

Chairman's report of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly meeting held on 12 February 2016

General Report

We received the following questions which did not correspond to an agenda item:

Dr Anthony Eva asked the Assembly to ensure that transport plans were tested against CO2 emission targets for 2030 and beyond. We pointed out that the entire City Deal's strategy was predicated on enhancing connectivity through sustainable modes: public transport, cycling and walking, but acknowledged that the powering of public transport still left an important question open. Bob Menzies confirmed that a lot of work was going on to speed the emergence of cleaner buses. He also stated that the Access Study Report about the city centre which would be published in June would refer to carbon impact.

Cambridge City Councillor Markus Gehring asked why demand management measures suggested at the Call for Evidence could not be integrated with the consultation processes for specific transport infrastructure schemes where they could be of some use. He also raised concern about the quality of the diagrams in the consultation document for the Western Orbital corridor scheme. Bob Menzies said that all demand management options put forward in the Call for Evidence were still being considered as further work was needed to better understand their impact. The Board had agreed at the outset that it wanted to engage wherever possible with the public at an early conceptual stage on transport infrastructure schemes which would be prior to the definition of actual routes.

Jim Chisholm, referring to the ideas surfaced in the Call for Evidence, identified a choice between transport infrastructure schemes which were likely to bring more traffic into the city and spending a smaller sum on leading edge technology - and asked whether the latter would be better. Tanya Sheridan stated that everything submitted as part of the Call for Evidence would be examined and reported in June and Bob Menzies confirmed that consequent decisions would be delivered in parallel if necessary.

Mike Sargeant asked if members of the Assembly would visit Milton Road to see the issues that had arisen from residents. We endorsed his suggestion that members did familiarise themselves, if they were not already, and recommended that he contact members of the Assembly outside the meeting.

1. Recommendations on reports to the Board

2(a) Greater Cambridge City Deal Financial Monitoring

This was noted.

2(b) Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership Budget 2016/17

Members noted the request for greater provision in the operational budget but were unanimously of the opinion that more detail was needed about what this would be spent on before agreeing with it, and they introduced this proviso in their recommendation to the Board.

Some members were looking for a return of unspent funding from the constituent councils' New Homes Bonus, but it was agreed after explanation that this would be premature before knowing of the future of this funding stream to the councils, about which the government was consulting on changes. After this a number of different options may need to be considered going forward.

Chris Malyon stated that it had always been the expectation that the City Deal grant from government would be supplemented by local funding sources to meet capital spending costs. It was however unwise to specify amounts of Section 106 developer contributions to the programme budget where negotiations had not been completed. He did however agree to provide a broad expectation of sources of funding the current gap between City Deal grant funding for Tranche 1 and the forecast cost of Tranche 1 projects.

A discussion took place on apparent slippage of some transport schemes. Bob Menzies said that for good reasons start and finish times of construction did not necessarily coincide with payment schedules and it was important not to identify slippage by spending projections. The Assembly agreed to request a reconciliation between the two so that members could satisfy themselves of this, to which officers agreed.

The Assembly recommended that the Board(with modifications in bold):

- (a) Notes the briefing note appertaining to the future of New Homes Bonus.
- (b) Approves the budgetary provision for the 2016/17 operational budget, **subject to more information being made available on the further spending items, including the City Deal Programme's staffing structure.**
- (c) Requests that more detailed proposals be brought forward in respect of the additional investment in Housing and Intelligent Mobility.
- (d) Approves the provisional profiling for the remainder of Phase 1 of the programme, **subject to the inclusion of reconciliation in respect of the apparent slippage of some schemes.**
- (e) Agrees that the unallocated New Homes Bonus pooled resource be retained to facilitate the successful delivery of Phase 1 of the programme.
- (f) Considers a further report on the strategy for the redistribution of unallocated monies before the end of the year.

2(c) A428/A1303 Better Bus Journeys Scheme – Public Consultation Outcomes and next steps

We received one public speaker on this item. **Lynn Hieatt** requested an acknowledgement of the number of instances that contributions to the consultation process had complained about the process itself. Bob Menzies accepted that some people had made this point and this had been recorded. But he considered that this did not constitute a flaw in the exercise which had been very successful in its purpose of identifying issues with the various concepts that had been put to the public, which had been its purpose, not to act as a voting referendum. It had also elicited a number of hybrid and alternative options. The engagement exercise had achieved a high level of participation. Both the issues raised and the alternatives would be evaluated and mitigation measures weighed before recommending next steps.

In considering the officers' report, a discussion took place about the statement that the consultation had taken place in accordance with the consultation principles of the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership. Members were not aware of these principles having been adopted and we agreed to seek clarification in a future agenda item at the Assembly so that any decision could be subject to full public scrutiny.

Opinion was expressed that options put to consultation took insufficient account of Smart City proposals and congestion reduction measures which regrettably continued to be considered separately, which the Board will want to note.

We thanked the contributors to the consultation exercise.

The Joint Assembly noted the responses to the consultation on the A428/A1303 bus infrastructure improvement scheme, including the alternative and hybrid options suggested and recommended that the Executive Board includes these and other comments received in the ongoing development and assessment appraisal to allow the Board to select a recommended option or options in September 2016.

