



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

Report To: Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board 25 January 2017

Lead Officer: Hilary Holden, City Access Programme

City Access congestion reduction proposals: Consultation Responses and Next Steps

Purpose

1. To report the results from the consultation on 'Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge' that are informing the work of the City Access project team and influencing the emerging work programme.
2. To agree next steps on the City Access work following the consultation, in line with the project objectives and scope agreed in January and June 2016.

Recommendations

3. It is recommended that the Executive Board:
 - (a) Agrees that:
 - (i) Officers should work up and assess options for a package of physical demand management measures.
 - (ii) These measures should make the best use of the limited road space and capacity in Cambridge, in order to improve bus reliability, cycling and walking, particularly within the designated Air Quality Management Area (see map in Appendix C).
 - (iii) No further work is undertaken on the package of six peak-time congestion control points consulted upon.
 - (b) Agrees that officers should continue to work up and assess options for the other seven elements of the eight-point plan consulted on, including:
 - (i) A Workplace Parking Levy: Co-design a workplace parking levy (WPL) scheme with employers with more detail available for Board and public review later in 2017:
 1. To work with individual employers and groups of employers during 2017 on the details of the scheme.
 2. To determine the local transport priorities that will receive the revenue raised, building on employer evidence of transport needs and coordinated with Council infrastructure planners.
 3. To be coordinated with and if feasible form a part of the City Deal and the Local Enterprise Partnership's broader engagement with the business community.
 4. The roll-out to include practical support for employers looking to manage their parking demand in advance of the levy coming into effect.

5. It is recommended that as far as possible, the Cambridge WPL should resemble the Nottingham template. However, there will need to be agreement on how to charge, the price, its geographical extent, exemptions and how it will be administered and enforced.
- (ii) On-Street Parking Controls: Note that the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (CJAC) is considering whether to recommend changes to parking policy in Cambridge and subject to business case, the City Deal would fund consultation on new residents' parking zones and the costs of implementation.
 - (iii) Improved Public Space and Air Quality: Agrees that officers should:
 1. Assess the possibility of establishing a Clean Air Zone and the potential for the introduction of a pollution charge in central Cambridge within the existing Air Quality Management Area. Key criteria for assessing this should be its impacts on: health; the local environment, including air quality and public realm; bus reliability and cycling; business and the economy; deliverability and value for money.
 2. Ensure that initiatives to improve city centre access should continue to consider opportunities for improving the city centre experience and economy and that this should be coordinated with other work across the Partnership that has similar objectives, including planning policy.
 - (iv) Better Bus Services and Expanded Park & Ride: Agrees that officers should continue work to identify how to reduce bus delays on key bus routes by engaging bus operators and finalising the Bus Network Review.
 - (v) Better Pedestrian and Cycling Infrastructure: Agrees that officers should continue to work with other partners to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.
 - (vi) Travel Planning: Agrees that officers should continue to work with Travel for Cambridgeshire to support employers to adopt sustainable policies and practices with regard to travel to work and travel during work.
 - (vii) Smart Technology: Agrees that officers should continue to work with Connecting Cambridgeshire to develop smart technology solutions.
- (c) Agrees that officers, with partner assistance, should deliver a City Access communication and engagement plan to support these recommendations if agreed. It is recommended that the plan focuses on communicating:
- (i) Factual information about the vision for the future;
 - (ii) Statistics and research results;
 - (iii) The need for a package of complementary measures to ensure productivity growth without commensurate growth in congestion;
 - (iv) How we are developing workable solutions by designing them in partnership with those who will be impacted.
 - (v) The plan will also set out how the City Access programme fits into the broader plan for city centre revitalisation, and the wider City Deal transport vision and housing plan.

