



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on  
Tuesday, 4 August 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
John Bridge	Cambridge Chamber of Commerce
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board substitutes in attendance

Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council

### Officers/advisors

Antoinette Jackson	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Lloyd	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Rankin	Cambridgeshire County Council
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Aaron Blowers	Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly.

## 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 June 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Questions asked or statements made, together with an responses from Members of the Executive Board or officers, were noted as follows:

#### **Statement by Edward Leigh**

Mr Leigh spoke about a bigger vision for transport in Greater Cambridge and acknowledged the Board's desire to get more people onto public transport, which he stated was a big challenge for practical, social and financial reasons.

He felt that Park and Ride sites were needed on all arterial routes into the City, making them easily accessible to as many people as possible and minimising the need to travel on the M11 or the A14 to reach one. Mr Leigh believed that there was a strong case for eight or nine new sites, which could be complemented by a network of cycle-and-ride hubs in the villages and outskirts of the City and bus-and-cycle hubs within the City. He was of the opinion that this would take some pressure off roads, but would not solve the problem. He added that Park and Ride sites had shown to abstract users from regular bus services, making those less financially viable and leading to a reduction in rural services with more people having to drive to Park and Ride sites. He made the point that some people did not have their own vehicles and said that there was a real danger that the poorest people living in rural communities could be cut off from the City.

Mr Leigh proposed a solution known as 'gating' or queue relocation, whereby vehicles were held at points outside of the City where there was space to increase road capacity. Traffic lights, connected to queue detectors in the roads ahead, could release cars only as fast as they could move freely and a bypass lane could be introduced to allow access for emergency vehicles, buses and other classes of road users to skip the queues. He had identified a possible sixteen locations where roads would need to be gated, mostly close to Park and Ride sites. These measures, in terms of building more Park and Ride sites and introducing gating, he felt, were affordable within the City Deal programme.

Mr Leigh explained that he was working with a small group of people, currently resourced by the Cycling Campaign, to expand this vision for enabling everyone to use the most convenient and appropriate combination of driving, public transport, cycling and walking to get around Greater Cambridge. He welcomed the opportunity to discuss how this could be developed further.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, informed Mr Leigh that he and representatives of the Executive Board would welcome a discussion around these proposals ahead of a report on city centre congestion scheduled for consideration by the Board later in the year. He agreed that more investment in Park and Ride facilities was needed and recognised the significance of tackling congestion as part of City Deal investment.

#### **Question by Jim Chisholm**

Mr Chisholm referred to the support that had been received for the proposed Chisholm Trail route at the meeting of the Joint Assembly held in July, but understood some of the concerns that had been highlighted by objectors at that meeting. He made reference to a revised proposal for the route that had very recently been published and included some

changes to reflect discussions that had subsequently taken place. He said that everyone needed to work and communicate better together to ensure that any main differences were resolved before a more definite route went before public consultation in the Autumn. Mr Chisholm added that the completed route should give many who currently drove, from Milton to Addenbrookes or Trumpington to the Science Park for example, a more pleasant and healthy option by cycling and also contribute to reduced congestion within Cambridge.

Mr Chisholm said that there was a lack of good evidence about the mode changes that occurred when good facilities for cycling were constructed. He felt that 'before and after' studies were needed, not just solely counts of cycles, and asked whether that would happen.

He also said that the improved access for both cycling and walking on the east side of the railway would give much added value to an eastern entrance for the main railway station. Hills Road should then have reduced congestion and there would be added benefits for the Chisholm Trail. He asked whether this would happen.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, informed Mr Chisholm that pre and post impact analysis and studies of the Trail would be undertaken to quantify the benefits, which was standard practice for major transport schemes.

The latter question related to a proposal by Network Rail that had been considered in 2010/11 which consisted of an extension to the existing overbridge with an entrance to the eastern side. Mr Chisholm felt that this would be an easy way to achieve a reduction in congestion.

Mr Hughes felt that there were broader issues that needed to be considered as part of this matter, notwithstanding consulting with Network Rail and taking into consideration the planning issues for that area. He added, however, that this was something that did have potential and could be explored further.

Councillor Herbert, as local City Councillor for that specific area, highlighted that there were issues at both ends of the proposed Trail that needed to be considered, specifically in terms of how the Trail connected with other routes and cycling linkages.

### **Statement by Chris Blencowe**

Mr Blencowe spoke as a Trustee of Cambridge Past, Present and Future and reiterated its support for the Chisolm Trail. He also welcomed the proposal that the Leper Chapel should become a focus for the Trail and appreciated that the Trail would improve the visibility and accessibility of the Chapel. Furthermore, Cambridge Past, Present and the Future supported the plans for a café and public car park on the southern side of Newmarket Road.

