



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Thursday, 2 June 2016 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
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 Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers/advisors:

Christopher Walkinson	Business Community
Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Joanne Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Roger Hickford was **ELECTED** as Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Kevin Price was **ELECTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dave Baigent, Anne Constantine and Sir Michael Marshall.

It was noted that Councillor Tim Wotherspoon had been appointed as a Member of the Joint Assembly by South Cambridgeshire District Council, in place of Councillor Nick Wright.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 February 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Kevin Price declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as he was a resident in relatively close proximity to Milton Road.

6. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman, reported that a significant 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.

The following questions did not necessarily relate to any items on the agenda for this meeting and were therefore asked and answered at this stage of proceedings, as follows:

Question by Mary Pountain

In view of the late publication of consultation responses, some of which not being published until the evening of 31 May 2016, Mary Pountain was concerned that this was not a democratic process with there not being enough time allowed for proper reflection on the schemes, particularly in view of the Executive Board meeting having been brought forward by a week. She therefore asked whether the Joint Assembly would recommend the postponing of the Executive Board meeting to allow sufficient time for the Joint Assembly Members, and members of the public, to assimilate all the information and review the impact of each scheme when combined with the other City Deal proposals.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that officers supporting the City Deal programme were committed to openness and the democratic process, together with making sure as much information as possible was in the public domain. He stated that the consultation report was published five clear working days in advance of the meeting, as required, but that some of the information contained within background reports had not been available for technical reasons.

Question by Wendy Blythe

Wendy Blythe reported that Cambridge communities were finding it difficult to maintain faith in the process, especially in view of the publication of late information and the officer

responsible for community engagement being seen to limit attendance at the recent Histon Road and Milton Road briefing. In respect of the proposed Local Liaison Forum, she asked how Forum stakeholders would be identified, on what basis objectives would be set and what success would look like.

Mr Menzies reported that Local Liaison Forums would involve all local Councillors from the County Council, City Council and District Council where appropriate and that it would be up to them to decide which stakeholders they wished to invite. The Forum itself would set its own terms of reference, setting out its objectives. In terms of what success would look like he highlighted that Local Liaison Forums were not decision-making bodies. He therefore added that success would be judged by the end product of the scheme.

Question by Roxanne de Beaux

Roxanne de Beaux asked whether the Joint Assembly would recommend to the Executive Board that the designs for Milton Road should include dedicated, segregated and sufficiently wide space for people who walked, together with separate, dedicated and sufficiently wide space for people who would be cycling. She also asked whether the Assembly would remove the recommendation that floating-bus stops were not considered.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, highlighted that discussions had taken place in length to establish how best to integrate all levels of usage along the Histon Road and Milton Road corridors. Further work was still needed and there were lots of options to consider. Floating bus stops were one of the options that still had to be considered and at this stage it was unclear whether or not they could work along these corridors.

Mr Walmsley made the point that cycling featured very highly as part of all City Deal transport infrastructure schemes. In respect of the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes, he said that there was still a high level of design work to undertake. Mr Walmsley took the opportunity, however, to highlight the cross city cycling item due for consideration later at this meeting which gave very good examples of high quality cycling facilities and provision for the area.

7. PETITIONS

Three petitions had been received, as follows:

'Save the trees and verges on Milton Road'

Charles Nisbet, Chairman of the Milton Road Residents' Association, presented the petition and reported concerns of local residents who he said were horrified at the prospect of the Milton Road avenue being turned into an urban highway and losing the trees and greenery associated with the road.

He highlighted some of the benefits of grass verges, vegetation and trees at the roadside, which included drainage and the impact on people's health and wellbeing and said that such greenery should be at the forefront of developments.

Mr Nisbet reported that the paper version of the petition totalled 1250 signatures, with a further 1201 signatures received online.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the petition, in view of the issues raised relating to an item due for consideration later at this meeting.

'Milton Road segregated cycleways'

Roxanne de Beaux, on behalf of Hester Wells, presented the petition which requested that Milton Road improvements under the City Deal should include high-quality cycleways, physically separated from both motor traffic and pedestrians.

She said that poor facilities would simply not get used, wasting time, money and missing an opportunity to get new people cycling in an environment in which they felt safe. She highlighted a guide produced by Camcycle entitled 'Making Space for Cycling' which had been endorsed by national bodies and set out principles of good cycle infrastructure.

Ms de Beaux reported that 640 verified signatures had been received in support of the petition and asked the Joint Assembly what measures were being taken to ensure the proposed cycleways were of sufficient quality to increase cycling modal share on the route.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the petition, in view of the issues raised relating to an item due for consideration later at this meeting.

'Petition to oppose the Histon Road schemes'

The lead petitioner was not in attendance to present this petition, but it was noted that the petition contained 755 signatures.

8. CAMBRIDGE ACCESS AND CAPACITY STUDY

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Joint Assembly. Questions were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh asked the Joint Assembly whether it would defer consideration of the Access Study options long list until it had been satisfactorily completed and its conclusions validated by a multidisciplinary panel. He also asked whether the Assembly would defer consideration of plans for new bus lanes on any city road until the following had been completed:

- trialling and evaluation of city centre access measures;
- installation, programming and evaluation of smart traffic management;
- determination of minimum space requirements for cycling infrastructure;
- proper modelling, trialling and evaluation of inbound flow control, in conjunction with city centre access restrictions;
- modelling of bus lanes using a baseline determined by all of the above.

Mr Leigh also asked whether the Joint Assembly would consider using the City Deal to set up a council-owned bus company.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, acknowledged that further work was required but thought that the scheme had reached a point where it could be shared with the public, which was what the Executive Board was being recommended to do. He was keen for the work undertaken to date to be put in the public domain in order that it could be developed further through public consultation.

In terms of baselines, Mr Menzies reflected on schemes from around the world that had addressed congestion which shared the common theme of constraining car use and investing in public transport infrastructure. He emphasised that both aspects were vital and confirmed that this was what the City Deal programme was seeking to achieve.

Mr Menzies reported that very few municipal bus companies were in existence as they had struggled to compete in the market with private providers. He made the point that municipal bus companies could not be favoured by local authorities and that strict tendering rules would still apply and have to be followed when awarding contracts for services.

Question by Councillor Markus Gehring

Councillor Gehring made the point that many residents were concerned with eliminating one option at this stage as an effective way of reducing core traffic. He therefore did not understand why congestion charging was off the table without proper evidence. He added that raw data had not been published and said that the evidence was not there in order to evaluate all of the options.

