



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on  
Thursday, 1 October 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 Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

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

Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	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
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership
Jean Hunter	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Steve Count (Cambridgeshire County Council). Councillor Ian Bates was in attendance as Councillor Count's substitute.

## 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 August 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 any responses from Members of the Executive Board or officers, were noted as follows:

#### **Question by Mal Schofield**

Mr Schofield presented a document entitled 'issues concerning growth and modal shift – travel to work to 2021' which set out statistical information relating to:

- travel to work in Cambridge City by mode in terms of trends in travel behaviour from 2001 and forecasts up to 2021;
- travel to work in terms of numbers, destination and mode of transport based on 2011 census data;
- travel to work, actuals and forecasts for the next census in 2021.

As part of presenting this information he welcomed the findings of the Capacity Study and asked the following questions:

"There was a commitment to switch road capacity in the city, from cars to other modes. How will that be achieved?"

"Travel to work by public transport has stayed more or less consistent, around 7% since 2001. Is this modest percentage expected to continue? If not, what figure is forecast in relation to planned further investment in dedicated busways?"

"This analysis is a first attempt at providing a 'route map' for commuter patterns. A detailed forecasting and modelling is essential. Is that intended?"

"As cycle traffic increases, so does the need for segregation from pedestrians on major routes through the City. What is the planned target for dedicated cycleways?"

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, thanked Mr Schofield for this additional analysis.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, agreed with the comments Mr Schofield had made in light of the data and findings of the recent Capacity Study that had been carried out, originally commissioned by the County Council.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged the questions and noted that they covered a range of topics which represented real challenges for the Board to face. He said that the Board's initial focus would be to tackle congestion at peak times, aiming for a 20% reduction in vehicle usage, which would also improve capacity on radial routes. Councillor Herbert added that the list of measures set out in Mr Schofield's documentation were part of that, but said that there would be other things to consider as well.

In terms of bus usage, Councillor Herbert said that there was currently very little incentive for people to use buses instead of private vehicles as they themselves were often held up in traffic. Referring to the Chisholm Trail, he reflected that there was lots planned in

tranche one for cycleways and was conscious that there had to be a focus on on-road issues as well.

### **Question by Lynn Hieatt**

Lynn Hieatt referred to the outline proposals for the Madingley Road corridor and said that, in speaking to literally hundreds of people, she had not found enthusiasm for them.

She reflected on a number of innovative proposals that had been suggested over the last few months, some of which, in her view, were quite imaginative and aimed at resolving the root of the congestion problems in Cambridge by eliminating them through traffic management, as opposed to accommodating congestion as if it were inevitable. Mrs Hieatt said that other places had managed to get commuters' cars out of the city, especially during rush hours, so that cleaner-technology buses could get people to their destinations without being stuck in traffic. Her suggestion was to look at what had worked elsewhere and spend the City Deal money on more pedestrian and cycleways, more village and city bus services more Park and Ride facilities and more innovative ways of getting private car traffic out of the city.

Mrs Hieatt wanted the Executive Board to explore more practical and holistic proposals so that residents could be consulted properly on ways for dealing with a problem that was personal for them every day. She therefore asked whether residents could expect to see this in the forthcoming consultation.

Councillor Herbert explained that there would be a further consultation and call for evidence on the different options available for holistic citywide issues, which was something that had been discussed at the last meeting of the Joint Assembly.

Councillor Herbert respected the feeling that there was in the West of the City regarding some of the detail in the options put forward for consultation. He emphasised that the consultation was an open one and urged people to participate, putting forward alternative options if they wanted to which would be considered along alongside all responses. He reiterated, however, that issues around bus capacity and better cycling provision needed to be addressed for peak times and non-peak times.

Councillor Herbert closed by saying that the issue of congestion in Cambridge needed to be resolved and he hoped that people would respond to the consultation, recognising that a deliverable option was needed rather than deny there was a problem that needed to be addressed.

### **Question by Stephen Coates**

Mr Coates' question was in connection with the campaign of more than 3,500 residents of Cambridge, its surrounding areas and beyond to preserve the West Fields.

