



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Wednesday, 15 July 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University

Members and substitutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Roger Taylor	University of Cambridge

Officers/advisors

Antoinette Jackson	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Dan Clarke	Connecting Cambridgeshire
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dave Baigent (Cambridge City Council), Councillor Francis Burkitt (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Anne Constantine (Cambridge Regional College) and Jane Ramsey (Cambridge University Hospitals).

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 June 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman reported that a number of public questions had been received which related to items on the agenda for this meeting. He intended to accept those questions as part of considering the respective item. One question not related to any items on the agenda had been received and was asked and answered as follows:

Question by Stephen Lunn

Mr Lunn made a statement explaining that East Anglia Haulage was an employer of a significant number of local people at Madingley Mulch and that he was somewhat surprised and disappointed that he had not been contacted by anyone in authority connected with the Cambridge City Deal concerning the proposed option for a new Park and Ride site east of the Madingley Mulch roundabout. He highlighted that local press items had triggered concerns from his employees as to what the potential implications were for his business in the future and thus its continued employment. Whilst appreciating that the drawings published had been referred to as being indicative at this stage, he said that not only did the drawings for the site and option 1 (c) in general have dramatic implications for future passing trade, but they also appeared to include his site as part of the proposed Park and Ride development.

Mr Lunn therefore asked the following question:

“Does the proposed Park and Ride development footprint east of the Madingley Mulch roundabout include our site, or only the land to the north of the current A1303?”

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, responded by saying that the Council had spoken to colleagues at East Anglia Haulage in relation to this issue. He confirmed that all ownerships in the area were being looked at as part of developing the options but that nothing at this stage had been determined. Landowners and businesses in the area would be consulted prior to any decisions being taken, to gain a better understanding of the issues and opportunities in relation to the route. Mr Walmsley confirmed that an initial consultation process had been approved which would be taking place in the Autumn. It was noted that a meeting had been subsequently arranged to meet with representatives of East Anglia Haulage on-site on 4 August 2015.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions for consideration by the Joint Assembly had been received.

6. REPORTS SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

6 (a) Chisholm Trail cycle links

The Joint Assembly considered a report which summarised a recommended route for the Chisholm Trail proposed to be taken forward to public consultation.

Mike Davies, Team Leader of Cycling Projects at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted the following benefits of the recommended route for

the Chisholm Trail:

- a safer, direct and more convenient largely off-road route for cycling and walking;
- improved access to green spaces, employment areas, retail sites and residential centres;
- links into a network of existing cycle routes;
- minimal impact on other motor traffic journey times;
- enhancement of the environment, streetscape and air quality;
- provision of a link from the main Cambridge railway station to the new railway station at Chesterton;
- the creation of more capacity for sustainable trips along the rail corridor;
- links to strategic priorities for City Deal cross-city cycle improvements.

The Chairman took this opportunity to invite receipt of public questions and statements, as follows:

Statement by Jim Chisholm

Mr Chisholm explained that a number of European cities had tackled car congestion by providing better cycling facilities and better public transport and that Leicester, Nottingham and Coventry were examples of cities in England where car dominated structures were being removed.

In relation to economic benefit, he said that some people feared that improved cycling facilities would solely allow individuals to cross town quicker and provided very little economic benefit. He was of the view, however, that as a result of route improvements there had been huge increases in cycling into Cambridge from villages in the past ten years and it was getting new people to cycle that would provide economic benefits. Mr Chisholm suggested that the recommended route should be seen as a route that would give many less confident riders, who currently drove to work, a pleasant, relaxing, healthy, more reliable and probably even quicker trip by cycle or on foot, therefore achieving those economic benefits by reducing congestion. He added that many of the sections of the new route could be provided without any heavy engineering.

Mr Chisholm closed by saying that it was not necessary to force people out of their cars to reduce congestion, and that simply providing good alternatives for those willing to change would make a difference.

The Joint Assembly noted the statement.

Question by Chris Smith

Mr Smith said that the route was built over Fen Ditton Meadows, across the curtilage of the Leper Chapel, a Grade 1 listed building, over Coldham's Common, a county wildlife site, and through other public and open green space, with no adverse effects noted in the report. He therefore asked what the adverse effects of this scheme were believed to be prior to its adoption by this group, including those on the rights of commoners and landscape.

In terms of the cost benefit ratio, Mr Smith said that with a ratio of 35:1 and a cost of around £12.5 million including the Fen Ditton bridge, this would indicate implied benefits of approximately £420 million. Given the route was perhaps 210 metres shorter end to end than existing cycle routes, this equated to £2 million per metre in benefits. He therefore asked for an explanation as to how this figure of £2 million per metre would represent

value for money.

