



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on  
Thursday, 17 December 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### 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 Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Nick Wright	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Anne Constantine	Cambridge Regional College
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

### Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council

### Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Glen Richardson	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Brian Stinton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andrew Cameron	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, took this opportunity to welcome Dr John Wells to his first meeting of the Joint Assembly following his co-option by the Executive Board on 3 December 2015. Dr Wells was a University of Cambridge nomination and represented the Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute.

## **2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 November 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Further to minute number 9 of the previous meeting, it was noted that the base number of existing apprentices was confirmed as being 300 new starts in 2014/15.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, provided an update on the outcome of the Executive Board's consideration of the Joint Assembly's recommendations following its last meeting. The following points were noted:

- the recommendation to delay the consultation process in respect of the Western Orbital corridor scheme was not supported;
- the recommendation to include schemes on city centre bus and coach capacity management and a Huntingdon Road Park and Ride were supported;
- the recommendation to remove the word 'Station' from the Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station bus priority scheme was not supported.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 6 as he had a personal relationship with Nichola Harrison, who had registered to speak as a member of the public.

## **4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, reported that a number of people had registered to speak in relation to specific items on the agenda for this meeting. He therefore proposed that those questions be put at the relevant item.

A question from Edward Leigh had been received which did not relate to an item on the agenda for this meeting. The question was asked and answered as follows:

Mr Leigh listed six major developments in the region over the past two years, which he said would add to the considerable load on the strategic highways and railways. He also referred to the approximate 25 million vehicles that travelled annually past Cambridge on the A14, the 22 million on the M11, the 17 million on the A11 and the 9 million on the A505, as well as the fact that Cambridge railway station saw nearly 11 million passengers per year. Mr Leigh said that most of the urgent upgrades to the region's road infrastructure involved Highways England and that there was huge untapped potential in the existing rail network. He therefore asked why so few of these schemes featured in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Mr Leigh was of the opinion that feasibility studies and business cases should progress with schemes so that Highways England and Network Rail could programme schemes in sooner rather than later. He also questioned engagement between City Deal partners and Highways England or Network Rail and asked whether any consideration would be given to asking the Department for Transport to appoint Highways England and Network Rail as formal partners in the City Deal, with representation on the Executive Board.

Jeremy Smith, Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding at Cambridgeshire County Council, acknowledged the importance of the issues raised by Mr Leigh but reminded him that the transport infrastructure schemes included as part of the City Deal programme were on many of the networks included in the Long Term Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Mr Smith also reported that he and other officers from the County Council worked closely with strategic partners such as Network Rail and Highways England, although he emphasised that it was not up to the County Council or any other City Deal partner to produce business cases for schemes on Highways England's networks. It was also noted that Network Rail had a significant improvement agenda of its own progressing and delivering improvements on other routes feeding into Cambridge. Mr Smith closed by reassuring Mr Leigh that lots of the issues he had raised were already in the County Council's strategy document.

Councillor Bick, in referring to engagement between officers from the partner Councils and strategic partners such as Highways England and Network Rail, said that it would be useful to understand the type of engagement that took place and cited an 'engagement map' as an example of something that could be produced. Mr Smith agreed to circulate a document to Members of the Joint Assembly to meet with this request. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, also made the point that this was a strategic issue and would be incorporated as part of the City Deal's Communications Strategy.

## **5. PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

## **6. OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC REALM AND GREEN LANDSCAPING ENHANCEMENT WITHIN CITY DEAL DELIVERY**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, invited three members of the public who had given notice of questions or statements in relation to this agenda item to put forward their questions or statements. Questions or statements were therefore made as follows:

### **Question by Mike Sargeant**

Mr Sargeant expressed concerns about the consultation process, principally in respect of the Milton Road scheme, and the perception that the proposals in the draft options report would be 'railroaded' through regardless of responses made by members of the public as part of the consultation. He asked what reassurance he and residents could be given that ideas and concerns would be listened to and that this consultation would be a meaningful exercise.

He also highlighted that one of the biggest issues for local people in respect of the Milton Road scheme was the potential loss of trees and grass verges and the road becoming an urban motorway. He asked why these issues had not been included in the consultation documentation, despite being raised at a previous meeting of the Joint Assembly, and sought reassurance that keeping a green, residential character to Milton Road was a priority.