Mr Blencowe reported that representatives from Cambridge Past, Present and Future had met with the consultant who had agreed that the part of the original preferred route that would have seen the underpass opening directly in front of the Chapel was unacceptable and should be withdrawn from further consideration. An alternative plan had been submitted to the County Council that moved the underpass further to the East along Newmarket Road, which he said was a significant and much welcomed improvement.

Cambridge Past, Present and Future felt it would be more acceptable if the underpass was located towards Coldham's Brook so that there was less impact on the Chapel. Mr Blencowe reported, however, that Cambridge Past, Present and Future had been told that

it was not possible to locate the route any closer to the Brook than the location proposed in the newly submitted plan, for drainage reasons. He disputed this and referred to subways constructed below the ground water table that did not flood elsewhere in Cambridge and in other countries such as Holland. He felt that this was more a matter of cost than of engineering, which he then said raised the question of how much it was worth to protect the setting of Cambridge's oldest entire building.

Mr Blencowe closed by reporting that Cambridge Past, Present and Future was working with the County Council to carry out both a heritage survey of the Chapel curtilage and an ecological survey of the Chapel Meadows. He said that until this information was available it would not be possible for his organisation to take a final position on the optimal route and urged the City Deal Executive Board to do the same.

Councillor Herbert was pleased that progress had been made since the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 15 July 2015 and stated that it was proposed to consult on the revised route, although options would be kept open.

Mr Hughes said that progress had been made following very useful conversations with representatives of Cambridge Past, Present and Future. Picking up the point about cost and engineering, he highlighted that there always had to be a balance between the two. He was keen to continue discussions with Cambridge Past, Present and Future as part of the consultation process in order to reach agreement on a proposal that suited everyone.

#### **Statement by Roxanne De Beaux**

Ms De Beaux spoke on behalf of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and expressed the Campaign's support for the proposed consultation for the cross-city cycle routes and the Chisholm Trail.

She said that improving infrastructure for people to cycle into and around Cambridge would have numerous benefits at an individual, community and business level. Ms De Beaux added that cross-city cycle routes were just one part of making a transport system that could support growth and the Campaign looked forward to seeing the details of these plans and working with the Councils and their consultants to ensure the improvements could best meet the needs of cyclists and other road users.

Ms De Beaux said that the Campaign strongly believed that the focus of cycling investment in the coming years must be on improving the radial routes in Cambridge and the inner ring road, which were extremely poor for cycling. Areas like Newmarket Road desperately needed a complete redesign and the Campaign would like the City Deal to be more ambitious in proposing improvements in Cambridge in the coming years.

She also urged the City Deal Executive Board to apply further consideration to the roundabout at Fen Causeway to Lensfield Road and consider more ambitious and effective solutions for one of the worst intersections in Cambridge. In addition, Ms De Beaux urged the Board to be bold in its plans so that the infrastructure of Cambridge could be as world leading as the technology and discoveries the City was known for. She highlighted that the Cycling Campaign and other groups were working together to make suggestions about how this could be achieved, which it was hoped could be shared with the Board in the coming months.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the support of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and what he perceived as being significant common agreement over the schemes proposed. He was also pleased to hear that further work would continue to be undertaken to suggest further improvements.

Councillor Herbert explained that, had the £500 million of Greater Cambridge City Deal funding been delivered in one tranche, it would have been possible to produce a deliverable programme for significantly improving Newmarket Road. However, the phased way in which funding would be allocated by the Government for the City Deal meant that further tranches of funding would only be provided upon delivery of prescribed objectives for specific schemes and that Newmarket Road would be considered for investment in future tranches. He emphasised that other City Deal projects, such as the city centre congestion project, and those in respect of radial routes would provide further opportunities to consider how Newmarket Road could be improved.

### **Question by Sophie Hyde**

Mrs Hyde asked whether the Executive Board was happy with the route of the Chisholm Trail at the point where it crossed the river. In particular, she asked whether the damage to green space was justified, whether mitigations had been costed, whether the current modelling was accurate, whether this was a crossing point as opposed to an upgrade of existing infrastructure and whether this was a good use of public money.

Mrs Hyde was also concerned that the route could be used by motorised vehicles.

Mr Hughes explained that this was a relatively early stage of the process and a lot of the issues raised as part of the question could be fed in as part of the consultation exercise. He emphasised that there was no final scheme at this stage and that this would be worked up after the consultation process had concluded.

Councillor Herbert made it clear that there was no intention for this proposed Trail to be used by motorised vehicles.

## **5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Councillor Roger Hickford, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had met on 15 July 2015. He presented a report and recommendations from the Joint Assembly for each respective item on the agenda for this meeting, which it was agreed he would present at the relevant point of the meeting.