The Joint Assembly noted Councillor Gehring's points.

Question by Robin Pellew

Robin Pellew asked why the public was being denied a choice between alternative packages and questioned why one approach was being employed, discarding alternatives. He challenged the assumption within the report that one approach was better than another and referred to a peak hour charge which he felt could be more effective and generate more income.

Mr Pellew reiterated that members of the public should be offered alternatives and urged the Joint Assembly to adopt recommendation (b) in paragraph 86 of the report and requested that further work be carried out.

Mr Menzies responded by saying that this was a key question for debate by the Joint Assembly as part of this item. He added, however, that a levy could be just as effective as congestion charging, as well as being fairer, highlighting that peak congestion control points, in his opinion, provided better options than a blanket congestion charge.

Question by Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor asked why a congestion charge had been dismissed without going to public consultation.

Mr Menzies referred to the answer given to the previous question.

Question by Jim Chisholm

Jim Chisholm asked whether the Joint Assembly would lobby the Government and Members of Parliament for civil enforcement powers to be enabled by the Department for Transport, particularly in respect of enforcing things such as illegal obstructions and manoeuvres which themselves contributed to congestion. With these powers, and pragmatic civil enforcement leading to higher compliance, he felt that congestion could be reduced without expensive and disruptive engineering programmes.

Mr Menzies confirmed that local authorities outside of London could only enforce parking and bus lanes and welcomed more lobbying on this issue.

Question by Charles Nisbet

Charles Nisbet referred to paragraph 64 of the report which stated that work on the Access Study had not identified options for managing demand in the city that would remove the need for other City Deal interventions. He therefore asked whether the study should be resumed with renewed vigour, since the identification of such options would render it unnecessary to pursue the engineering works proposed for the Histon Road, Milton Road and Cambourne to Cambridge schemes, thus saving a great deal of public money and disruption to those areas.

Mr Menzies reiterated the point he made in response to an earlier public question where he said that cities worldwide constrained traffic as well as investing in public transport in order to successfully address congestion. In cases around the world it was demonstrable that both interventions resulted in positive results.

Question by Dorcus Fowler

Dorcus Fowler referred to two of the aims stated by the Cambridge Access and Capacity Study as being:

- to deliver a comprehensive and attractive Park and Ride service;
- to deliver an increased rail mode share.

She referred to what she felt was a regular service offered by Oxford's Park and Ride scheme and the significant reduction in people using Cambridge's Park and Ride facilities since the parking charges were introduced. She asked why the reduction in Park and Ride usage had not been addressed and why it was not possible to follow Oxford's example to make the Park and Ride scheme more attractive.

Dorcus Fowler also asked why the City Deal did not seize the possibility of making North Cambridge station a transport hub, to include a Park and Ride facility and a further adaptation to ease school traffic.

Mr Menzies clarified that the parking charge at Cambridge's Park and Ride sites was not introduced for transport reasons but reflected the financial situation at the County Council. It was noted that it cost approximately £1 million to run the Park and Ride sites in Cambridge.

Referring to Oxford, Mr Menzies reported that he and colleagues had visited Oxford and confirmed that a charge of £2 per vehicle was currently in place at Oxford's Park and Ride sites. He added that additional evening services had been trialled on the Park and Ride in Cambridge, but that these had proved not to be worthwhile and the services were therefore not introduced permanently.

Mr Menzies also confirmed that North Cambridge station had been designed as a transport hub, with 1,000 cycle parking spaces and 450 car parking spaces. It was not proposed to convert that facility into a Park and Ride site as in view of this detrimentally impacting the city's other Park and Ride facilities.

Question by Karrie Fuller

Karrie Fuller asked what progress had been made on the projected Eastern Orbital and why an Eastern Orbital route, along with the Western Orbital, was not being given priority over building bus lanes into the city centre along the residential streets of Histon Road and Milton Road, which failed to serve the large employment growth sites.

Mr Menzies confirmed that this was a large scheme which had not been included in Tranche 1 of the City Deal programme and that it was proposed for inclusion in the Tranche 2 programme.

The Chairman thanked members of the public for their questions and invited officers to present the report.

Mr Menzies, in presenting the report, also provided the Joint Assembly with a presentation on the Access and Capacity Study. A number of key points were noted, including the following:

- confirmation of the vision, aims and objectives of the City Deal partnership in respect of tackling congestion;
- the Cambridge Access Study had been commissioned in May 2015, followed by an audit report in August 2015 and the subsequent call for evidence in the Autumn of 2015 which had generated hearings and written submissions;
- the Executive Board in January 2016 had approved the assessment of submissions based on criteria in the following areas:
 - fairness
 - effectiveness
 - implementation
 - value for money
 - economic impact
 - dependencies and broader benefits
 - environmental impact and design
- 365 individual interventions were suggested as part of the call for evidence, with some having already been included in the long list. Further to the assessment process 44 interventions were shortlisted, of which 30 had been suggested by respondents to the call for evidence;
- the six main themes that materialised were:
 - public transport infrastructure and service improvements
 - infrastructure improvements for walking and cycling
 - demand management and fiscal measures
 - highway capacity enhancements
 - behavioural change
 - technology
- taking this into account, the proposed package of measures consisted of:
 - better bus services and expanded usage of Park and Ride sites
 - better pedestrian and cycling infrastructure
 - better streetscape and public realm
 - peak congestion control points in the weekday morning and evening peak periods
 - a workplace parking levy
 - on-street parking controls, including residents' parking
 - smart technology
 - travel planning