2(d) The Chisholm Trail

We received two public statements relating to this item.

Rob King, who runs a local logistics business specialising in urban delivery by bicycle, and **Edward Leigh** both commended the Chisholm Trail project and encouraged consideration of more such schemes for high quality cycleways in the future.

In discussion, reference was made to the value to business of the Chisholm Trail indicated by Rob King's contribution and it was suggested that added economic benefit be carefully studied and tracked to assist the evaluation of future such schemes.

The Assembly requested periodic progress reports on the process of land acquisition and agreement with Network Rail.

The Joint Assembly recommended that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the results of the public consultation.
- (b) Gives approval to submit a planning application based on the widths and path types as set out in the report and the route proposed as shown in Plan 1 of the report.
- (c) Supports the continuation of land negotiations.
- (d) Gives approval to use Compulsory Purchase Orders if needed.

2 (e) A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge: Approval to Consult on Transport improvement concepts

Jeremy Smith updated his written report by acknowledging that a more comprehensive look would be necessary before it was advisable to discount major road interventions between the A11 and Haverhill, but that this should not impede consultation on the other concepts described from taking place independently as recommended as part of the City Deal programme. The Assembly agreed unanimously to reflect this in recommendation (b) below.

In response to questions about the proposed discounting of a re-opening of the railway to Haverhill from the City Deal project, Bob Menzies explained that the feasibility study, that had been previously committed, was among the background papers and that amongst extensive ongoing engagement with the rail industry on this issue and others, the Board had met the Chair of Network Rail.

In discussion, a variety of points were raised by Assembly members, which are drawn to the attention of the Board:

- The impact of growth in Sawston and the potential for a route via Sawston to be included among the concepts
- The need to improve the diagrams supporting the consultation as they were likely to leave the public unclear whether they were looking at a concept or a precise proposal
- The importance of the overall vision of the scheme being made more clear and who it was intended to serve
- Focus on cycling and walking should not be lost within this scheme and openness should be retained for a specific link to this end
- The potential challenge for any of the offroad concepts, if eventually selected, to be achieved within the Tranche 1 timescale
- The importance of relating bus infrastructure investment to the way operators will run services on the infrastructure (noting current tariff disincentives to bus usage to Granta Park)

In respect of this last point, the Assembly decided to meet representatives of the bus operators to better understand the possibility of obtaining service commitments in the context of infrastructure investment in bus priority.

Officers committed to us that the proposed consultation copy would be shared with members of the Assembly and Board prior to publication.

The Joint Assembly noted the findings summarised in the report and the Draft Concepts Report and recommended that the Executive Board:

- (a) Discounts from further consideration as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal reopening the railway to Haverhill and providing a Busway all the way to Haverhill. ***(The Joint Assembly agreed to remove from the recommendation contained within the report reference to major road interventions).***
- (b) Approves for public consultation the illustrative concepts set out in the report to provide improved Park and Ride linked to Bus Rapid Transit between Fourwentways and Cambridge, and cycling and walking measures along the corridor.
- (c) Agrees to receive a report recommending a preferred set of measures, informed by public consultation and the conclusion of appraisal and assessment work, in late 2016.

2 (f) Southbound Bus Priority Slip Road – Junction 11, M11

Informed by the officers' report on the issues and risks associated with this, the Assembly recommended to the Board not to pursue it as an independent project at this stage.

A number of members spoke of the importance of better public transport connectivity to the Bio-Medical Campus from the west and the fact that change in this junction could make a positive contribution.

There was no dissent within the Assembly from this view. However the majority of members considered that it could only deliver value as part of a wider Western Orbital scheme and they felt that it might not be consistent with the particular orbital scheme that is selected. This could result either in wasted money, if premature development work had to be aborted, or committing the City Deal to a particular version of the orbital project ahead of properly evaluating the different ways the orbital could be achieved. On the information provided by officers, protection of this scheme as a potential future option did not appear to require any further development work at this stage.

It was also noted that uncertainties over planning issues were likely to frustrate significant overall progress on a standalone scheme anyway at this stage and that outside the broader orbital context actual usage by buses may be low or non-existent.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) Noted the outcome of the high level risk assessment and the progress made on the proposal for a bus only slip road at Junction 11 of the M11.
- (b) ***Recommended that the Executive Board integrates the scheme into the developing Western Orbital proposals to ensure that it is considered within this wider strategic context.***

8 Members of the Joint Assembly voted in favour of (b) above, as apposed to 7 Members voting in favour of recommendation (ii) set out in the report.

2 (g) Smart Cambridge – 'Smart Technology City Management Platform' Investment

This report was welcomed and much positive support was expressed.

- (a) Recommended that the Executive Board approves the investment of £300,000 to develop a first stage 'smart technology city management platform' for Greater Cambridge.
- (b) ***Requested a progress report in six months.***

2 (f) City Deal Workstream Update

The Assembly welcomed the appointment of a Strategic Communications Manager and noted the report.

2 (g) Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan

Observing the number of major agenda items scheduled for the Assembly meeting on 2nd June, we decided to make this an all-day meeting. The Forward Plan was noted.