

Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly – 18 January 2017

Notice of public questions

1) Dr Joanna Gomula

To ask this question under agenda item 7

To the Joint Assembly and Executive Board:

I have reviewed the documents referred to in your e-mail. You promise that there will be "better public transport" when the proposal is implemented. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find any specific proposals to guarantee this.

There are many services, and individual companies and persons - ambulances, school deliveries, disabled travellers, airport transfer companies - that should be exempted from the restrictions. **Where can one find a list of such exemptions? How and where can someone, for example a disabled person or an airport transfer company, apply for an exemption?**

Answer

The recommendations made to the Executive Board by officers are asking for their support for further work to be undertaken to develop further the 8-point plan for tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge. Elements of the plan include:

- Physical demand management measures - it is envisaged that only buses and emergency vehicles would be exempt from some of the restrictions.
- Workplace parking levy - exemptions have not yet been decided for a future scheme in Cambridge, but for the existing scheme in Nottingham the exemptions are detailed in Section 3 of this document: <http://documents.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/download/1233 section 3>. In Nottingham any workplace parking places occupied by registered disabled Blue Badge Holders need to be licensed but get a 100% discount from any charge.
- On-street parking controls - disabled parking bays are and will continue to be provided near key destinations and outside houses where the existing criteria for a marked on-street space are satisfied.

6) Cathy Michell

To ask this question under agenda item 7

As a Cambridge resident I am very disappointed to hear that the traffic restrictions at rush hour that I thought had been agreed on have now been ditched because of protests. I believe that there will always be protests about trying to restrict car use in a city, just as there were about pedestrianisation years back (now taken for granted!). Councils simply need to lead in a brave and visionary manner. But something radical has to happen soon. This is because of gross (and illegal) air pollution in our streets and also potential grid lock in the centre as Cambridge continues to expand. Now government money is coming our way, can the following be considered, perhaps again!?

- Congestion charging between certain hours
- Requiring all private schools in centre to bus their pupils to Park and Ride (we experience much less traffic out of school term!)

- Making 'Park and Ride' much cheaper and more effectively promoted. (Set up a council run service of mini buses to challenge Stagecoach)
- New railway stations or light transport routes. e.g. Addenbrookes and to Cambourne and other new towns into Cambridge.
- Bus subsidies – get help of large and wealthy private companies, e.g. Microsoft and Astra Zeneka
- 'Boris bikes' available and easy to access, as in many European cities, e.g. Barcelona
- More and improved cycle paths that are well maintained long-term (Hills Road near station and Botanical Gardens is a disgrace)
- Closing all city centre car parks except to disabled drivers and those with electric cars
- Extending pedestrian-only areas beyond present boundaries
- Tree-planting and landscaping to help improve air quality and ethos of city centre.

Answer

These are some helpful ideas. We plan to consider the practicality of introducing some or all of these as we develop further the delivery plans that are recommended in the officer report to the Executive Board.

7) Aylmer Johnson

To ask this question under agenda item 7

It is encouraging to see that the Council's City Deal includes plans for orbital bus routes, which will greatly improve the city's public transport network – however the main benefit will only be realised if the existing 'radial' routes are made straighter (especially citi 1), and if 'oyster' cards are introduced to allow all passengers to change buses easily.

Does the Council have any plans to introduce either of these measures?

Answer

The opportunities and barriers to better integration of travel ticket purchasing are currently being investigated as part of the City Deal Smart Cambridge workstream, as outlined in the "First Steps to Intelligent Mobility" proposal that was approved by the City Deal Executive Board in July 2016 (the document can be found here: <http://tinyurl.com/z9862xc>).

12) Robin Pellew – Cambridge Past Present & Future

To ask this question under agenda item 7

CambridgePPF welcomes the recommendation that the Peak-Time Control Points should be dropped. However, with the removal of the main congestion-reducing element, we are concerned that the rest of the package will be insufficiently robust to address the congestion problem in the long-term. The Work-Place Parking Levy is principally a fund-raising mechanism, so the effectiveness of the rest of the package will depend largely on whether agreement can be reached with local communities for on-street parking regulations to deter commuter parking.