- public transport infrastructure and service improvement proposals included:
 - improvements to Park and Ride sites and services
 - more frequent services
 - express services from satellite towns
 - bus priority measures
 - bus stop interchange improvements
 - Cambridge North Station
 - Addenbrooke's Station
- proposed infrastructure improvements for better cycling and walking included:
 - improved conditions for cycling and walking
 - reallocated road space for cyclists and pedestrians
 - strategic cycle routes
 - increased cycle parking the city centre core
 - increase cycle parking at workplaces
 - urban realm improvements
- peak time congestion control points sought to reduce peaktime car trips in congested areas and also freed up space for buses, cyclists and pedestrians. Technical work already undertaken had tested proof of concept options and it was proposed that implementation would be carried out on a trial basis through an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order from Autumn 2017, with consultation taking place during the trial. It was proposed that peak time congestion control points would:
 - operate only during weekdays at peak times
 - provide access only to buses, taxis and emergency vehicles
 - be controlled through automatic number plate recognition cameras
- the workplace parking levy sought to provide revenue funding to improve public transport, supporting a reduction in car use. A proposed bespoke scheme for Cambridge would be based on the principles of the Nottingham scheme, with income used to fund transport infrastructure and services to support the transport needs of employers;
- parking controls would seek to limit commuter parking, as well as manage impacts of the work place levy and peak-time congestion control points;
- behaviour change and travel planning would consist of travel planning advice and support for employers, schools and individuals and would also incorporate:
 - a multi-modal journey planning app for Cambridge
 - school travel plans
 - car clubs and car sharing schemes
- congestion charging, as an alternative, could consist of several variations, such as zoned, cordoned or a city wide zone. The London scheme incurred a daily cost of £11.50 and a £5 a day rate for a congestion charge in Cambridge had been estimated to create £40 million to £44 million per year;
- potential issues with introducing congestion charging included:
 - alternatives needed to be put in place before implementation of a congestion charging scheme;
 - a congestion charge scheme could only be implemented as part of Tranche 2 of the City Deal programme at the earliest
 - a congestion charge scheme raised questions of equity
 - the price of the scheme would need to increase over time.

Mr Walmsley recommended that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations contained within the report, in that the Executive Board:

- (a) notes the call for evidence analysis and the Cambridge Access Study Long List and Short List reports and outcomes;

- (b) agrees the policy approach for a congestion reduction package, incorporating:
 - better bus services and expanded usage of Park and Rides;
 - better pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
 - better streetscape and public realm;
 - peak congestion control points in the weekday morning and evening peak periods;
 - a workplace parking levy;
 - on-street parking controls (including residents' parking)
 - smart technology;
 - travel planning;
- (c) notes the consultation and engagement principles attached to the report at Appendix D and agrees the principles of the engagement process on the proposed congestion reduction package, to commence in July 2016.
- (d) endorses the proposal for a trial implementation of peak congestion control points, possibly on a phased basis in late 2017 using an experimental Traffic Regulation Order, with consultation on the Order held during the experimental period.

The Chairman thanked Mr Walmsley for his presentation and invited Members to debate the above recommendations.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon had some concerns regarding the workplace parking levy. Referring to paragraph 53 of the report, he asked whether the creation of additional income was the sole reason for introducing such a scheme and, if so, was concerned that this would be construed as an additional tax. He also thought this may cause a disincentive to the growth of businesses. In addition, he questioned whether the levy was targeting the wrong people and was of the view that, if charging was imposed, those undertaking short journeys should be charged rather than those people commuting into the city and contributing towards the local economy. Noting that those cities effectively tackling congestion had introduced demand management as well as investing in public transport, he was content to support the recommendations.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh noted that the Nottingham workplace parking levy had accomplished 100% compliance by employers. He asked whether officers had a sense of how employers in Cambridge would react to the introduction of a workplace parking levy and whether dialogue with employers on that basis had yet commenced. Mr Menzies confirmed that engagement with employers on this issue had not yet taken place.

Councillor Maurice Leeke referred to paragraph 5 of Appendix B where it stated that measures would focus on providing support for journeys to and from work, such as support for peak hour express bus services from major satellite settlements and orbital bus services. He felt that this statement contradicted Mr Menzies' presentation, thinking that the definition was too narrow, and said that services needed to be put in place to ensure that people could use them in order to get to work in mornings and enable them to get home in evenings.

Councillor Leeke was also concerned that peak congestion control points would simply move congestion elsewhere, creating less convenient journeys for people and creating more pollution. He was also of the view that there was not enough information as part of the report to consider the benefits of congestion charging and was keen for the Assembly and Board to look at the long-term issue of congestion rather than in the short-term. Councillor Leeke called for more work to be done on that element of the report before accepting it for public consultation.

Councillor Bridget Smith was disappointed that more detail on proposals to reduce car parks in the city had not been included in the report and felt that a study on that issue should be undertaken, which she thought in itself would encourage modal shift. She also highlighted a growing concern of sixth formers from villages in South Cambridgeshire who had difficulty travelling in and out of the city for college and other educational institutions. She reported that an increasing number of young people were dropping out of Cambridge colleges as they could not afford to travel to the city, so felt that access to education was a key issue that the City Deal should seek to resolve.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley said that it should be made clear how funding gained from the workplace parking levy would be used.

Helen Valentine felt that the introduction of a workplace parking levy would actually encourage modal shift. She said that Anglia Ruskin University had already removed car parking from some of its sites, so from an employer perspective did not think it would be a significant concern.

Christopher Walkinshaw, advisor to the Local Enterprise Partnership, highlighted that the major problem was in areas where there were no alternatives to using private cars to enter the city. In terms of the workplace parking levy, Mr Walkinshaw made the point that sometimes employees did not have anywhere else to park, referring to Park and Ride sites that themselves only consisted of 200 to 300 spaces. In addition, public transport did not provide adequate enough services to ensure that people could get to work on time in the morning and be able to get back home in the evening. He indicated that he would be worried if the workplace parking levy turned into a tax on jobs.

Andy Williams reported that he had attended a recent business event with representatives of Cambridge based business and said that most of the people he spoke to had barely heard of the City Deal, and that a lot of them would be surprised by the introduction of the levy. He was of the opinion that such a levy would be a hard proposal to sell if the charges for parking at Park and Ride sites were not removed. He felt that a clear and compelling vision for what any additional revenue would be spent on as a result of introducing the levy would be extremely important to the business community.

Councillor Kevin Price reflected on the equity of a congestion charge and said that Cambridge was already becoming a city where people could not afford to work and live, with lots of people moving out of the city but continuing to work in Cambridge. He reminded the Joint Assembly that the average wage of people in Cambridge was £31,000 per year and that 40% of people earned less than £22,000. In terms of the least worst option, he said that the workplace parking levy, although impacting employers, would be a much lower level than that of a congestion charge. Councillor Price took this opportunity to remind Members that the Park and Ride parking charge was a result of the significant budgetary pressures that local authorities faced and if that charge was removed the County Council would need to make service cuts elsewhere.