### **Question by Wendy Blythe**

Wendy Blythe asked how the loss of grass verges, trees, gardens and nature posed by arterial road schemes would be assessed, making the point that verges soaked up surface water and trees were a buffer against noise and pollution.

She said that a large number of respondents to the call for evidence sessions had argued that bus lanes were an engineering solution to what was in fact a traffic management problem and would simply generate more road capacity. She therefore asked whether, given that the argument for bus lanes, in her view, was not yet proven, the wishes of residents who wanted to keep their trees and gardens would be ignored.

Wendy Blythe also asked how the public health implications were being assessed, in terms of the psychological impact of these transport schemes on communities and on individuals. She reflected on Milton Road currently having attractive trees and verges along the route and asked what environmental standards a world famous heritage city with attractive approach roads should be aspiring to. She added that simply providing landscaping options to mitigate major damage would not be good enough.

### **Statement by Nichola Harrison**

Nichola Harrison highlighted widespread public concern that the bus priority measures for Milton Road, Histon Road and Madingley Road would cause severe damage to the green environment and community life of these residential neighbourhoods. She said that the City Deal was a fantastic opportunity to improve Greater Cambridge's inadequate transport system, but at present she felt that there was a real danger that its engineering schemes would fail to achieve public support. Nichola Harrison therefore proposed that the City Deal should employ landscaping and public realm experts, including Council officers and external experts, to produce an Environmental Design Code. This would ensure that consideration of the local environment was not simply an optional extra but was at the centre of proposals for radial routes and, in due course, elsewhere inside and outside the city. She added that the Design Code should be introduced not simply to protect the existing environment, but to improve it.

Councillor Bick stated that answers to the questions would be provided as part of the subsequent discussion.

Glen Richardson, Urban Design and Conservation Manager at Cambridge City Council, and Andrew Cameron, Director of Urban Design at WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff consultancy, provided the Joint Assembly with a presentation on opportunities for public realm and green landscaping enhancement within City Deal delivery.

The following points were noted in respect of creating streets and how space could be allocated:

- streets were persistent, hardly ever changed in their nature and held urban areas together, creating a sense of community;
- street layout and dimensions remained constant over many centuries, with buildings changing rather than the streets they were built around;
- roads facilitated movement and divided communities, whereas streets defined a place and helped create communities. It was therefore streets rather than roads that the City Deal should be aiming to provide in residential areas.

Numerous visual examples, both national and international, were shown which provided before and after perspectives of where trees, greenery and sustainable urban drainage systems had been incorporated as part of street improvements. This included indications of rationalisation of space, areas showing plenty of room for movement for all users, the greening of major arterial routes and ease of pedestrian movement.

Visual examples were also shown of successful models of sharing space on streets in terms of motorised vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and highway features that were not 'over-engineered'. These included pedestrian first crossing points, gateways, courtesy crossings, pedestrian orientated design, two-way cycle paths, segregated cycle paths and median zones.

In terms of addressing use of the street and adding trees and greenery, a number of scenarios were given of the different options available using a 20 metre right of way as an example. Scenarios included:

- 'do-maximum' consisting of pedestrian access, cycleways bus lanes, and motor vehicle access all with two-way access with no trees or greenery;
- the addition of trees on one side, with reduced width cycle lanes to compensate;
- trees on both sides of the street with bus access only in one direction;
- a tree-lined street with two-way cycle lane segregated from the street, with bus access only in one direction;
- shared footpath and cycleway, reduced width running lanes and a median strip.

Specific examples were also presented of how trees and greenery could be introduced into the urban street setting, with photographs of a street where this had taken place in Cambridge being shown.

It was reported that precedents elsewhere showed that it was possible to achieve the infrastructure to support more sustainable modes of travel and deliver a high quality of public realm. However, ultimately there would be choices to be made in order to strike the right balance of infrastructure and the amount and type of public realm in terms of soft and hard landscaping. Detailed investigation of constraints, such as services for example, and the development of design options to integrate soft and hard landscaping would be an important stage of future work. It was also emphasised that the options, as much as possible, needed to respond to the context of where they were being introduced.