Ever since the time of the Cambridge Transport Commission back in 2009 we have pressed for the introduction of some form of congestion charge as the only effective

means of addressing the congestion problem. As the City Deal's own consultants have already advised, and I quote, "...no other demand measure is likely to be as effective (as a congestion charge) in reducing congestion, delivering mode shift, and increasing transport revenue for Cambridge." To deny this option seems to us to be irresponsible.

We now have a proposal for a 'pollution charge' but zero clarity as to what it is or how it would be implemented. Whether this pollution charge might be combined with, or even replace, a congestion charge remains unclear until we receive elaboration from the City Deal.

So my Question is: **will the City Deal Assembly recommend that the Executive Board should instruct Officers to work up the measures in the proposed Access and Congestion package as proposed in Agenda Item 7 whilst at the same time ask the Board to develop elaborate what this pollution charge comprises and how it would be applied?**

Answer

- It is an officer recommendation that the introduction of six peak-time congestion control points is not progressed further. Rather, further work be progressed on an alternative package of physical demand management measures. Hence there is no removal of the main congestion-reducing element of the 8-point plan.
- In relation to the specific question of the Assembly, this further work forms the officer recommendation to the Board that the Assembly is considering in advance.

4) Carolyn Postgate

To group this with questions 10, 13 & 14

At the Joint Assembly Meeting September 29th 2016 you committed to making a decision on your preferred Park & Ride locations, 1, 2, 3 and Scotland Farm. You asked the Officers to produce a side-by-side analysis of the sites so that you could make an informed decision. My questions are:

- a. When Andy Williams of AstraZeneca asked for a simple side-by-side analysis, **why did the officers not disclose to the Assembly the Atkins Report on Park & Ride locations dated September 2015?**
- b. **Has the Assembly had sight of the Atkins Report before now?**
- c. Given the strength of feeling against site 3 on 29 September, **does the Assembly have the courage to recommend that site 3 should be excluded from further consideration?**

10) Alistair Burford

To be grouped with question 4, 13 and 14

We became aware of the officers preferred location for a P & R site, Crome Lea farm in September 2016. Prior to this date, there was no indication that Crome Lea was even a consideration as all documents referred to Madingley Mulch. In November 2016, I met with Messrs Heller and Shepherd and asked why their preferred P&R site at Crome Lea Farm had not been clearly marked on the consultation documents or the GCCD board reports until **September 2016**. The Officers stated that the site had not been identified until later in the year as they were only working to a principle of a site being located to the south of Madingley Mulch.

I subsequently made a FOI request and have been provided with an Atkins report

dated **September 2015** ' Park and Ride Locations' which clearly identifies Crome Lea Farm as the southern site and is a document that has not been made available to the public or the LLF.

In recent correspondence, officers have stated that the Atkins Report is a technical feasibility study that informed the consultation that was carried out in late 2015.

My questions are;

a. Given that the officers state that the Atkins report 'informed the consultation' that was carried out in late 2015, why was site 3, Crome Lea Farm not disclosed as part of the public consultation?

b. Does the Assembly think that if the Crome Lea had been clearly identified at the public consultation that the objections to the site would have been far greater?

c. I have concerns about the report that was sent to me. I have made further FOI requests in an attempt to retrieve the original version and the revised version of the report, but my requests have not been successful. Could officers explain why the reports have been withheld?

d. As the consultation excluded some vital information about the location of site 3, does the Assembly agree that the consultation conducted in November 2015 was flawed and failed to meet the principles of a fair and transparent consultation?

13) Stephen Coates

To group this question with 4, 10 and 14 under agenda item 4

Landowners are clearly having a huge input in terms of formulating a route for the A428 busway. The Cambourne developers will now give the City Deal £8.7m towards the corridor. We have still not received any answer from Cambridge University as one of the landowners saying building over the West Fields could provide land and financing to the busway. **Given Cambridge University had detailed information from Atkins on the potential park and ride sites before the October 2015 consultation, which enabled them to formalise a detailed consultation response, why was this information not disclosed to the local community at the same time?**

Secondly, why are officers saying that the local community is not entitled to any information now on the extensive discussions with landowners and developers when this is clearly having a huge impact on routing and funding of the busway - what about democratic oversight?