Councillor Tim Bick felt that there was an obvious omission from the recommendations and that congestion charging as an alternative should be included in the public consultation, reflecting on paragraph 75 of the report where it clearly set congestion charging out as an alternative approach. In his opinion it was quite clear that a congestion charge would have a larger impact in reducing congestion and create significant opportunities to raise revenue. He accepted the comments made about fairness and equality, but still wanted the public to be given an opportunity to put forward their views on this proposal and on what they felt was fair and equitable. Councillor Bick added that the part of the recommendations that really tackled congestion was the proposed introduction of peak congestion control points, but he was concerned about the impact these would

have on people's journeys and the inequality that itself may introduce depending on which part of the city you are accessing and from where. In addition, he was concerned with the resulting displacement that would occur with such a scheme.

Councillor Bick said that the recommended approach closed down the option of congestion charging too early making the process too restrictive, indicating that in his view there should be two approaches put forward for consultation.

Claire Ruskin highlighted the substantial back office costs that would need to be put in place prior to any trial for congestion charging, which she said could be justified in a city the size of London but was more challenging for a city such as Cambridge. In terms of peak congestion control points, she recommended ensuring that improvements to bus services and Park and Ride sites were in place prior to the commencement of any such trial.

Mr Menzies responded to some of the points made by Members and the following points were noted:

- officers would work with schools regarding peak congestion control points in order to target those roads where there were significant problems;
- engagement needed to take place with employers in order to develop a package of public transport improvement and better understand their employees' needs in that respect;
- there were significant problems with buses caught in congestion, with Hills Road given as an example, and Stagecoach itself often sent out additional buses to ensure that services were uninterrupted;
- a car parking strategy had been in place for many years across the city and county, with rates set to encourage short-stay parking aimed at promoting retailers. A high turnover was therefore the target for city centre car parks and as a result they did not contribute to peak-time congestion;
- the improvements to public transport as a result of the City Deal transport infrastructure schemes should result in vast improvements to bus services from South Cambridgeshire to Cambridge, therefore addressing the problem that young people faced in terms of being able to access education provision in the city;
- it would be a requirement to identify, at an early stage, how the revenue incurred as a result of the workplace parking levy would be spent;
- very useful data was being gathered from the business community, with this engagement with employers continuing in view of it being a very important part of the project.

Councillor Tim Bick proposed an amendment to the recommendations set out in the report, replacing paragraph (b) with the below wording:

'The Executive Board asks officers to work up an alternative congestion reduction package led by peak hour congestion charging with a view to inviting informed public input on this, as well as the currently proposed package, before a decision on the final approach is made'.

Councillor Bridget Smith seconded the amendment. She said that not including congestion charging as part of the next stage of consultation was denying people the opportunity to put forward their views on the issue. Councillor Smith acknowledged the investment that would be necessary to set up the back office associated with a congestion charge scheme, but was of the view that this was the only scheme able to generate sufficient revenue to fund necessary improvements to the Greater Cambridge area.

Councillor Maurice Leeke said that he understood behavioural change as being the key to success in terms of addressing congestion and that a way to alter people's behaviour would be to provide a much better bus service. Additional revenue was vital in being able to deliver the improvements that were required and he believed that a congestion charge scheme was the only realistic way in which the required revenue could be raised. He added that the majority of people had not had the opportunity to look into the data and said that the public deserved to be consulted on the issue.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon made the point that people looked to elected Members and bodies such as the Joint Assembly to act as community leaders and make these kind of decisions. In reading the technical report, he could not see any technical reasons setting out how a congestion charge could benefit Cambridge.

Voting on the amendment, with 3 votes in favour and 8 votes against, the amendment was lost.

Voting on the recommendations set out in the report, with 8 votes in favour and 3 votes against, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the call for evidence analysis and the Cambridge Access Study Long List and Short List reports and outcomes.
- (b) Agrees the policy approach for a congestion reduction package, incorporating:
 - better bus services and expanded usage of Park and Rides;
 - better pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
 - better streetscape and public realm;
 - peak congestion control points in the weekday morning and evening peak periods;
 - a workplace parking levy;
 - on-street parking controls (including residents' parking)
 - smart technology;
 - travel planning.
- (c) Notes the consultation and engagement principles attached to the report at Appendix D and agrees the principles of the engagement process on the proposed congestion reduction package, to commence in July 2016.
- (d) Endorses the proposal for a trial implementation of peak congestion control points, possibly on a phased basis in late 2017 using an experimental Traffic Regulation Order, with consultation on the Order held during the experimental period.

9. HISTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: REPORT ON INITIAL CONSULTATION AND SELECTION OF A PREFERRED ROUTE

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Joint Assembly. Questions were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Councillor Jocelyne Scutt

Councillor Jocelyne Scutt reported that residents of Histon Road and Milton Road, as well as residents on surrounding streets and roads, were significantly concerned about the impact to their comfort, safety and environment as a result of plans for improved transport

along these roads. She asked the Joint Assembly to confirm that it would only endorse projects for Histon Road and Milton Road that incorporated an intrinsic and essential part of landscaping and public realm and that it would advance to the Executive Board no projects for these roads which did not accept this as a fundamental part.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that the intention was to ensure that all works were done in such a way that they enhanced, and sought to improve, the public realm to the highest possible standards.

Question by Michael Bond

Michael Bond referred to the inbound bus stop at Union Lane as the biggest single cause of rush hour delay on Milton Road and asked why the City Deal team had not made moving it to the other side of the junction to sit at the end of the bus lane an option. He asked for this solution to be recommended in order that access to Union Lane could remain open for the residents of Chesterton.

Mr Walmsley acknowledged the problem and suggestion, confirming that this would be looked at as part of the next stage of design for the scheme.

Question by Lynn Hieatt

Lynn Hieatt was of the opinion that the success of the safety, functionality and aesthetic design in schemes already in place, with Hills Road and Huntingdon Road given as examples, should be assessed before moving onto new parts of the city. She asked whether the Joint Assembly would recommend to the Board that such a review be carried out, with input from residents' associations, heritage groups, architects and highways engineers before any plans were made for Cambridge's other approach roads.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that there had been big increases in cycle use on both roads and recognised that some of the work previously undertaken had not been as successful as it could have been with regards to landscaping, specifically in respect of vehicle overruns. He fully expected this to be taken into account as part of the design process for this scheme.

Question by Mike Sargeant

Mike Sargeant asked that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board resolved to complete the design phase for Mitcham's Corner this summer and ensure that Tranche 1 of the City Deal programme at least addressed the issues around cycling and pedestrians at Mitcham's Corner so that it encouraged cycling and walking on Milton Road. He also asked that major changes to the highway layout at Mitcham's Corner be completed, including a bus interchange and removal of the gyratory system at the earliest possible point in Tranche 2.