In closing, Mr Richardson and Mr Cameron said that the City Deal provided a great opportunity to improve mobility along key routes and in city centre locations for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users. However, this had to be balanced with the human desire to create attractive places and streets that would enhance the experience for residents and visitors in Cambridge.

Councillor Bick thanked Mr Richardson and Mr Cameron for a very informative presentation, further to which discussion ensued and the following points were noted:

- there were studies that suggested a wide range of benefits from the inclusion of trees and greenery in streets, including a natural slowing down of traffic, more pride and identity with an area and improvements in property value, retail base, mental health, air quality and surface water drainage;
- one of the examples shown in the presentation outlined a scheme where cyclepaths had been set out in parallel streets to those of other road users and a question was raised as to how that could apply in Cambridge. It was noted that the examples shown were context specific and such a proposal would need to be considered alongside the wider Transport Strategy and other related policies;
- a question was asked regarding the use of tidal bus routes. Mr Cameron explained that there were some issues in using tidal bus routes in both directions, such as the additional signage and markings that would be required and the necessity to have bus stops on both sides of the street. These requirements would be detrimental to the quality of space, so the use of tidal bus routes would need to

- be properly investigated in that context;
- conflict between different users and cycle parking in the city centre were two issues that would need to be addressed;
- the presentation provided a very positive overview of what could be achieved with schemes such as Histon Road and Milton Road and would probably go a long way in allaying the public's concerns;
- there had to be compromise in developing these transport infrastructure schemes, but it was important that the compromise was right. Each user group would have different views as to what the priority should be for a scheme and that was where balance and compromise played an important part.

Referring to Nichola Harrison's statement, Councillor Bridget Smith supported her proposal for the production of an Environment Design Code. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, suggested that a Design Guide setting out parameters may be more appropriate and useful for Members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board as a basis for their decision-making as schemes were developed. The Joint Assembly therefore requested that officers be asked to identify what could be included in an Environmental Design Guide for City Deal transport infrastructure schemes, setting out what such a guide could consist of together with the estimated cost and officer time associated with developing the document.

In answer to Mike Sargeant's question, Mr Hughes said that all responses received as part of any consultation process would be seriously considered. The schemes currently out for consultation at Madingley Road, Histon Road and Milton Road were at the first, conceptual stage of consultation, but any responses to those consultations would be fully considered and subsequently reported back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Further consultations consisting of more detailed proposals for each scheme would then take place at a later stage.

Councillor Bick reflected on the significant criticism the City Deal had received in respect of the number of consultations it was undertaking, so made the point that they would not take place if City Deal partners were not serious about wanting to hear people's views.

In terms of Mr Sargeant's question about maintaining Milton Road's green and residential character, Mr Hughes reiterated the point made earlier about compromise but said that one of the main objectives would be to improve the environment of the street. The specifics of a scheme at Milton Road were currently not available as the consultation only set out two conceptual options at extreme ends of the spectrum. A later stage of the process would provide a more detailed scheme, setting out priorities, and it would be at that stage that the real impact of the scheme could be assessed and options, including those associated with public realm, properly considered.

Answering the question by Wendy Blythe, Mr Hughes said that it was difficult to say how the loss of grass verges, trees, gardens and nature posed by arterial road schemes could be assessed at this stage. Once the views of the public and stakeholders had been received as part of the consultation process officers would look at how best those issues could be addressed. It would be at this stage where judgements and decisions on compromises would need to be made. In terms of the question regarding public health implications, it would not be possible to assess them at this stage as there was not yet a specific scheme proposed. The business case for any transport infrastructure scheme would assess relative merits of the scheme, including health and environmental issues.

The Joint Assembly:

- (1) **NOTED** the presentation.
- (2) **AGREED** that officers be requested to identify what could be included in an Environmental Design Guide for City Deal transport infrastructure schemes, setting out what such a guide could consist of together with the estimated cost and officer time associated with developing the document.

## **7. TACKLING CONGESTION: CALL FOR EVIDENCE**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, invited three members of the public who had given notice of questions in relation to this agenda item to put forward their questions. Questions were therefore asked as follows:

### **Question by Penny Heath**

Penny Heath referred to paragraph 16 of the report for this item, which listed the criteria following the call for evidence sessions on tackling congestion in Cambridge. She asked why no criterion for environmental impact had been included, which should cover issues such as impact on pollution, character, conservation and landscape of the City.