Mr Davies responded by saying that the proposed underpass would provide a link from the Leper Chapel site to the lake on the south side of New Market Road. This would present opportunities to enhance the site in terms of planting and landscaping, but also in terms of access by foot and bicycle. It would also mean that more less-able people could use the car park near the lake and access the Chapel via the underpass. He added that ecological and heritage surveys were planned and emphasised that the project presented an opportunity to enhance, not degrade, the Chapel as a destination and as an asset to the City.

It was noted that partners would work closely with Cambridge Past, Present and Future, friends of the Leper Church and other organisations to develop a project that met all needs and gave the best outcome.

In terms of the cost benefit ratio, Mr Davies explained that the 35:1 ration had been put together based on the benefits of moving car trips to cycle, the figures relating to which had been endorsed by the Department for Transport.

Mr Davies said that the proposed route was designed to be much more direct, safer and attractive for users in comparison to the existing road-based routes. By crossing the River Cam on a new bridge, Newmarket Road via an underpass and Mill Road via spare rail arches, the proposed route would avoid a number of busy and dangerous roads and existing junctions. Routing the path across green spaces and providing direct access to two stations and various important centres along the way, he felt, would ensure a pleasant, direct and convenient route that was likely to attract new cyclists and which supported the objective of modal shift from the private motor vehicle.

Statement by Robin Pellew

Mr Pellew said that Cambridge Past, Present and Future had been a consistent long-term supporter of the proposed Chisholm Trail, and emphasised the organisation's continued support for the project.

He referred to the Leper Chapel on the North side of Newmarket Road as being the oldest roofed building in Cambridge in continuous use, dating back to around 1150, and that it was a Grade 1 listed building together with its curtilage so as to protect its setting. He also highlighted that the Meadows were ecologically rich in species and a county wildlife site. In addition, Mr Pellew stated that the Stourbridge Fair dated back to 1114 and was held every year in September in front of the Chapel. With the Chapel and the Fair he reminded the Joint Assembly that these were some of the oldest roots of contemporary Cambridge, dating back even before the founding of the University. Cambridge Past, Present and the Future had steadfastly defended the Chapel and its Meadows from encroachment and development and Mr Pellew said that it would continue to do so.

Mr Pellew said that the preferred route by the consultant involved a tunnel under the Newmarket Road opening some 50 metres from the Chapel door, which would then run to the east of the Chapel through the curtilage and then up the east side of the Meadows. Cambridge Past, Present and Future had serious concerns about this proposed route which it felt was an invasion of a Grade 1 listed property that would seriously impact the setting of the Chapel. With a public cycleway through the middle of the site, Mr Pellew did not think it would be possible to stage the Stourbridge Fair in front of the Chapel.

Mr Pellew, on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and the Future, therefore advised the Joint Assembly that it did not at the moment endorse the preferred route as proposed and

that consultation would need to take place with the Friends of the Leper Chapel, Historic England and other partners. It would then like to enter into discussion with the consultant and the City Council to explore other options, not least the route outlined in option (b). Mr Pellew repeated overall support for the Trail, but reserved the right to oppose the routing through the Grade 1 curtilage of the Leper Chapel.

Mr Davies responded by saying that his colleague and the consultant had met with a representative of the Friends of the Leper Chapel and the Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present and Future on 1 June 2015 on-site to open discussions about the proposal. Subsequently there had been further discussions to seek permission to enter Cambridge Past, Present and Future land to undertake ecology, heritage and topographical surveys, for which agreement had been given. He added that the Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present and Future was helping write the scope for the heritage survey which was extremely useful and would be mutually beneficial.

Mr Davies said that, if developed carefully and sensitively, the project should enhance the setting and access to the Chapel site, stating that partners would work closely with Cambridge Past, Present and Future and other bodies towards the very best outcome. He added that the consultant had a proven track record of delivering sensitive sustainable transport projects, most of which included habitat enhancements, public art and, in many cases, had strived to showcase historic and heritage issues.

Referring to option (b), Mr Davies said that it would impact negatively on the privacy of a property which currently backed onto fields on one side and the railway line on the other, but confirmed that this issue would be covered in the consultation.

The Chairman invited Members of the Joint Assembly to discuss the proposal set out in the report, further to which the following points were noted:

- careful consideration had to be given to the impact on Leper Chapel as a result of any route proposed as part of this project, including landscaping and the location and design of proposed public art;
- a question was raised as to why the proposed route could not follow the existing railway line. It was noted that the railway had been followed as much as possible, but railway infrastructure and buildings, together with operational issues such as delivery and storage yards for some commercial premises, did not make this possible for the whole route;
- the report was very encouraging and sought to address an aspiration that had been around for a long time;
- safety and convenience were two important aspects of the route that made it very positive;
- the Leper Chapel was a very valuable asset, but this should not prevent the route progressing nearby, or prevent a proposed underpass near Newmarket Road;
- a question was raised as to whether specialist conservation expertise would be used to ensure that significant advice and consideration was given to the sensitivities surrounding the Leper Chapel. It was noted that the City Council's urban design team had such expertise in place, together with the Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present and Future who had significant experience and who would be working closely with partners on the project. Reassurance was given that further specialist advice and expertise would be sought if necessary. Mr Davies made it clear that the Councils would be working closely with all interested parties in the area and that this was not purely an engineering project. He addressed fears of unsightly underpasses by referring to examples in Royston of attractive and safe underpasses which had been put in place that were much different in