Thirdly, how can the Assembly allow officers to insist that the best strategic outcome is a greenfield busway whilst avoiding answering questions (as they did at the Atkins meeting) by saying detailed work is not complete yet?

Does selective release of information to privileged parties show that this argument is highly misleading and just an expedient way of making it harder for the community to challenge poor proposals (especially when they do not get the same information)?.

How can the officers select an option that could cost £207m and yet keep saying that the detailed work is not yet done?

Does this not therefore add up to evidence of predetermination and therefore should the Assembly not challenge this in a robust way, especially given the poor business case of the busway?

Given clear evidence of predetermination, should the Assembly not question the Board about its management of conflicts of interest in relation to Cambridge University?

14) Chris Pratten

To group this question with 4, 10 and 13 under agenda item 4

A recent Freedom of Information request uncovered an Atkins report from September 2015 (A428 Western Corridor Study: Park and Ride Locations) which was only shared with City Deal Partners. We have requested that City Deal officers immediately release all documents and reports produced by Atkins regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor. This request was made at a meeting organised with City Deal officers and Atkins representatives. A subsequent request by email from a representative of Save The West Fields was also refused, in a manner implying an even more hardline approach to information sharing than was in evidence at the Atkins meeting.

Will the Assembly recommend that officers be asked to immediately produce and publish a list of all documents and reports produced by Atkins and other consultants regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor?

Answer to 4, 10, 13 and 14

Answer

The Aitkins Report dated September 2015 was an initial feasibility report and was drafted in advance of the public consultation undertaken later in 2015. Its purpose was to support the approach taken in the consultation which was, as will be recalled to consult on where a P&R would be best located in terms of overall strategic objectives. However given that at that early stage all of the route options were still being assessed no specific site could be identified – only a broad location e.g. close to Madingley Mulch roundabout. As has been set out before, the key determinant to the best location of the P&R would be the integration with the bus priority measures which the P&R serves. The purpose of the September report was not to provide a detailed analysis of the different P&R options in terms of any final scheme, but rather to ensure that there were feasible locations at the A428/A1303 interchange in order that this option could be confidently offered to the public for comment.

Offering specific sites for public consultation in September 2015 would have been pre-emptive - primarily because the sites would need to be combined with the potential alignments in order to make any sense. As such peoples choices on the P&R site would have been constrained by their favoured route which in asking people to assess two what if questions. That would be very difficult to expect people to respond to and may have discouraged people responding. The alternative would have been for specific sites to be offered irrespective of the route chosen by the respondent but this then would have resulted in incompatible combinations. As such it was considered that at this early conceptual stage of the consultation a very straightforward separate question about P&R sites position around the roundabout would be a better approach in order to understand issues and constraints.

The report itself was a 'draft' and is now subject for further revision based on the instruction of the Board on 13th October to consider specific P&R sites (site 4) and compare and contrast with Scotland Farm. The report did not refer to the Catchment Areas which were only agreed over 1 year later by the Board for further analysis. Given that as stated the key strategic consideration for the P&R site was its relationship with the Catchment Area, publishing the September 2015 draft prior to the Catchment Areas being agreed would have resulted in a fragmented and non strategic approach to identifying the best site.

It is important to stress that the process of site identification is based on ongoing refinement of knowledge of the issues. Chrome Lea was identified as a possibly feasible site in the draft September 2015 report but at that stage no alignment or even catchment area existed and therefore to suggest that it had been 'chosen' then

is incorrect. Chrome Lea was at that point no more the 'preferred option' than any of the other sites and that only once further detail of the routes themselves was understood could a recommendation be made on the P&R site.