### **Question by Lynn Heatt**

Lynn Heatt asked what steps the Joint Assembly was now taking to prepare for a public debate and meaningful consultation on any proposed parking controls or congestion-charging schemes in Cambridge. Furthermore, she asked what timeframe residents could expect for these ideas to be researched and developed into proposals and put into public discussions about the future of congestion in the City and their neighbourhoods.

### **Question by Robin Pellew**

Robin Pellew said that the call for evidence had been a thoroughly worthwhile exercise in bringing together a wide diversity of skills and expertise, but said that its value depended on the next step of how this body of information and experience was to be used. He added that there was now a widely held expectation that the City Deal would build on this foundation by pursuing some of the main proposals throughout the appointment of consultants to take them forward to the stage where they could be subject to the detailed scrutiny of public consultation. Mr Pellew therefore asked what assurance the Joint Assembly or County Council could give that sufficient funding would be made available to enable the more promising proposals to be advanced.

Mr Pellew also referred to what he perceived as being a lack of synchronisation with the various public consultations, referring to consultations currently ongoing in respect of the A428 corridor, Histon Road and Milton Road. The options presented by the City Deal were all based on the assumption that bus lanes were the answer to the peak-hour congestion at these pinch-points, however, the call for evidence showed that there were genuine alternatives. He therefore asked how any new measures for alleviating congestion emerging from the call for evidence would feed into the examination of the options for these arterial roads.

Councillor Bick stated that answers to the questions would be provided as part of the subsequent discussion.

Consideration was given to a report which provided an initial summary of submissions received in response to the tackling congestion call for evidence sessions that had recently been held and sought agreement to the means of assessment of the submissions received through the Cambridge Access Study or, where more relevant, through individual City Deal schemes. Jeremy Smith, Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and informed the Joint Assembly that 77 responses to the sessions had been received to date. The main areas of focus had been captured in Appendix 1 of the report and were separated into the following categories:

- demand management and fiscal measures;
- technology;
- public transport infrastructure and service improvements;
- infrastructure improvements for active modes;
- highway capacity enhancements;
- behavioural change.

Mr Smith highlighted that officers had not yet had the opportunity to carry out any qualitative analysis of the information at this stage, but reported that all submissions were available for viewing on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website. The report set out a proposed assessment criteria to be used with regard to the call for evidence submissions and proposals. This would ensure that analysis supported City Deal objectives and consisted of the following criteria:

- fairness;
- effectiveness;
- value for money;
- economic impact;
- dependencies and broader benefits;
- implementation.

In answer to Mr Pellew's question regarding examination of the options, Mr Smith said that consultants had been commissioned to assess the options and that a report on outcomes was scheduled for submission to the Executive Board in June 2016. Mr Hughes added that if the conclusions were pertinent to the radial route projects, there would be sufficient fluidity to weave these into them as necessary.

Councillor Bick reflected on the demand management and fiscal measures aspect of the responses, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, noting the following suggestions or proposals that had been received under that theme:

- further limiting access to the city centre and further selective road closures;
- further parking controls;
- road pricing;
- workplace parking levy;
- 'gating' and queue redistribution;
- tourist tax.

Councillor Bick sought feedback from Members of the Joint Assembly as to what their initial reactions were in respect of these six proposed approaches to demand management. The following comments were noted:



- this was the beginning of the process so it was too early to make any judgements on each proposal or suggestions without the greater detail that the consultants would be able to provide having properly assessed them. Consideration of this issue should therefore wait until the report was available in June 2016;
- any proposals or suggestions that increased business costs would be concerning and went against the aspiration of attracting new businesses into the Greater Cambridge area;
- more evidence would be required in respect of road pricing, or congestion charging, and there was a danger that fairness of such a scheme could not be achieved in terms of the those living within and visiting the city boundary, as well as potentially targeting the wrong types of user;
- there was not enough information available at this stage on the majority of proposals or suggestions to form a view. However, it would be important not to waste time or money on those ideas that were not realistic, so some sensible decisions at an early stage may be necessary;
- the concept of congestion charging did not have to be the same as the model used in London and could, for example, being introduced during peak times in the mornings and evenings;
- an additional revenue stream from a scheme such as congestion charging would enable the City Deal to provide much better quality and frequency of transport, both in the city centre, beyond Cambridge and perhaps even beyond the Greater Cambridge area;
- lots of residents within Cambridge wanted further parking controls to be looked into further;
- the difficulty with road pricing, or congestion charging, was that it would be seen as penalising people for using their vehicles. If the revenue gained from such a scheme contributed to bus subsidies, people may be much more open minded about it;
- the issue of charging cyclists as part of a road pricing or congestion charging scheme was suggested, further to which there was significant support by Members of the Assembly that cyclists should not have to pay to go into Cambridge;
- a tourist tax placed on each tourist coach or bus coming into the City could provide a significant revenue stream;
- there were significant practical problems with introducing a system such as gating or queue redistribution that would need investigating.

Councillor Bick, in reflecting on the discussion and the issue of demand management, asked whether the Assembly could expect confirmation from the Executive Board that demand management should be part of the City Deal's wider strategy. In discussing this specific issue the following further comments were noted:

- the real issue was wanting people to want to go into Cambridge;
- the key problem was how people travelled into the City, with the main objective being to provide an attractive, easy and sustainable way for people to enter the City, so that it was a positive experience that they would want to repeat;
- it was far too early as part of this specific piece of work to determine how demand management should feature as part of the City Deal's strategy.

Councillor Bick asked whether inclusion of demand management in the City Deal's strategy would have an impact on the decisions and outcomes of radial route transport infrastructure schemes. Mr Hughes confirmed that demand management had been included as part of the County Council's strategies for the last ten years and was also part of the Long Term Transport Strategy. He said that managing demand was essential but that it was not about stopping people coming into the City and principally about how they

travelled there. Mr Hughes added that there was overwhelming evidence from around the world that a strategy solely based on demand management or solely based on alternative routes did not work and that a successful programme for the City Deal had to consist of both issues to alleviate Cambridge's congestion problems. In terms of demand management featuring as part of the City Deal strategy, Mr Hughes was of the opinion that it was already part of the strategy and that it had been included in the original City Deal pitches to Government, as well as being envisaged as part of the Access Study. He emphasised, however, that congestion charging was only one way of managing demand. The situation as he saw it was that the City Deal had not yet approved a particular approach to demand management and Mr Hughes clarified that all demand management measures would be assessed as part of this call for evidence process.

In answer to the question by Penny Heath, the Joint Assembly unanimously agreed that a criterion to assess environmental impact and design should be added to the list of criteria set out in paragraph 16 of the report.

Addressing the question raised by Lynn Hieatt regarding further public debate, Mr Hughes said that the consultants were ready to commence work on assessing the proposals and suggestions received as part of the call for evidence sessions and report back on outcomes at the meeting of the Executive Board in June 2016. That would then provide for a more informed public debate when more detailed had been worked up.

Councillor Bridget Smith reflected on the successful public engagement that had been achieved as part of this process and did not want this impetus to be lost. She asked whether anything could be set up to maintain this interest and momentum, further to which Claire Ruskin offered to facilitate this through the Cambridge Network.

The Joint Assembly recommended to the Executive Board that it:

- (1) **NOTES** the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
- (2) **AGREES** 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 31 December 2015, subject to the inclusion of an additional criterion to assess environmental impact and design.
- (3) **NOTES** that the work referred to in resolution (2) above will be brought back to the Executive Board on 16 June 2016, including an assessment of impacts of potential City centre measures on other elements of the City Deal programme.
- (4) **AGREES** 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.

## 8. **WORKSTREAM UPDATE**

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the progress report which set out updates on each workstream of the City Deal.

It was noted that interviews were currently underway for the Strategic Communications Manager vacancy.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the workstream update.

**9. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the revised Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan, which included the Histon Road and Milton Road transport infrastructure schemes and Cambridge Access Study items listed for the meeting of the Executive Board on 16 June 2016 rather than 22 July 2016.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.05 p.m.**

---

This page is left blank intentionally.