He also asked about democratic representation and the role of the Local Liaison Forum in view of the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council being recommended to be given delegated authority to approve a further consultation for a preferred option scheme design.

In terms of Mitcham's Corner, Mr Walmsley reported that this had not featured in Tranche 1 of the City Deal programme as a priority, however, the Executive Board had agreed to undertake initial work on it during Tranche 1. This work had therefore been taking place and was currently underway with colleagues from the City Council from a public realm perspective. This dialogue would continue, but he confirmed that this aspect of the

scheme would be included alongside other schemes considered as priorities for inclusion in Tranche 2 of the programme.

With regards to the role of the Local Liaison Forum and delegated powers given to the Executive Director, Mr Walmsley said that the Board would be asked to set perimeters for preferred options, the details of which would then be worked up and developed into proposals for consultation. The Executive Director, as part of that process, would liaise with the Board and feed in any comments from the Local Liaison Forum.

Question by Erica McDonald

Erica McDonald said that the City Deal proposals looked at traffic along a north-east and south-west alignment which divided the community around Milton Road. She therefore asked what the City Deal would do to reduce the dividing effect on the community by providing crossing points along pedestrian and cycle desire-lanes, rather than just at road junctions.

Mr Walmsley reported that officers, at this stage, were not proposing additional crossing points, but acknowledged that they had not yet been ruled out either. This would be considered as the scheme developed. He emphasised that there was a balance to be struck between local need, safety and the public realm.

Question by Maureen Mace

Maureen Mace asked why the City Deal was proposing a solution that would significantly and negatively impact the existing street scene with 'the removal of a large number of highway trees' with opportunities only for 'new highway tree planting and other green landscaping areas throughout the route, albeit not always on both sides of the road'. She asked for a commitment to have a minimum 1 metre width along the entire length of the road within an avenue of trees and green verges on both sides of the road, which she felt was entirely possible considering the road's width.

Mr Walmsley said that as well as local needs, safety needs and the issue of public realm, there was also a strategic need for this scheme, emphasising the importance that the balance in this respect was right. He added that the details of the scheme had not yet been devised, so it was too early in the process to make such a commitment.

Question by Michael Page

Michael Page referred to the 'do something' option in the report which showed a four-lane carriageway with bus lanes on both sides requiring the removal of 16 mature trees. He felt that there was insufficient space to accommodate cycle paths and footpaths with proper segregation together with two bus lanes, without compromising the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. He therefore urged the Joint Assembly to recommend that this section of the plan was not taken forward and be returned to officers for revision.

Mr Page also asked that a recommendation be put forward to the Executive Board in respect of the Hills Road and Lensfield Road junction that this part of the plan was not taken forward and be returned to officers, who be asked to produce a roundabout design that could be consulted upon.

Councillor Hickford made the point that this issue was likely to be debated as part of consideration of the item.

Question by Luke Tunmer

Luke Tunmer was concerned that the proposals for closing major roads to general traffic at peak periods was going to significantly change the locations and extent of congestion points in the city. He therefore asked Joint Assembly Members their opinion as to what the imperative was that was driving decisions to proceed with the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes ahead of any congestion point trials and decisions relating to the City Centre Access Study.

Councillor Hickford made the point that this issue was likely to be debated as part of consideration of the item.

Question by Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor referred to a briefing on the Milton Road scheme where officers explained the intent of their recommendations, particularly in respect of the 'do something' option, and asked for further clarity as to what the Assembly was being asked to support.

He wanted to see the Joint Assembly recommend pavements and cycleways segregated from motor traffic by trees along the full length of Milton Road in order to make cycling a safer and more attractive option. He also thought that the Assembly could usefully rule out the introduction of parking on Milton Road between Arbury and King's Hedges Road as he was of the view that parking and its associated buffer zone was not a good use of valuable road space.

Councillor Hickford made the point that this issue was likely to be covered in the officer presentation and debated as part of consideration of the item.

Question by Councillor Ysanne Austin

Councillor Ysanne Austin was concerned that the officers' report did not offer any modelling of the impact of citywide traffic reduction measures and the impact on Milton Road. She asked whether this work could be carried out and the evidence considered prior to committing to build new bus lanes on Milton Road.

Mr Menzies confirmed that this detailed modelling and design work would take place as part of the next stage of the process, over the next few months.

Question by Alastair Boyles

Alastair Boyles highlighted that the New Local Plan recognised Mitcham's Corner as an Opportunity Area and set out the objective to reduce the effect of traffic on the area and, ultimately, remove the gyratory system in favour of a simpler intersection. He therefore asked what measures the City and County Councils, and the City Deal partnership, were taking to ensure that the City Deal proposals for Milton Road would further this objective to reduce the effects of traffic and the gyratory road system that had blighted this part of Cambridge for decades.

Mr Menzies reiterated that one of the City Deal objectives was to improve bus and cycleway provision. He reported that there was much more work that needed to be done before bringing anything forward for consideration in relation to Mitcham's Corner but anticipated its inclusion in Tranche 2 of the City Deal programme.

Question by John Beasley

John Beasley said that the City Deal proposals for Milton Road featured traffic lanes of 3 meters in width, which he said was contrary to Highways Agency guidelines of 2005 for this type of road. This being the case, Mr Beasley asked whether officers could state if, for safety reasons, the City Deal team was recommending restricting gross vehicle widths along Milton Road.

Mr Walmsley said that many of the streets in Cambridge were only 6 metres in width so a sequence of works was having to be managed within that context. He added that it would therefore not be possible to maintain levels of width throughout when restricted in this way.

The Chairman thanked members of the public for their questions and invited officers to present the report.