- appearance to the perceived concrete underpasses commonly seen in urban areas;
- it was agreed that the words ‘for the purpose of public consultation’ should be added to the first recommendation contained within the report, to make it clear that the route was a proposal for consultation, rather than a route proposed for approval;
 - the terms ‘premature’ and ‘undeliverable’ had been muted by one of the public speakers as part of their statements and a response to these claims was requested. Mr Davies said that a significant amount of work had been undertaken by the consultants on this proposed route and the option set out in the report, in his view, represented the best, most balanced, direct and safe route in order to achieve the ambitions of the Chisholm Trail. He acknowledged that certain sections of the route may present problems in due course which could themselves become undeliverable. If such circumstances occurred, however, alternatives would have to be found;
 - in answer to a question regarding the flexibility of the scheme in terms of changes that could be proposed as part of the consultation, Mr Davies said that there were a number of options that could be included within the consultation to aid responses. He cited four possible options regarding Leper Chapel and the use of a crossing instead of an underpass for Newmarket Road as examples that could be included within the consultation document.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Approves the proposed route option for the Chisholm Trail for the purposes of public consultation.
- (b) Gives approval to proceed to consultation on the route in the Autumn 2015.

6 (b) Cross-city cycle improvements

Consideration was given to a report which summarised the strategic approach and key principles for developing the cross-city cycle improvements in Cambridge and set out some early work that had been undertaken, informed by stakeholder engagement, on the routes which would benefit most.

Mike Davies, Team Leader of Cycling Projects, presented the report and highlighted that the proposed priority cross-city cycle schemes represented strategic links to both radial and orbital cycle routes, especially those to employment or development sites. He referred Members to Appendices 2 and 3 of the report which set out a scoring methodology and a list of scored schemes, respectively. Plan 1 attached to the report also illustrated the proposed location of City Deal cross-city schemes. It was noted that the chosen schemes were the result of the outcomes of a stakeholder workshop held on 7 March 2015.

The Chairman took this opportunity to invite receipt of public questions and statements, as follows:

Statement by Roxanne De Beaux

Roxanne De Beaux represented the Cambridge Cycling Campaign which welcomed the proposed cross-city cycling routes and strongly supported the proposed improvements to the nominated corridors. She said that these were clearly areas where improvements were required and the Campaign was confident that high quality improvements to these

corridors would achieve the desired modal shifts and reduce congestion.

Regarding the Hills Road and Addenbrooke's corridor, Ms De Beaux said that nothing short of a separate light phase would improve the safety for the most vulnerable. She added that the advance lights would not add significant improvement to the existing situation where cyclists, through their sheer number, already dominated this intersection and prevented any more than a few cars from getting through at a time. There was also a high risk of collision in this area so the Campaign recommended that a better solution with separate light signals and safer cycling infrastructure should be included.

The Campaign supported proposed improvements to links to East Cambridge and the National Cycle Network 11, however, it felt that there should be proposals for further assessment and suggested investigating use of Section 106 funding from the Ice Rink and Marshall's developments.

Ms De Beaux emphasised the terrible infrastructure for cycles on Arbury Road and said the Campaign agreed that this route must be improved due to the lack of alternative routes. The Campaign was also pleased to see the links to the North Cambridge Station and looked forward to seeing further details of this. It did, however, recommend a scheme to improve the Trumpington Road and Lensfield Road double roundabout which was an appalling junction where many accidents had occurred and had not been included on the list of schemes.

In closing Ms De Beaux said that the Cambridge Cycling Campaign was very pleased with the proposals presented and the improvements that they would provide for cycling in Cambridge.

The Joint Assembly noted the statement.

Statement by Councillor Peter Sarris

Councillor Peter Sarris of Cambridge City Council, representing the East Chesterton Ward, wanted to make it clear that all Ward Councillors from East Chesterton fully were fully supportive of the proposed improvements to link the railway station and science park and emphasised that there was also a great deal of local support for these schemes. He did make the point, however, that it would be important for officers to be conscious of anxieties by residents regarding access being impeded in the Green End Road area when bringing forward that particular scheme.

The Joint Assembly noted the statement.