He said that the campaign was concerned that the draft interim report of June 2015 on the A428 options appeared to be flawed in a number of fundamental and substantive aspects and believed it should be amended whilst there was still time. The report and 'SWOT' analysis it contained, he said, were based on a number of material inaccuracies, resulting in an imbalanced presentation that appeared to many readers as favouring one option over another. Mr Coates felt that the inaccuracies could well lead to a flawed appreciation of the options presented and were even likely to be seen as misleading. Some examples included:

- attributing to Option 1(c) 'the potential to upgrade cycling facilities along the line of the Coton footpath to Grange Road' was incorrect, because this had nothing to do with Option 1(c). The already announced and long-overdue implementation of the Section 106 Agreement of the West Cambridge site would allow this without buses running alongside;
- no engineering detail was provided for Option 1(a), when this kind of supporting detail had been included for Milton Road and Histon Road. Without having provided this, the 'SWOT' analysis stated that Option 1(a) would mean 'possible loss of cycling amenity on Madingley Road'. According to an initial feasibility study, commissioned by Philip Cooper at Cambridge Architectural Research, bi-directional bus lanes, along with appropriate provision for pedestrian and cycle routes, were viable options on Madingley Road. This also meant that the choice of a single bus lane gave the impression that Option 1(a) was slower than Option 1(c);
- no ecological impact assessment was included in the draft interim report, when there was clear evidence that the West Fields were a habitat for protected species;
- the draft proposed route of Option 1(c) went directly against the ruling of the High Court in 2008, which stated that the Coton corridor was critical for the setting of the City.

Mr Coates asked whether the public could expect these problems to be addressed and corrected when proposals were published at the consultation stage.

Mr Hughes explained that what was taken to the Board in June 2015 were a number of very outline, conceptual proposals in terms of what to initially consult on. The report in June 2015 was not supposed to be a detailed analysis of each option. By including these options in an initial consultation process at this stage would provide a way of ruling out some of the options and understanding what a preferred route may look like ahead of a further, more detailed, consultation on the preferred route itself.

He emphasised that all views were welcomed and would be considered to inform a process of evaluation for the detailed scheme. The scheme was currently at the conceptual stage, with more detailed surveys, such as ecological and engineering surveys, being undertaken at a later stage of the process.

### **Question by Edward Leigh**

Mr Leigh followed up on his speech at the last meeting of the Executive Board in relation to 'gating' and referred to a document he had circulated to Board Members entitled 'trailing smart traffic management'.

He felt the document addressed the concern that Council officers had raised about the lack of road capacity to accommodate queues created by gating, stating that the maximum number of additional vehicles queued behind a gate being in the region of fifty was a theoretical maximum that would not be reached in practice.

Mr Leigh strongly urged the Board to consider smart traffic management as a viable solution to the City's congestion problems and suggested that the next steps should be to:

- invite professional and academic experts to advise on the viability and appropriate implementation of smart traffic management;
- trial the system at up to three sites, as identified in the document circulated to Members of the Board;
- task the Smart Cities Team to set up the necessary data gathering equipment to

monitor the trials.

Mr Leigh also presented a proposal for Girton Interchange, which had also been circulated to Members of the Board. He called for the Board to push for and, if necessary, part-fund a scheme which would:

- create an all-ways junction, shortening journey times;
- reduce pressure on local roads, in particular the A1303 (Madingley Road);
- significantly lower the cost of construction.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged this detailed piece of work in respect of gating, or smart traffic management, and referred to discussions held at the last meeting of the Joint Assembly in respect of City centre congestion. He said that the Board was currently not in a position to be able to undertake trials on specific proposals and that other alternatives and views also needed to be taken into account.

Councillor Herbert reported that officer advice in respect of gating had been that it provided more significant challenges than first seemed apparent and that a dialogue needed to be opened up in order to determine some of those issues.

He also referred to the review of the A14 and the process of examination that was currently taking place by a group of Inspectors. The Board would not have any direct influence on the Inspectors' decision other than through representations by partner authorities at a public enquiry.

Mr Hughes felt that it was highly unlikely for the Girton Interchange proposals to be fed into Highways England's scheme or schemes for the A14 at this stage due to it already being very constrained on budget and deliverability, together with the fact that a vast amount of design work had already been done and with work onsite expected to commence early next year. Mr Hughes agreed to liaise with Highways England to ascertain whether any proposals relating to Girton Interchange could be fed into the scheme or schemes for the A14, and provide Mr Leigh with any feedback.