Mr Walmsley, in presenting the report, also provided the Joint Assembly with a presentation on the Histon Road and Milton Road transport infrastructure schemes. A number of key points were noted, including the following:

- objectives for the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes consisted of:
 - comprehensive priority for buses in both directions wherever practical
 - additional capacity for sustainable trips to employment and education sites
 - increased bus patronage and new services
 - safer and more convenient routes for cycling and walking, segregated where practical and possible
 - maintain or reduce the general traffic levels
 - enhance the environment, streetscape and air quality
- the following process would be followed for delivery of the two schemes:
 - consultation on initial ideas
 - assessment of consultation
 - further testing of initial ideas and any new ideas
 - recommendation of preferred options to the Executive Board. It was noted that this was the stage in the process that both schemes were currently at
 - further development of preferred options
 - consultation on detail of preferred options
 - report consultation responses to the Executive Board
 - detailed development and design
 - statutory approvals, including consultation
 - seek approval from the Executive Board to build scheme
 - build scheme
- key issues resulting from the consultation on initial ideas included the following:
 - concerns over the impact of banned turns and restricted access in respect of Victoria Road, Warwick Road, Gilbert Road, Arbury Road, Union Lane and King's Hedges Road
 - concerns over increased traffic lanes, impact on green landscaping and difficulty in crossing wider roads
 - concerns that ideas for cycling improvements did not suit all cyclists;
 - impact of junction changes in respect of Union Lane, Elizabeth Way and Victoria Road
 - role of Mitcham's Corner in the Milton Road project
- the following outcomes for Histon Road were heavily influenced by views received from residents living on and near both routes:
 - limited level of improvement achieved by both options with 'do maximum'

- option considered to achieve more
 - more support for than opposition to Victoria Road junction ideas
 - more support for than opposition to parking removal
 - strong support for need for streetscape enhancement
- the following outcomes for Milton Road were heavily influenced by views received from residents living on and near both routes:
 - limited level of improvement achieved by both options
 - more opposition than support for key junction changes
 - more support than opposition for parking removal
 - strong support for need for streetscape enhancement
- post consultation work would consist of:
 - a review of tidal flow bus lanes not seen to add value and have significant impact on street scene
 - bus journey time modelling to assess the benefits of bus lane options
 - assessment of changes in traffic flow resulting from possible junction changes and various impacts across the northern city road network
 - review of options to change road layout at Mitcham's Corner junction, with further traffic modelling in hand for favoured options

Mr Walmsley made specific reference to the issue of floating bus stops and highlighted that the narrow nature of Histon Road provided less opportunities to consistently introduce them.

Members were referred to an addendum that had been circulated that took into account the results of additional data which had very recently become available and changed recommendation (b) as set out in the original report. Mr Walmsley therefore recommended that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations contained within the report and addendum, in that the Executive Board:

- (a) notes the findings in the initial consultation report;
- (b) agrees to take forward, for further design work, the initial ideas included in the 'Do Maximum' option, excluding the idea of banning the right turn into Warwick Road and the idea of 'floating' bus stops, to develop two preferred design options, one including and one excluding the changes at the Victoria Road junction;
- (c) notes the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period to develop a preferred option layout for further consultation;
- (d) supports the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation;
- (e) delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve further consultation for a preferred option scheme;
- (f) notes the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

Councillor Bridget Smith praised the comments and questions raised by members of the public and said that they were the best people to provide the Assembly with advice. She did not believe that delegating authority was democratic and felt that people should be able to comment further on the scheme's development in the public domain in a forum such as this Assembly. She was also very concerned by Local Liaison Forums and emphasised the importance of their meetings being held in public. Councillor Smith proposed an amendment to recommendation (e) which read:

'agrees that a preferred option scheme design for Histon Road and Milton Road returns to the Joint Assembly for further consideration and recommendation to the Executive Board, if necessary.'

Councillor Maurice Leeke seconded the amendment.

Mr Menzies clarified that meetings of the Local Liaison Forum were open to the public, the difference being that the Forum itself decided upon who, as key stakeholders, became members of the Forum. In terms of the amendment, he felt that the process was too far down the line having already gone out to consultation and that this additional step would add approximately six weeks to the process.

Claire Ruskin made the point that previous consultation documents had been shared with Joint Assembly Members via email prior to publication in draft form, and that the same process could be followed for these schemes. Councillor Smith argued that this was not open and transparent.

Councillor Maurice Leeke said that more emphasis was being placed on spending the City Deal money quickly as opposed to spending it well. He was of the opinion that the Executive Board should be looking at the best possible solutions for the longer term rather than doing something quickly just in order to spend the money.

Mr Walmsley accepted that the City Deal partnership was working to a tight programme but highlighted that extensive consultation would take place on each scheme associated with the programme, making the point that comments and views had already been taken into account and resulted in changes being made to schemes.

Andy Williams drew Members' attention to Mr Walmsley's presentation in terms of where the scheme was in the current process compared to the stages it still had to progress through, highlighting that there was still lots of opportunities for consultation on these schemes.

Voting on the amendment, with 3 votes in favour, 6 votes against and 1 abstention, the amendment was lost.

Councillor Kevin Price proposed an amendment, which took into account the many responses he had received by residents affected in the city, and thought that it reflected a better way forward than that proposed in the report and addendum. Councillor Price therefore proposed that the Executive Board be recommended to:

- (a) note the findings in the initial consultation report and welcome the many detailed and high quality responses from residents and other stakeholder groups which have been used to shape the next stage of consultation;
- (b) note the initial ideas included in the 'Do Maximum' options, excluding the idea of banning the right turn into Warwick Road and the idea of floating bus stops but reconsider the 'Do Minimum' option and other ideas, specifically:
 - (i) that the restricted capacity along the northern section of the Histon Road route precludes the proposal for an inbound bus lane and that smart traffic management and bus priority signalling should be the preferred option;
 - (ii) raised cycle lanes either side of Histon Road along the northern section of the route up to the Rackham Close junction and advisory cycle lanes either side of Histon Road along the southern section of the route;
 - (iii) mature tree planting and green landscaping on grass verges along the carriageway reflecting the existing public amenity, in particular along the northern section of the route;

- (iv) further investigation of the proposed permanent closure of the Victoria Road junction to vehicles, other than buses and cycles, turning left into Victoria Road from Histon Road and turning right out of Victoria Road onto Histon Road given the intention expressed in the initial consultation to address peak time congestion and recognising the need for access by other vehicles outside peak hours;
- (v) further investigation of proposals to permanently remove on-street parking along the outbound southern section of the route given the intention expressed in the initial consultation to address peak-time congestion and recognising the needs of residents;
- (c) support the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation;
- (d) note the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period and request the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council to develop a detailed preferred option design, traffic and parking mitigation measure proposals and initial business case for the purposes of further consultation, and bring them to the City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board;
- (e) note the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

In responding to the amendment, Mr Menzies highlighted that it actually took a step back in the process by not identifying a preferred option. In addition, with no notice of the amendment and in view of its relative length and complexity, it was difficult for officers and Members of the Joint Assembly to properly assess the implications. Councillor Price therefore agreed to withdraw the amendment, with the points it raised being noted by the Assembly.