Officers stress that the consultation purpose was not to identify any specific sites. The consultation map conveyed conceptual ideas in terms of where – in relation to the roundabout – people would prefer to see a P&R. There was no detail on how close to the roundabout the P&R would be. The detail of the specific site is to be set out in the next consultation planned to be held in late 2017 and this consultation will include detailed information about the P&R site and the issues which are of concern to allow for an informed debate to be had.

Officers have been hold a series of meetings with stakeholders and have been responded to FOI requests as received as well as providing significant explanations in separate correspondents. Reports are not being 'withheld' but requests for 'drafts' (that is unfinished papers which are not generally quality controlled) may not always fall under the requirement for disclosure. Officers have released drafts (for example the aforementioned 2015 report) but do need to ensure that all requests are complied with in line with the councils information management protocols and in consideration of the professional position of the technical consultant. Officers have undertaken to provide further information on the internet site on earlier reports and this is in process. Officers are unsure where the assertion comes from that they have said that the public is not entitled to information.

The overall issue is primarily developing a clear understanding of what information informs which stage of the decision making process. At the earliest stage for a scheme of this scale and scope, it is clear that it would highly inefficient and time consuming to collect detail information about outline concepts. As officers have explained on numerous occasions at public meetings, detailed information must be well grounded and based on effective analysis. As such detail is only developed once a clear strategic direction is established. This is in line with Transport Assessment Guidance as endorsed by government. The logic of this approach is entirely clear. It is simply incorrect to suggest that strategic decisions are invalid if not backed up by significant detail. In fact it can be argued that at the strategic level, detail can be distracting from the key objectives. The direction of travel should be established first before further investigations are justified. This also reflects the decisions taken by the Board to date. Again no 'site has been chosen' for a P&R but officers have made the case that specific sites should be investigated further and that the outcomes of those investigations should be presented to the Board at a later date.

Officers are not aware of selective information releases. Cambridge University have had no part in the project development beyond a number of officer technical meetings to allow for the project to understand the potential for integration of any scheme via the West Cambridge development. A number of courtesy meetings have also been held with landowners along the corridor including some colleges as well as other landowners. It is incorrect to claim that Cambridge University had any access to the draft September 2015 report which was not provided to them.

15) Robin Heydon – Camcycle

To be asked under agenda item 6

We are concerned that the forward plan shows a March agenda item for the city deal design guide but we have not seen any consultation on this document or any process for commenting on it.

Could you inform the public how they should comment on this document such that those comments can be considered before the March meetings?

To be asked under agenda item 7

We welcome the summary of findings for the city access. We note that the most preferred proposal was the introduction of better pedestrian and cycling facilities with 43.8% of respondents saying it would improve their journey. We support the introduction of work place parking levy and on-street parking controls as we believe these will have the most benefits for increasing the use of public transport and cycling, and also provide a revenue stream to help provide better public transport and improve pedestrian and cycling facilities in the city deal area. We also note that the reallocation of road space on Hills Road has doubled the number of people cycling.

Doesn't the Hills Road cycle scheme prove that when high quality cycling facilities are provided that they will be used?

When will the city deal extend these benefits to other main roads, and reallocate road space on other main roads for people walking and cycling?

Answer

For agenda item 6

The same questions has been asked by the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations (FECRA) and it was confirmed that there will be no consultation externally on this guide as no agreement was reached to do so, and it does not change current policy.

For agenda item 7

We plan to consider the practicality of introducing some or all of these as we develop further the delivery plans that are recommended in the officer report to the Executive Board.

5) Allan Treacy

To group this with questions 16 & 17.

This Question relates to the City Deal's preferred option for an off road route from Madingley Mulch roundabout through Coton Village to the M11 bridge.

The Joint Assembly and City Deal appears not to have taken the views of the community regarding the environmentally destructive off road option seriously and given fair weighting to these views in the analysis of the consultation. The off-road option appears to still the only option on the table as evidenced by a request for us to participate in workshops to assess landscaping mitigation schemes for this option before the outcome of a feasibility study to look at an on road option down Madingley Hill and onto the existing M11 bridge is published.