The Chairman invited Members of the Joint Assembly to discuss the proposal set out in the report, further to which the following points were noted:

- reference was made to the omission of schemes in Mill Road that scored highly but had not been included. It was noted that schemes at Mill Road and Lensfield Road had purposely been omitted as they would potentially be improved as part of the city centre access study. This piece of work would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for consideration in due course;
- a comment was made that cycle routes did not often join up with one another. The improvements within the report were therefore welcomed but a question was asked as to whether these schemes would connect to existing routes. Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that the City Deal provided an opportunity to build more infrastructure around cycling and provide solutions to some long-standing problems. He referred to the

proposed Chisholm Trail as an example of a strategic route that would provide connectivity to other routes in the area as well as link up with other employment sites across the city;

- in terms of the £900,000 required to improve the Hills Road and Addenbrooke's corridor, a question was raised as to whether this could be supplemented by Section 106 funding. It was noted that £900,000 was an early estimate at this stage, but it was noted that Section 106 funding could be available to support this particular scheme;
- a question was raised regarding the provision of secure cycle parking and whether £25,000 would be enough in view of the number of additional cyclists these schemes, and other City Deal schemes, aspired to produce through model shift. It was noted that the County and City Councils had been developing and delivering a programme of such improvements for many years and the additional City Deal monies would secure funding for the programme moving forward. In addition, a point was made that lots of these schemes were aimed at people commuting to work, therefore, provision of parking at employer sites would be equally as important as parking provision at the railway and bus stations and other similar key locations in the city.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Approves the choice of the proposed priority strategic cross-city cycle schemes as set out in the report.
- (b) Approves the public consultation on the schemes, as set out in the report.
- (c) Agrees to receive a report on the consultation results of each scheme and endorse the findings.

6 (c) Smarter Cambridgeshire work stream

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out a proposal for a 'smart cities' approach within the City Deal programme to help support the delivery of improved transport, skills and housing and unlock further sustainable economic growth within Greater Cambridge.

Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy at Cambridge City Council, presented the report and referred to Connecting Cambridgeshire, a multi-agency programme established to address digital connectivity infrastructure shortfall and support better exploitation of digital technology across all sectors. The Connecting Cambridgeshire programme included a number of work streams and one of those strands included the investigation of 'smart' technologies and its relevance for Cambridgeshire and, specifically, the City Deal programme.

The Executive Board allocated £20,000 for two years to develop a smart cities work stream with a view to seeking bids for external funding. A 'smart cities' workshop was held early this year with a number of local expert speakers and City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board representatives, where it was requested that a 'Smarter Cambridgeshire' proposal be developed. Proposals had therefore been worked up and the initial objectives of the Smarter Cambridgeshire project, through to 2016, would be to:

- generate an outline 'smart architecture' blueprint which would facilitate the delivery of a 'test bed/demonstrator' programme;
- establish and deliver an initial one year test bed/demonstrator programme of work

packages which implemented small scale 'smart' solutions, with a focus to transport related opportunities;

- establish and participate in a wider forum for collaboration with and information exchange between complementary work programmes and other initiatives across the wider Cambridge research and development communities to develop and showcase the smart credentials and profile of the area;
- investigate Government, EU and other funding opportunities and co-ordinate funding bids to develop the Smarter Cambridgeshire programme in both the short and medium term;
- investigate and develop collaboration opportunities with other nearby cities, including Peterborough and Milton Keynes;
- develop a longer term smart cities approach which reflects the level of ambition for Greater Cambridge. This would complement and influence the emerging City Deal programme to ensure that smart characteristics were incorporated within the overall approach to housing, transport and skills as part of the delivery of the City Deal.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- £20,000 seemed quite a small investment considering the proposed objectives. It was noted that the key behind this work stream was to unlock further funding, working alongside and complimenting the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme and organisations such as Cambridge Network. Members of the Assembly were reminded that a significant amount of external funding was available to support the objectives of this project;
- it was positive that the aspiration of the project was wider than the Greater Cambridge area, as people commuted into and visited the area from places further afield;
- a question was raised as to examples of good practice from other smart cities. Dan Clarke, from the Connecting Cambridgeshire team, reported that Birmingham, Bristol, Glasgow and Milton Keynes had all demonstrated good practice and confirmed that he had already been in discussions with representatives from Bristol and Milton Keynes.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approves the establishment of a Smarter Cambridgeshire work stream for Greater Cambridge, as outlined in Appendices A and B of the report, to be overseen within the City Deal governance arrangements.

7. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal work programme.

In view of the cancellation of the City Deal Executive Board meeting originally scheduled to be held on 9 September 2015, it was **AGREED** that the Joint Assembly meeting scheduled to be held on 25 August 2015 would also be cancelled.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** its schedule of meetings for the remainder of 2015, with dates for meetings in 2016 to be confirmed in due course.

The Meeting ended at 3.50 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.