- (d) To take these recommendations forward, it is proposed that work on the individual elements of the City Centre access work be developed through a series of delivery plans. Proposed plans are:
- (i) Bus improvement delivery plan
 - (ii) Communications and engagement delivery plan
 - (iii) Cycling provision delivery plan
 - (iv) Demand management delivery plan
 - (v) Parking management delivery plan including a workplace parking levy and on-street parking controls
 - (vi) Public space & air quality delivery plan including pedestrian infrastructure
 - (vii) Smart technology delivery plan
 - (viii) Travel planning delivery plan

Reasons for Recommendations

4. The public and stakeholder consultation undertaken July-October 2016 found there to be a range of views on the best options to reduce peak time congestion in the city, and specific views on what would and would not be acceptable. The Consultation Report is being published to accompany this Board Report. A summary of the results are included in Appendix B. The key findings are:
- Recognition that doing nothing is not an acceptable option.
 - Widespread support for action to:
 - Improve air quality
 - Make buses a more viable option.
 - Differing views on the best demand management measures:
 - Public opinion is (and will likely remain) divided, as no one measure will benefit everyone equally.
 - The concept of six peak-time congestion control points to restrict all vehicles except buses and cycles raised significant and valid concerns, although there was some support for it.
 - There is support for but also some opposition to both a workplace parking levy, and to further on-street parking controls.
 - Congestion charging was not consulted on directly but a small minority of respondents called for it to be a part of the options considered.

Background

5. The City Deal is seeking to secure the future of Greater Cambridge as a leading UK and global hub for research and technology, support economic growth and improve quality of life for residents of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The role of the City Access programme of measures is to direct City Deal investment to:
- Achieve economic growth without commensurate growth in congestion.
 - Expand the people-carrying capacity of the transport system in central Cambridge.
 - Enhance the quality of the experience of accessing central Cambridge.

- Enhance the quality of place in the city centre as impacted by transport.
- Deliver the objectives agreed in June 2016 (reproduced in Appendix A) prepared following the 'Call for Evidence'.
- Assess options for delivery using the sifting criteria prepared for the 'Call for Evidence' (see Appendix A).

Considerations

6. Congestion and the unreliability of bus services has been worsening steadily in Cambridge and forecasts show that with no action, this will continue with significant extra travel delays expected. There are no easy solutions to this problem and whilst the consultation has demonstrated that the majority of respondents believe something has to be done, Board members should be aware that this will require changes to the travel patterns (such as route, time and/or mode of travel) of a significant number of residents of Cambridge and those travelling into the City. The scale of benefits that can be achieved will be closely related to the extent of the changes introduced.

Options

7. The recommendations presented here have been chosen because it is considered they can deliver the City Deal objectives.
8. Fiscal demand management measures are an alternative option but at this stage, without ruling out future fiscal measures completely, the recommendation asks for priority to be given to the progression of physical measures given their relative speed and ease of implementation.
9. A significant amount of work would be needed to develop a fiscal demand management scheme, with costs in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, possibly more to develop a scheme for consultation¹. Designing and implementing a congestion charging scheme would need significant input from specialist consultants, with a cost and a delivery timeframe that is difficult to estimate given the need to satisfy the requirements of the Secretary of State. Congestion charging was also only raised by a minority of respondents to the consultation.
10. For these reasons, and at this stage, fiscal demand management, other than an assessment of the potential for a Clean Air Zone, is not recommended for further development.

Legal Implications

11. The introduction of a road user charging scheme in Cambridge is not within the control of local partners. Under the Transport Act 2000², an order from the UK Secretary of State for Transport is required to implement any form of road user charging and a public inquiry could be mandated. An order of this kind would be required if the Board opted to take forward:
 - Any fiscal demand management measures to reduce congestion, such as a cordon charge or a charge for movement within a congested zone. Excess

¹ The expenditure on the Transport Innovation Fund congestion charging scheme and model refresh was several million pounds, although subsequent developments would reduce costs this time around, they would remain significant.

² <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/38/part/III>

revenue above that required to operate the scheme is required to be ring fenced for spending on local transport priorities. And/or

- Any fiscal air pollution reduction measures, such as a charge to enter or drive within a Clean Air Zone. Current draft legislation relating to the introduction of Clean Air Zones indicates that charges will be set locally but at a level recommended by central government who will seek to ensure that they are at “an appropriate level to address air quality issues without the potential for excessive revenue raising”³.

12. In contrast to road user charging schemes, there is more local control over the introduction of a workplace parking levy. The Transport Act 2000 does not specify procedures for publishing workplace parking levy scheme orders nor for the making and consideration of objections to such proposals. There are also no specific requirements in the Transport Act 2000 for public consultation on these schemes. In the case of Nottingham, the Secretary of State was satisfied with the local public consultation exercise, the consideration of alternatives (including road user charging and supplementary business rates) presented at the Examination in Public and as a result believed that a Public Inquiry was not justified.