Councillor Tim Bick questioned how these schemes differed to a County Council scheme introduced at Hills Road where bus lanes were seen as being a lot less important on a route that was just as busy as Hilton Road and Milton Road and asked why bus lanes were a requirement for these schemes when they were not required for Hills Road. He also made the point that infrastructure investment may be the answer, but that lots of people thought that should be a last resort if outcomes could be achieved using a lighter touch. Councillor Bick was disappointed that an integrated approach with other City Deal schemes had not been achieved by this stage of the programme.

Mr Menzies responded by saying that there may be options as part of the A1307 scheme to extend bus provision onto Hills Road, but in respect of the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes he said that there was no alternative for people travelling along those corridors, whereas there were alternatives in the use of Hills Road as a route in and out of the city.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred to Appendix 3 in terms of what success would look like, specifically regarding journey times, and was surprised to see that these schemes sought to reduce journey times by only three minutes. She said that this made very little impact and questioned whether the investment was worthwhile. Andy Williams agreed with this view and expected a significantly higher reduction in journey times.

Mr Walmsley was of the opinion that the investment was worth it and that a reduced journey time of three minutes on busy corridors such as Hilton Road or Milton Road was very positive, making the point that large bypass schemes had been approved on the basis of achieving a lower reduction in journey times. Mr Menzies added that the benefit calculation took into account the number of people affected, and on corridors such as Histon Road and Milton Road the three minutes would be saved by a large number of people, which would make a significant difference.

Voting on the recommendations contained in the report and addendum, with 6 votes in favour and 4 votes against, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the findings in the initial consultation report;
- (b) Agrees to take forward, for further design work, the initial ideas included in the 'Do Maximum' option, excluding the idea of banning the right turn into Warwick Road and the idea of 'floating' bus stops, to develop two preferred design options, one including and one excluding the changes at the Victoria Road junction.
- (c) Notes the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period to develop a preferred option layout for further consultation;
- (d) Supports the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation.
- (e) Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve further consultation for a preferred option scheme.
- (f) Notes the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

10. MILTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: REPORT ON INITIAL CONSULTATION AND SELECTION OF A PREFERRED ROUTE

This item was considered as part of the item on Histon Road at minute number 9, which included a number of public questions, consideration of the report and receipt of an officer presentation.

The officer recommendation in the report was noted as follows:

That the Executive Board:

- (a) notes the findings in the initial consultation report;
- (b) agrees to take forward the initial ideas in the 'Do Something' option for further design work including the Union Lane closure and Elizabeth Way roundabout ideas and 'floating bus stops', where highway space permitted, but excluding the ideas for banned turns at the Gilbert Road, Arbury Road and King's Hedges Road junctions;
- (c) agrees to consider major changes to the highway layout at the Mitcham's Corner junction for implementation as part of the ongoing tranche 2 prioritisation work;
- (d) notes the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period;
- (e) supports the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation;
- (f) delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve a further consultation for a preferred option scheme design, as detailed in section 43 of the report;
- (g) notes the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

Councillor Kevin Price proposed an amendment, which took into account the many responses he had received by residents affected in the city, and thought that it reflected a better way forward than that proposed in the report and addendum. Councillor Price therefore proposed that the Executive Board be recommended to:

- (a) note the findings in the initial consultation report and welcome the many detailed and high quality responses from residents and other stakeholder groups which have been used to shape the next stages of consultation;
- (b) take forward the initial ideas in the 'Do Something' option for further design work including 'floating' bus stops (where highway space permits) but excluding the ideas for banned turns at the Gilbert Road, Arbury Road and King's Hedges Road junctions. This includes:
 - (i) a single bus lane for the length of Milton Road in the direction of travel leading up to junctions;
 - (ii) segregated cycle lanes on each side of the road with additional on-pavement two directional cycling on the west side of Milton Road from Arbury Road to Gilbert Road;
 - (iii) mature tree planting and green landscaping within the highway throughout the route;
 - (iv) further investigation of options for Highworth Avenue roundabout ideas to evidence the benefits of any scheme and address the concerns of residents.
- (c) agree to consider major changes to the highway layout at the Mitcham's Corner junction for implementation as part of the ongoing tranche 2 prioritisation work;
- (d) note the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period;
- (e) support the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation;
- (f) request the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment to develop a detailed preferred option design, as laid out in recommendation (b) and section 43 of the report, and bring a report to the City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval on further consideration;
- (g) note the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh seconded the amendment.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council did not think that the proposals set out in (ii) and (iii) of the amendment would be possible as the road was not wide enough all the way along the length of the road in order to achieve this.

Voting on the amendment, with 3 votes in favour, 4 votes against and 3 abstentions, the amendment was lost.

Voting on the recommendations contained within the report, with 6 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the findings in the initial consultation report.
- (b) Agrees to take forward the initial ideas in the 'Do Something' option for further design work including the Union Lane closure and Elizabeth Way roundabout ideas and 'floating bus stops', where highway space permitted, but excluding the ideas for banned turns at the Gilbert Road, Arbury Road and King's Hedges Road junctions.

- (c) Agrees to consider major changes to the highway layout at the Mitcham's Corner junction for implementation as part of the ongoing tranche 2 prioritisation work.
- (d) Notes the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period.
- (e) Supports the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation.
- (f) Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve a further consultation for a preferred option scheme design, as detailed in section 43 of the report.
- (g) Notes the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.

11. CROSS CITY CYCLING

The Joint Assembly considered a report which summarised the results of public recommendations and proposed next steps in respect of cross city cycling improvement schemes.

Mike Davies, Team Leader (Cycling Projects) at Cambridgeshire County Council, provided the Joint Assembly with a brief presentation, setting out details of the following cycling improvement schemes:

- Fulbourn Road and Cherry Hinton eastern access;
- Hills Road and Addenbrooke's corridor;
- links to east Cambridge and national cycle route 11;
- Arbury Road;
- links to Cambridge North Station and the Science Park.