### **Pat White**

Mrs White asked the following questions:

"What is the northern Chisholm Trail for and is it value for money?"

"Why have the environmental impacts been deliberately ignored?"

"Why haven't greater priorities in the City like widening Mill Road bridge been looked at?"

"Why, at two meetings I attending regarding the bridge, has it been presented as a fait accompli with no mention of the Chesterton bridge not yet being a 'done deal'?"

Councillor Herbert explained that the Board had taken a decision to go out to public consultation on the proposals for the Chisholm Trail, so there was still an opportunity for people to have their say and respond. He did not feel that the environmental impacts had been ignored and these would become clearer in the consultation document.

In explaining the Chisholm Trail it was noted that the Trail was essentially an off-road route, with the intention being to take the route off the bridge and use side tunnels that were not currently used. He said that this was a great opportunity to provide better links

with existing cycle routes and important sites such as employment, residential and development areas, as well as provide people with an alternative route to use instead of main roads.

## 5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented a report on the recommendations from the Assembly's last meeting held on 16 September 2015. It was agreed that those recommendations relating to specific items on the agenda for this meeting would be presented at the relevant point of the meeting.

His report provided an overview of the main topics covered as part of public questions received at the meeting. Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, responded to a point about a Communications Manager not having yet been recruited and said that this appointment was a priority that he hoped would be progressed shortly.

Councillor Bick reported that the Joint Assembly, in discussing its contribution to the developing City Deal agenda, had emphasised the importance of engagement with local people about the innovative suggestions and ideas being put forward to reduce congestion in Cambridge. The Joint Assembly therefore agreed that it would investigate the leading models of transport management to reduce congestion in the City, with any recommendations being passed onto the Executive Board, and asked the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Assembly to liaise with officers to pursue consideration of this issue.

Councillor Herbert welcomed this suggestion but thought it was important that the Board and Assembly worked together to facilitate this piece of work in order that it could feed into proposals going forward. It was therefore **AGREED** that the Chairman of the Executive Board would meet with the City Deal Director and other officers to produce an outline of how the Board and Assembly could work together, in liaison with the Chairman of the Joint Assembly, to prepare proposals to secure ideas from members of the public and organisations to address congestion in Cambridge.

It was also **AGREED** that an update report on this piece of work be submitted to the January meeting of the Board and preceding meeting of the Joint Assembly.

## 6. M11 BUS-ONLY SLIP-ROADS FEASIBILITY REPORT

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with a report following consideration of this issue at the meeting of the Assembly held on 16 September 2015.

Councillor Bick informed the Board that Assembly Members discussed the report and had noted the advice from officers to return to these schemes when considering options for the Western Orbital scheme, the process for which was scheduled to commence in December 2015. A number of Assembly Members were impatient with progress, in particular with changes to the M11 southbound exit at Junction 11 which they had regarded as a relatively inexpensive project that could be easily delivered. Some Assembly Members had reservations about advancing one potential component of a Western Orbital scheme. The Assembly agreed, however, that the Executive Board be requested to accelerate improvements to Junction 11 of the M11 as soon as possible, as a standalone project. It also supported the other recommendations contained within the report, but only in respect of Junction 13 following the Assembly's recommendation in respect of Junction 11.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that the Executive Board on 17 June 2015 requested a high-level feasibility report on a number of scenarios with regard to Junctions 11 and 13 of the M11, following a recommendation by the Joint Assembly. He emphasised that the report made no recommendations and was solely a technical report or study on some options from an illustrative perspective for the Board's consideration. He referred to early advance work that was taking place around the Western Orbital scheme, scheduled to be reported to the Board at its meeting on 3 December 2015. It was reported that a more detailed study of the whole corridor would take place in due course, subject to Board approval, which would provide an opportunity to look at these Junctions in more detail as part of that process.

Mr Walmsley also pointed out that, at this stage, the future of Junctions 11 and 13 of the M11 were unknown in the context of the City Deal and the Western Orbital scheme. Options and proposals coming forward for the scheme may not mirror what had been included or identified as part of the high-level feasibility report so, if work progressed on this as a standalone project, it could be that some of the work may not be required as part of the Western Orbital scheme, resulting in it being aborted and the resources being wasted in the longer term.