Financial Implications

13. The creation of teams to work up the eight delivery plans listed in paragraph 4 will require additional resources to those currently secured which will have an impact on the spending profile. The City Access team is planning to take the lead on three of the eight delivery plans:
- (a) Communications and Engagement Delivery Plan. Two out of the six people in the City Access team are dedicated full time to leading this Plan. No additional spending planned.
 - (b) Demand Management Delivery Plan. The City Access team is leading on this plan with consultant support. No additional spending on additional staff currently planned.
 - (c) Parking Management Delivery Plan (encompassing the workplace parking levy and expanding existing on-street parking controls). A dedicated team of two additional FTEs would allow us to proactively push the design, consultation and delivery of a scheme. This will have an impact on the City Access programme spend profile.

Four City Access team members have a support role on the remaining five delivery plans covering: Bus Improvements; Cycling Provision; Public Space & Air Quality; Smart Technology and Travel Planning. We are advising our lead delivery partners that they add dedicated City Access resources into their teams to deliver the City Deal programme. This will have an impact on their team spend profiles with spend being attributed to City Access and other City Deal projects.

³ https://consult.defra.gov.uk/airquality/implementation-of-cazs/supporting_documents/161012%20%20Consultation%20Document%20%20FINAL.pdf

Consultation Responses and Communication

14. Board members should consider the following piece of evidence:
- Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge Consultation Report, November 2016

Background Papers

15. Board members should consider the following piece of evidence:
- Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge Consultation Report, November 2016

Report Author: Hilary Holden – Lead Officer, City Access. City Deal
Telephone: 01223 475922
Email: hilary.holden@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Appendix A – Objectives and Option Sifting Criteria

City Deal Transport Strategy Objectives

The City Deal transport vision is that it should be easy to get into, out of, and around Cambridge by public transport, by bike and on foot.

The objectives, agreed in June 2016, are:

- To ensure transport in Greater Cambridge supports economic growth and the continuation of the Cambridge Phenomenon.
- To bring about a step change in the quality and reliability of public transport in Greater Cambridge by tackling congestion, investing in the infrastructure needed for quicker, more reliable public transport journeys and working in partnership with public transport providers.
- To reallocate road capacity to public transport, cycling and walking to encourage journeys using these modes and reduce traffic volumes.
- To encourage continued growth in the numbers of people cycling in and into Greater Cambridge.
- To use the opportunities that road space reallocation, congestion reduction, and infrastructure projects offer to improve air quality, the public realm and the historic and natural environment.

To achieve this vision, and with a 'do-nothing' forecast growth in journeys of about 30% by 2031, there needs to be a reduction in peak hour vehicular traffic of 10-15% from 2011 levels. To lock in the benefits, the released road network capacity will need to be captured (saving it from inducing new vehicular trips) and reallocated for the benefit of bus users, cyclists and pedestrians.

City Access Options Assessment – Sifting Criteria

The following sifting criteria have been agreed for the assessment of options for City Access, as established in the 2016 Cambridge Access Study:

- Fairness – what is the impact on people in different income brackets and those in Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and outside Greater Cambridge, including commuters?
- Effectiveness – how much will it improve City Centre Access and reduce congestion? Will the effects be short-or long-term, will they be effective in both the morning and evening peak?
- Value for money – affordability, costs and benefits from implementation, to include ongoing costs as well as one-offs and whether it is affordable with City Deal (capital) funding.
- Economic impact – on City Centre vibrancy and on business and other economic activity.
- Dependencies and broader benefits – would other measures be needed to maximise effectiveness? Does this impact on whether it can be introduced in the short term or long term? Could it complement, or detract from, other objectives?
- Implementation – can it be implemented and if so would positive impacts be expected in a City deal tranche 1 timescale? What is the extent of the practical challenges to delivery, and in what timescale is delivery feasible?

All of the above criteria will also need to be considered in the context of:

- Whether proposals would be acceptable to the public over the Greater Cambridge area and beyond?
- What other measures might be required to achieve acceptability? and
- What is the consequential impact on the implementation timeframe?