The presentation included photographs and plans associated with each scheme.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh referred to paragraph 15 of the report and a survey that had been undertaken, seeking clarity as to how that was carried out. Mr Davies confirmed that a combination of surveys had been undertaken to gather this data and that they would continue to be held in order to establish how people were accessing the city.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the results and key issues arising from the public consultation.
- (b) Increases the funding allocated to the schemes due to the expansion of scope.
- (c) Continues localised discussions over trees, hedges and boundaries.
- (d) Gives approval to implement all five schemes, subject to a few minor changes and areas where some further consultation is required, as per the summary table set out in the report.
- (e) Delegates approval of detailed final scheme layouts to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board.

12. CAMBRIDGE TO ROYSTON CYCLEWAY

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out how a significant and valuable part of the Cambridge to Royston cycleway route, namely Cambridge to Melbourn, could be completed, resulting in major economic benefits being realised in the short term.

Mike Davies, Team Leader (Cycling Projects) at Cambridgeshire County Council, provided the Joint Assembly with a brief presentation which provided photographs of how the route was expected to look upon completion of the scheme, together with maps and plans showing the route itself, as well as a plan of a proposed bridge over the A505. He highlighted that the bridge would be funded via a regional growth bid through the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Councillor Maurice Leeke said that this was a very valuable link and that any support that this Assembly could give to the Local Enterprise Partnership in respect of funding the bridge, which he felt was crucial, would be very appropriate.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh fully endorsed this expenditure and paid tribute to County Councillor Susan Van De Ven who had championed this scheme for a number of years. He said that this scheme would result in a huge return for people living in settlements along the route.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the work completed to date to provide a cycle link from Cambridge to Melbourn.
- (b) Approves the use of £550,000 of City Deal funding to complete the link.

13. CITY DEAL URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN GUIDANCE

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Joint Assembly. Questions were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Jean Glasberg

Jean Glasberg asked whether the City Deal would be conducting a skills analysis to ensure that the teams who would deliver this programme had the full range of competencies necessary to deliver good placemaking and sustainable development, as well as functional transport infrastructure.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that the City Deal partnership had a range of skills available within all three partner Councils and that consultants could also be appointed as and when required.

Question by Penny Heath

Penny Heath asked why the City Deal did not set up a Design Panel, like the Design and Conservation Panel such as that used by the City Council's planning department and in line with principles of Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth. She was also concerned that the document did not include enough reference to Cambridge's heritage.

Mr Menzies reported that Cambridge's historic environment sites were clearly covered by other policy documents at the County Council. In respect of the City Council's Design Panel, he explained that City Deal highways projects came under a different legislative framework to that of the planning application process.

Question by Nichola Harrison

Nichola Harrison did not think that the proposed Design Guidance document did enough to protect and enhance Cambridge's environment and community life, stating that it needed to develop as a locally relevant, flexible and practical tool. She felt that this could be achieved through a website where people could upload photographs and discuss design issues. She therefore asked the Joint Assembly to recommend to the Executive Board that it adopts a method, perhaps a website, which got the public involved in developing the document as a tool that inspired very high design standards in all City Deal schemes.

Councillor Hickford made the point that this issue was likely to be debated as part of consideration of the item.

Glen Richardson, Urban Design and Conservation Manager at Cambridge City Council, and Andrew Cameron, Director of Urban Design at WSP consultants, presented a report which set out the principles to be followed and guidance that should be taken into account during the development of City Deal transport infrastructure projects on the major roads into Cambridge and city centre access routes. A copy of the proposed guidance document was appended to the report which officers took Members through as part of a presentation.

The Joint Assembly was asked to recommend that the Executive Board:

- (a) endorses the City Deal Urban and Environmental Design Guidance document;
- (b) requires that the document is proactively used and referenced by project managers during the development of relevant City Deal transport projects;
- (c) requests that the document is updated periodically to reflect any significant changes in highway and planning design policy.

Councillor Bridget Smith was very pleased that this piece of work had been commissioned, but was extremely disappointed with the document that was presented. She said that it contained no reference to heritage, which for a city that had world heritage status was a significant omission, and also had no reference to best practice, no vision, a lack of detail and did not promote quality. She therefore called for the document to be vastly improved.

Mr Cameron disagreed with the comment regarding reference to best practice, stating that the document contained examples from around the world and the country of schemes considered as best practice. He made the point that Cambridge as a city was very restrictive and the guidance reflected that, seeking to strike a balance between these restrictions and the needs of users. He added that the brief was to produce a short, high-level guidance document referencing other good pieces of guidance which he felt was the appropriate thing to do.

Councillor Smith responded by saying that she did not see the point in this guidance document referencing other document and said that it did not recognise sympathies of the city.

Mr Richardson confirmed that the document sought to highlight the other important documents that had been produced locally, by Cambridge based officers, that would influence design principles in Cambridge. Mr Cameron added that it was specific to Cambridge as it made reference to restricted streets, a key characteristic of the city.

Councillor Tim Bick thought that the City Deal was better with this document in place than without it, but he was not convinced that it included everything that it could and regarded it as a starting point. He did not think it was aspirational enough and reflected on the suggestions put forward by public questioners in respect of the use of a Design Panel and the idea that the public could be invited to submit ideas and examples they considered as good practice, as well as those that they considered should be avoided. Councillor Bick therefore moved an amendment to the officer recommendation, replacing the word 'endorse' in paragraph (a) with the words 'requests the improvement of' and the addition of the following new paragraphs:

- (d) requests officers to investigate the process of all future City Deal schemes being considered by the Cambridgeshire Quality Design Panel;
- (e) requests officers to investigate the introduction of a facility that invites members of the public to provide photographs of aspirational ideas and ideas to be avoided for a website-based montage.

Councillor Maurice Leeke seconded the amendment. The amendment was unanimously agreed.

The Joint Assembly, therefore, unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Requests the improvement of the City Deal Urban and Environmental Design Guidance document.
- (b) Requires that the document is proactively used and reference by project managers during the development of relevant City Deal transport projects.
- (c) Requests that the document is updated periodically to reflect any significant changes in highway and planning design policy.
- (d) Requests officers to investigate the process of all future City Deal schemes being considered by the Cambridgeshire Quality Design Panel.
- (e) Requests officers to investigate the introduction of a facility that invites members of the public to provide photographs of aspirational ideas and ideas to be avoided for a website-based montage.

14. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal progress report.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the report and highlighted the programme plan that was now in place for the infrastructure programme. She also highlighted that the City Deal website was in the process of being improved, encouraging all Members of the Joint Assembly to use it.

It was noted that the Local Development Plan examination had recommenced.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal progress report.

15. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal Forward Plan.

The Meeting ended at 3.35 p.m.
