Board to endorse the officers' recommendations:

(C) That it should:

- (i) note the findings from the initial engineering assessment and technical study;**
- (ii) approve the public consultation on the options as set out in the report;**
- (iii) agree to receive a report on consultation later this year on a preferred option, or options, for full business case development.**

We noted requests for greater clarity about the detail of the options. We understood from officers that the proposed initial consultation was to enable the selection of a concept and that further investment of resources in detailed design work would not be undertaken until a concept had been selected; at which stage a further wave of consultation would be undertaken. Accordingly, the options currently proposed for consultation were regarded as representative of the means by which better priority for bus transport could be secured, in order to stimulate public input, which could include suggested hybrids or further alternatives.

(D) We seek the Board's endorsement of this understanding and feel that emphasis should be made in the consultation exercise to ensure that this context is fully explained to the public.

Making an exception to the above, the Assembly resolved to make two recommendations to the Board in relation to the location of a new park and ride site near to the Madingley Mulch roundabout and the future of the existing Madingley Road park and ride site:

(E) That the Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should:

- (1) Include a question asking about the public's views on the optimum location for the new Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch**
- (2) Contain a discussion or analysis of the benefits/disadvantages of retaining/closing the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site**

In relation to (1) above, the Assembly also discussed the possibility of better indicating the conceptual status of a new Park and Ride site at Madingley Mulch by not marking out on a map specific site or sites. And in relation to (2) above, the Assembly discussed the possibility of satisfying our recommendation by simply explaining the assumption of at this stage retaining the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site.

The Assembly discussed the relationship of the proposed on- and off-line busway options to cycling provision. We obtained confirmation from officers that cycling and pedestrian provision would be made in the case of each option and its scope in each case would be indicated as part of the consultation process. **(F) We seek the Board's agreement to this.**

It was identified in our discussion that reliability was as important as journey time for the choices people made about mode of transport. As the approach underlying the City Deal investments is to encourage modal shift to public transport, officers undertook to ensure this was adequately reflected as a variable against each of the options going into consultation. **(G) We seek the Board's agreement to this.**

The Assembly discussed the overall project timetable incorporated in the officers' report and noting its length, wished to pressure-test it to see if it could be accelerated. We approved the following recommendation to which the Board is invited to respond:

(H) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should instruct officers to produce a revised timetable based on 'approval of the City Deal Executive Board final scheme' being in May or October 2016, rather than December 2016 as currently shown, and explain what would need to change to achieve this timetable for the Executive Board to consider

In relation to the process of developing detailed designs following the initial public consultation, the Assembly approved the following recommendation to which the Board is invited to agree:

(I) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should establish an officer Project Board to develop the project and proposals agreed by the Executive Board, which would sit alongside a Local Liaison Forum to be established (as with other major projects) consisting of local County, City and District members, parish representatives and other key stakeholders, to exchange information and ideas on the project and ensure there was full information as it progressed. In addition to this, it may be appropriate to establish a task and finish Member Working Group for particular issues and the need for this should be established on an ad hoc basis.

The Assembly considered a number of other matters tangential to the launch of consultation on improvements to the A428/Madingley Road Corridor Scheme and approved the following recommendations to the Board on which its response is requested:

(J) That it should encourage Cambridge University (the freeholder of the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site) to discuss with the City Council's Planning Department how the site might be developed for residential development (including for affordable housing, and all in a manner that reflects the aims and aspirations of the Greater Cambridge City Deal) if the Park and Ride was closed in the context of the opening of a new site at Madingley Mulch and if the existing site was to revert back to the University.

(K) That it should instruct officers to bring a report to the September cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings containing an initial and high-level appraisal of the technical implications and costs of creating bus-only slip-roads:

- (i) at M11 junction 13: when turning off the A1303 (going east) onto the M11 (going south);**
- (ii) at the M11 junction 13: creating a bus lane alongside the existing sliproad off the M11, which would get priority treatment at the traffic lights;**
- (iii) at M11 junction 11: turning off the M11 (going south) between the existing farm and footbridge and the existing slip-road, then going round the corner of the farmland at Trumpington Meadows, running parallel to (and west of) Trumpington Road, and entering the Trumpington Road Park and Ride thence joining up to the Guided Busway.**