Appendix B – Summary of Survey Findings

Scale of response

- The engagement for Tackling Peak-time Congestion ran from 11th July to 10th October 2016. This used an awareness-raising engagement model and was led by the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership.
- Respondents were asked to submit their opinions on eight proposals.

Who responded?

- In total, 10,970 officially logged responses were received. Of these, there were 803 paper survey responses, 8,770 online survey responses, 862 emails, and 8 letters, as well as 377 social media comments (through Facebook and Twitter) and 150 verbal communications (phone calls, briefing events etc.).
- There were three petitions submitted in reference to this consultation, with a total of 10,590 signatures.
- The respondents were situated across the whole of the East of England, as well as from areas further afield, such as Kent, Worcestershire and Surrey
- The majority (27.3%) of respondents identified themselves as being between the ages of 35-44, followed closely by those aged 45-54 (26.3%). The age groups with the fewest respondents are the Under-17 (0.4%) and 75 and above (1.9%) groups.
- Of the respondents, 7,664 were categorised as Economically Active, 1,418 were categorised as Economically inactive, and 140 were categorised as Other.
- 7.3% of all respondents identified themselves as having a disability that influenced the way they travel.
- The majority of respondents identified themselves, and were thusly categorised, as Personal transport users (71.1%), closely followed by Active users (70.7%). Smaller numbers were Passengers (16.4%) and users of Other modes of travel (1.4%). Some respondents said they used multiple modes of transport.

What was said?

- The most preferred proposal was the introduction of better pedestrian and cycling facilities with 43.8% of respondents saying it would improve their journey.
- The least preferred options were the introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points and a Workplace Levy, with 64.5% and 40.6% of respondents respectively claiming it would worsen their journey.
- 68.3% of respondents said they would not change the way they travel in response to the proposals. 45.2% said they would change their behaviour in some way.⁴
- About one third of all respondents (32.5%) said that, if the proposals were introduced, they would change to public transport. 23.2% said they would switch to active modes of travel.
- 59.4% of respondents said the proposals would have an impact on their journey compared to 17.6% who thought the proposals would not impact their journey.
- Many respondents used the free-text questions to comment that they were not clear on some of the options given within the survey, including what the nature of Travel Planning and Smart Technology would be (Q2) and some suggested that a congestion charge should be introduced as a preferable alternative to the proposed

⁴ Percentages are calculated from the total 9,573 respondents. The percentages equal to over 100% due to the question design. Respondents could use the free text box for “other choices” as well as tick one previous option, and some respondents used just the free text option.

options, or that it should be considered. Some of these though a congestion charge should only apply to non-residents.

- Other forms of communication were analysed, including comments made verbally, via social media and through petitions. A range of topics arose, including concerns around pollution becoming more concentrated in residential areas, concerns that business critical deliveries had not been taken into account, worries that people will be prevented from accessing/leaving their homes during peak times, and concern that the needs of disabled citizens have not been taken into account, to name a few.

What conclusions can be drawn?

- Respondents concerns converged on the proposed peak-time congestion control points (PCCPs). It is clear that there are some valid concerns relating to air pollution on busier streets, worries that people would be prevented from accessing/leaving their homes and businesses during peak times, and concern that the needs of disabled citizens have not been taken into account.
- A majority of respondents (65%) felt that the package of six PCCPs proposed would worsen their journeys. A third of these respondents walked and/or cycled (36%) and thought PCCPs would worsen their journeys, and only 19% thought PCCPs would improve their journeys.
- What is clear is that people want alternative concepts to PCCPs developed that boost bus reliability and the quality of the environment and air in the city centre. This could be achieved by prioritising buses, bikes and pedestrians, in effect an extension of the core traffic management scheme in the historic centre.
- Also controversial were the proposals for a workplace parking levy and a roll-out of further on-street parking controls.
- The consultation did not present alternatives to the public and as a result, some respondents (6%) mentioned a congestion charge in their free text responses on the survey form. Most of these respondents asked for congestion charging to be considered as well as or instead of elements of the proposed eight-point plan, although the details of who would be charged were not clear.

Appendix C – Map of Areas within the Air Quality Management Area

