



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
GREATER PETERBOROUGH



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE



Report To: Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board

15 January 2016

Lead Officer: Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council

Tackling congestion: Call for Evidence

Purpose

1. This paper provides an initial summary of submissions received in response to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence, and seeks agreement to the means of assessment of the submissions received through the Cambridge Access Study or where more relevant, through individual City Deal schemes.

Recommendations

2. The Board is asked to:
 - A. Note the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
 - B. Agree the criteria for assessment of the ideas and proposals submitted to reduce congestion by reducing traffic volumes, managing traffic differently or managing access as part of the Cambridge Access Study, including any further ideas submitted by 31st December.
 - C. Note that the work referred to in recommendation B will be brought back to the Executive Board on 22nd July 2016, including an assessment of impacts of potential City Centre measures on other elements of the City Deal programme.
 - D. Agree that where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study (i.e. one of the tranche 1 or prospective future City Deal schemes), that those proposals are taken forward through those routes rather than through the Cambridge Access Study.

Reasons for Recommendations

3. The Call for Evidence on tackling congestion received an excellent response from a range of local stakeholders and experts locally and nationally, who have input a range of interesting ideas. Board and Assembly members participated in three hearing sessions, at which they questioned the evidence being given and led the debates that followed. 67 written responses have been received and 21 presentations were made at the hearing sessions.
4. The ideas that came forward were wide ranging but can broadly be grouped as follows, although some proposed an amalgam of all three:

- Those that sought to reduce congestion by directly or indirectly reducing the volume of traffic or managing the traffic in a different way e.g. through limiting vehicular access.
 - Those that proposed additional infrastructure, either at specific locations or generally e.g. new rail stations.
 - Those that proposed interventions that would require ongoing revenue support e.g. extra bus services.
5. All of this useful input needs to be assessed and it is considered that the best way to do this is through the Cambridge Access Study. It is also considered important that this analysis is based on agreed criteria to ensure it is focused and aligned with Project and broader City Deal objectives.
 6. Where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study then it is proposed that these would be taken forward through those routes rather than the Access Study.

Background

7. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) was adopted in March 2014, supports the local plans, and includes a comprehensive programme from which proposals in the Greater Cambridge City Deal are drawn. However, the TSCSC does not yet include detailed proposals for the centre of Cambridge. The Cambridge Access Study, under the umbrellas of the TSCSC and of City Deal, is considering the conditions and challenges on the transport network in and around Cambridge.
8. The Cambridge Access Study will recommend transformative interventions with the aim of considerably improving access, capacity, and movement to, from and within the city. It also aims to reduce congestion and delay, and will look at how we can keep general traffic levels in the city at or below current levels while accommodating the large scale growth that the Cambridge area is experiencing.
9. As part of the study, a Call for Evidence was launched to gather views, ideas and evidence aimed at tackling congestion in Cambridge. Written evidence was invited and interested parties were also able to present their ideas at one of three public hearings which were held on the 16th, 18th and 30th November.
10. In addition, on the 18th November, a meeting was held with a number of major “traffic generators” – organisations whose activities generate a large demand for travel.
11. The deadline for written evidence to be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in the December/January cycle was 30th November 2015. However, submissions received up until 31st December will still be accepted and analysed.
12. 67 written responses were received by 30th November, and 21 individuals or organisations gave evidence at the hearing sessions. 77 individuals or organisations in total engaged in the process, as detailed in Table 1 below. All of the submissions received, along with presentations and notes from the three hearings can be viewed at <http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>.

Table 1 **Number of respondents to Call for Evidence**

	Local person / organisation	Invited expert	Total
Written submission	55	1	56
Written submission and spoke at hearing session	11	-	11
Spoke at hearing session	5	5	10
Total	71	6	77

Considerations

13. Appendix 1 of this report notes the main themes and ideas suggested in submissions to the Call for Evidence up to 30th November. Appendix 2 provides an initial summary of the evidence received.
14. The submissions include a range of ideas for reducing or spreading out motor vehicle journeys, and also for infrastructure investments and service improvements. Some of the infrastructure investments proposed are already being consulted on or will be considered as part of the agreed Tranche 2 prioritisation process. Where appropriate therefore the analysis will be combined with the analysis of those individual schemes. For example, tidal flow bus lanes may be better assessed as part of the radial scheme consultation analyses, as these have been proposed for Madingley Mulch to Cambridge.
15. It should be noted that Appendix 2 provides only an initial summary of the submissions, and that detailed analysis will take place guided by the consideration of the submissions by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Given the limited timeframe since the close of the Call for Evidence hearings, it is considered too early to recommend endorsement of any of the measures proposed at this stage.

Assessment Criteria for Call for Evidence submissions and proposals

16. To ensure that analysis supports project and overall City Deal objectives, the following criteria are proposed for the assessment of options through the Cambridge Access Study:
 - **Fairness** – what is the impact on people in different income brackets and those in Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and outside Greater Cambridge, including commuters?
 - **Effectiveness** – how much will it improve City Centre Access and reduce congestion? Will the effects be short-or long-term, will they be effective in both the morning and evening peak?
 - **Value for money** – affordability, costs and benefits from implementation, to include ongoing costs as well as one-offs and whether it is affordable with City Deal (capital) funding.
 - **Economic impact** – on City Centre vibrancy and on business and other economic activity.