The following points were made during discussion:

- a project seeking to make improvements to Junction 11 should go ahead, despite there being a risk that in the longer term the works may not feature as part of plans or proposals for the City Deal Western Orbital scheme;
- commencement of this project would indicate to people that the Board was listening, that it was working together with the Joint Assembly and that it was trying to do something to improve problems at that Junction;
- Highways England needed to be content with whatever was being proposed as the M11 was a Highways England road;
- lots more businesses and employers were arriving in the area, who had provided evidence that the Junction in its current state would not be able to cope with the level of employees expected to work on their sites;
- there was no point in progressing with a project that may not be necessary as part of the subsequent Western Orbital scheme and there was a danger that this would solely divert both officer time and City Deal funding, only for Highways England to ultimately refuse approval of the project;
- Highways England should be contacted to ascertain its views on the potential for delivering improvements for Junction 11 of the M11, as set out in the high-level feasibility report.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **AGREED** that improvements to Junction 11 of the M11, as set out in the options of the feasibility report, be investigated further as an urgent standalone project with Highways England in terms of initially assessing feasibility and whether a business case would be likely to be viable and that an update on progress with this issue be submitted to the next meeting of the Board.
- (b) **NOTED** the findings of the technical report.
- (c) **NOTED** that the outcome of the A428/A1303 (Madingley Rise and Madingley Road) corridor and Western Orbital scheme development work will be the key determinant in considering the future recommended bus priority options in the locations set out in the report, in respect of Junction 13 of the M11.

## 7. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 August 2015.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and took Members through the capital programme for the first five years of the City Deal Partnership, revenue expenditure via the three partner Councils' New Homes Bonus contributions and expenditure from the non-project pool. The report highlighted that there was a degree of uncertainty around whether the New Homes Bonus would survive the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review. It had therefore been agreed to adopt a relatively prudent approach to the utilisation of this pooled resource and not to exceed commitments beyond the availability of the relative New Homes Bonus for 2015/16.

Mr Malyon explained that profiling for a capital programme of £180 million, which was in excess of the resources available, over the life of the first tranche of funding had provided some initial challenges. He was confident, however, that more accurate projections would be available early next year.

Reflecting on the lower than anticipated rate of expenditure from the non-project pool of funding, it was noted that this was due to slight delays in making appointments to key positions such as the Communications Manager role. Progress was now being made in the recruitment process for these key roles.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Joint Assembly at its meeting on 16 September 2015 had supported the recommendations contained within the report. A number of suggestions put forward at the Assembly meeting had been reflected in this report to the Board.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, said that financial position would be much clearer after the Autumn Statement, particularly with regard to the New Homes Bonus. He proposed that a detailed financial report for the 2016/17 budget be submitted to the Board early in 2016.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the financial position as at 31 August 2015.
- (b) **AGREED** to the funding of the on-going revenue commitments, as set out in the report, for the first five years of phase 1 of the Programme.
- (c) **AGREED** to the proposed framework for considering new proposals to be funded from the non-project resource pool.
- (d) **AGREED** that a detailed financial report for the 2016/17 City Deal budget be presented to the Board early in 2016.

## 8. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL WORKSTREAM UPDATE

The Executive Board considered a briefing note which provided updates on each of the City Deal workstreams.

Referring to governance, Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that this issue had been discussed at the meeting of the Assembly on 16 September 2015 in the context of the legislation relating to the City Deal moving to a Combined Authority. It



was the understanding of the Joint Assembly that consideration of the legislation requiring changes to facilitate this move had been postponed by Parliament. The Assembly therefore asked the Chairman to write to local Members of Parliament to seek their support in progressing consideration of this legislation. Councillor Bick reported that, since the Assembly meeting, he understood that the legislation behind the establishment of Combined Authorities would be included as part of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill. In view of this he therefore felt it unnecessary to write to Members of Parliament on this issue.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the updates from City Deal workstreams.

## **9. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

The Executive Board considered its Forward Plan and schedule of meetings.

It was noted that a supplementary paper would be circulated in time for consideration at the Joint Assembly's meeting on 7 October 2015 in relation to the six-monthly report on housing, which would provide more information on affordable housing.

The Forward Plan for the meeting of the Board and associated Joint Assembly scheduled to be held on 8 April 2015 would be reviewed due to this falling within the election period, with a view to cancelling these meetings.

The Forward Plan and schedule of meetings were **NOTED**.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.28 p.m.**

---