## **6. CHISHOLM TRAIL CYCLE LINKS**

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with an opportunity to consider whether to commence with public consultation in respect of a proposed route option for the Chisholm Trail.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with a report following consideration of this issue at the meeting of the Assembly held on 15 July 2015. He said that progress made with Cambridge Past, Present and Future since that meeting was extremely encouraging. The Assembly had recommended a slight amendment to the recommendation contained within the report, to make it clear that the route had not already been agreed and that it was out for public consultation.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and explained that the Chisholm Trail had been included as a City Deal transport scheme due to the range of benefits it could deliver, which included:

- being a safer, direct and more convenient largely off-road route for cycling and walking;

- providing improved access to green spaces, employment areas, retail sites and residential centres;
- providing links into a network of existing cycle routes;
- ensuring a minimal impact on motor traffic journey times;
- enhancing the environment, streetscape and air quality;
- creating more capacity for sustainable trips along the rail corridor;
- links to strategic priorities for City Deal cross-city cycle improvements.

Further to the public questions received earlier at this meeting, Mr Hughes confirmed that discussions would continue with Cambridge Past, Present and Future to seek to address the issues raised and agree an amicable way forward.

The following points were noted following discussion by Members of the Executive Board:

- going ahead with the consultation was the right thing to do and any comments, such as those received as part of public questions or statements at this meeting, could be submitted and fed into that process. This would then inform further consideration of the final route for the Trail;
- one of the public questions received earlier at the meeting suggested delaying the consultation until surveys at the Leper Chapel had been undertaken. This was not a realistic option as the scheme had to be delivered in accordance with strict deadlines in order to secure further City Deal funding from subsequent tranches. Officers reported their understanding that the ecology survey had already been received;
- a report on the findings of the consultation would be reported back to the Board in January or February 2016;
- there may be some elements of the Trail's programme that could be accelerated ahead of the proposed timetable for delivery. Officers agreed to look at this in further detail, highlighting and mitigating any risks associated with doing so, including the risk of abortive work;
- one of the key risks from a programme delivery perspective was how long it could sometimes take for decisions to be made on specific issues by Network Rail, especially in respect of land ownership;
- most landowners potentially affected by the proposed Trail had already been contacted and made aware of the proposal.

The Executive Board unanimously:

- (a) **APPROVED** the proposed route option for the Chisholm Trail for the purposes of public consultation.
- (b) **GAVE APPROVAL** to proceed to consultation on the route in the Autumn 2015.

## 7. CROSS-CITY CYCLE IMPROVEMENTS

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

Councillor Roger Hickford, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Executive Board with a report following consideration of this issue at the meeting of the Assembly held on 15 July 2015. He reported that the Assembly was very encouraged by the report and had unanimously endorsed the recommendations contained within it.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, 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. Appendices 2 and 3 of the report 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, but that these were in addition to schemes planned to form part of other City Deal packages or other highways projects that would be delivered by the County Council.

The Executive Board unanimously:

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

## 8. SMARTER CAMBRIDGESHIRE WORKSTREAM

The Executive Board considered a report which set out a proposal to incorporate 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.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with a report following consideration of this issue at the meeting of the Assembly held on 15 July 2015. He reported that the Joint Assembly had unanimously supported the recommendations contained within the report.

Noelle Godfrey, Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme Director, presented the report and referred to a 'smart cities' workshop that 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, were noted as being 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.

In answer to a question regarding the conceptual nature of the technology concerned and how to assess the architecture to put in place, it was noted that this was the reasoning for having a blue print which would enable flexibility and for changes to be made as and when technology developed. An important factor that had usefully supported this was reported as being the joint working that had taken place across all sectors.

In terms of testing, Members of the Board were informed that officers had commenced discussions with Milton Keynes and other 'smart' cities to assist with testing. It was agreed that the infrastructure used had to be replicable and scalable if it was to be successfully rolled out.

The Executive Board unanimously **APPROVED** the establishment of a Smarter Cambridgeshire work stream for Greater Cambridge, as outlined in the Appendices to the report, to be overseen within the City Deal governance arrangements.

## 9. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal work programme.

Future meetings of the Executive Board were confirmed to be held as follows:

1 October 2015 – 2pm  
3 November 2015 – 2pm  
3 December 2015 – 2pm  
15 January 2016 – 2pm  
3 March 2016 – 2pm  
8 April 2016 – 2pm  
16 June 2016 – 2pm  
22 July 2016 – 2pm  
8 September 2016 – 2pm  
13 October 2016 – 2pm  
17 November 2016 – 2pm  
15 December 2016 – 2pm

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.03 p.m.**

---