- **Dependencies and broader benefits** – would other measures be needed to maximise effectiveness? Does this impact on whether it can be introduced in the short term or long term? Could it complement, or detract from, other objectives?
 - **Implementation** – can it be implemented and if so would positive impacts be expected in a City deal tranche 1 timescale? What is the extent of the practical challenges to delivery, and in what timescale is delivery feasible?
17. All of the above criteria will also need to be considered in the context of whether proposals would be acceptable to the public over the Greater Cambridge area and beyond, what other measures might be required to achieve acceptability, and the consequential impact on the time frame in which proposals could be implemented.

Next steps

18. The criteria above are not designed to determine any next steps or decisions. They will focus the analysis of the suggested measures so that it can inform decision-making on which idea or package of ideas, if any, should be taken forward for consultation and development.
19. If the Board agrees the recommendations, the analysis of the ideas submitted against the criteria noted in paragraphs 16 and 17 above will be brought to the Executive Board on 22nd July. This report will recommend options that could achieve the aims of the Board and Assembly, and indicate the timescales and dependencies that are associated with them. This will include consideration of what might be achieved in the Tranche 1 period to 2020. It will also consider whether there are options that might be initially trialed.

Implications

20. In the writing of this report, taking into account financial, legal, staffing, risk management, equality and diversity, climate change, community safety and any other key issues, the following implications have been considered:

Financial and other resources

21. Resources for the further work on the Cambridge Access Study and on analysis of the Call for Evidence submissions are in place.

Consultation responses and Communication

22. This report details the Call for Evidence, and provides links to submissions made as part of that process.

Background Papers

The Cambridge Access Study web page can be found at:

<http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>

This page provides details of the study, including the [Audit Report](#).

In addition, the following can be accessed from the Cambridge Access Study web page.

- Written submissions to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence.
- Presentations made at the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings.

- Initial Summary of the evidence received, including notes of the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings and of the 'Traffic Generators' meeting (*also included in Appendix 2 to this report*).
- Presentations made at the 'Traffic Generators' meeting.

The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire can be viewed at:
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/tscsc/>

Report Author: Jeremy Smith, Head Transport & Infrastructure Policy & Funding
Cambridgeshire County Council
Telephone: 01223 715483

Appendix 1: Summary of main themes and ideas raised by respondents to the Call for Evidence

Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
Demand Management & Fiscal Measures	
Further limiting access to the city centre and further Selective Road Closures (Includes: extension of Core Scheme, pedestrianisation etc.)	14
Further Parking Controls (Includes: more residents parking zones, reductions in city centre car parks, reduction in free street parking)	20
Road Pricing (Includes: Congestion charge – various forms suggested for testing)	22
Workplace Parking Levy (Includes: taxing private non-residential parking in the city)	8
'Gating' and Queue Redistribution	4
Tourist Tax	2
Technology	
Smart Traffic Management (Includes: syncing signals more efficiently and further use of SCOOT system)	10
Data Collection Tools	2
Smart Card Tickets, RTPI, Journey Planning etc. (Includes: multi-modal, multi-operator tickets too)	5
Autonomous Vehicles	2
Public Transport Infrastructure & Service Improvements	
Bus Lanes, Tidal-flow Bus Lanes, Bus Priority Measures	10
Bus Rapid Transit	5
More Attractive Bus Journeys (Includes: reliability, nicer buses, quality bus partnerships and contacts)	16
Rail Investment (Includes: new stations, re-opening old lines, increasing capacity)	5
Underground Public Transport Systems (Includes: tunnelling for buses, metros etc.)	9
Transport Hubs & Interchanges (Includes: new ones, upgrades to existing and linking of modes)	9
Upgrading/Improving Park and Ride (Includes: Removing charge, new P&R sites, extending capacity of current sites, longer operation of services and free/discounted travel on P&R)	28
Infrastructure Improvements for Active Modes	
Enhanced Cycle Networks (in/from rural areas) (Includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes, links to services and Cambridge, joining the villages etc.)	17
Enhanced Cycle Networks (urban/city) (Includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes)	25
Further Cycle Priority at Junctions (Includes: priority at junctions etc.)	11
Cycle Parking (Includes new city centre facility, additional, secure racks at businesses/schools/leisure etc.)	11
Improved Pedestrian Facilities	7

Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
Highway Capacity Enhancements	
Junction Improvements (Includes: measures aimed at traffic flow improvements)	9
New Roads (Includes: orbital movements to the east of the city and a southern relief road)	6
Re-Classify Roads by Use	1
Promote / priority for Motorcycles/Scooters (Includes use of bus lanes)	3
Behavioural Change	
Last Mile Delivery & Consolidation Points and More Management of Delivery Vehicles (Includes reducing freight/HGVs etc.)	9
Tackling School & Sixth Form Traffic (Includes. using P&R sites as drop-off pick up, spreading hour of opening)	15
Peak hour spreading (Includes business hour change)	5
Car Clubs & Car Sharing	4
Low Emission Vehicles (Includes: electric vehicles, driverless vehicles etc.)	2

Appendix 2: Initial Summary of the evidence received.