As a result of discussions at the September Joint Assembly a decision was made at the October Executive Board meeting to look at the feasibility of an on- road solution down Madingley Hill and over the M11 bridge. Joint Assembly members may not have been aware that there was an Atkins report dated June 2016 stating that the M11 bridge was able to take a dedicated busway.

For reasons we do not comprehend the City Deal Executive Board decided that the study should only examine the feasibility of adding bus lanes in both directions along

Madingley Rise, when congestion is only a problem for eastbound traffic on work day mornings.

Our question is: With the topographical study on the Madingley Rise on road busway option having been completed, **why has the feasibility study not yet been completed and by what date will it be available?**

16) Amanda Fuller

To group this question with 5 and 17 under agenda item 4

Given that Option 3/3A for the West Cambridge busway was opposed by the majority of people in the consultation, given that the economic case for this option has more holes in it than a crocheted blanket, given that this option will be hugely environmentally destructive, given that this option represents very poor value for money and given that a Park & Ride on Madingley Hill can only be described as a blot on the landscape, **does the Joint Assembly endorse the Executive Board's decision to choose this as the preferred option over the more cost effective and environmentally sensitive on-road scheme proposed by the LLF?**

17) Roger Tomlinson – Coton Resident

To group this question with 5 and 16 under agenda item 4

I have been assured that the City Deal take seriously the need to address and answer questions from the public. Given the requirement for three working days notice, I trust that means questions can be answered in the meeting for which they are intended, in this case the Joint Assembly on the 18th.

I asked a detailed question at the Executive Board on 13 October 2016 about the basis of the "Strategic Economic Appraisal of the A428-A1303 Bus Scheme" for selecting Option 3/3A as the preferred route for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway.

The response received, some 12 days after the meeting it should have been considered in, from Jo Harrall, essentially did not answer the question but referred me back to the original documentation I was querying. There are two key phrases in the answer: "The 780 jobs are what we believe to be attributable" (note the word "believe") and "this is not a mathematical forecasting exercise".

We have submitted the "Strategic Economic Appraisal" to detailed analysis by people experienced in evaluating for HM Government such schemes and cases, and they confirm the serious weaknesses in the appraisal that the City Deal Assembly and Board appear to have accepted. The weaknesses are compounded by what are fatal flaws to their apparent 'guesstimates'. Throughout Option 3 is compared to Option 1, except Option 1 is not presented based on bus priority measures or accurate bus journey times or correct information about the status and potential improvement at the Junction 13 M11 bridge. Throughout the figures appear to have been wrongly skewed to favour Option 3/3A with no explanation or justification. Throughout there is no allowance for deadweight or displacement in terms of jobs created: very important when the consultants quoted emphasise that "identifying the extent of causality and assessing against conventional metrics (creation of new jobs and the construction of new houses) is very difficult and uncertain. This is the case in Cambridge".

There is in practice very little difference between the cost/benefit of the options once you strip out the inaccuracies and complete the calculations correctly, and Option 3 emerges as worst value for money.

Can the Joint Assembly members confirm that they have read the “Strategic Economic Appraisal” and understood it?

Assuming the answer is Yes, what is their view of them being supplied seriously misleading and inaccurate and incomplete information? And what action do they propose in relation to the officers who supplied it?

Will the Joint Assembly insist that officers go back and re-develop the economic case on the correct basis?

Answer to questions 5, 16 & 17

A topographical survey and highway boundary map has been provided to the Local Liaison Forum and published on line before Christmas. The Local Liaison Forum were asked for their views on ‘preferred approaches’ for bus priority designs along Madingley Road given that they had previously presented concept plans to the public LLF meeting in September 2016. Officers were instructed by the Board to consider the potential feasibility of a segregated 2 way busway and cycle track within the highway boundary on Madingley Road. Officers have also sought to be proactive in considering other potential scenarios even though these have not been specified by the LLF. This process of conceptual design does take time and is in addition to the other Board instructions to investigate the off road alignments to the south of Madingley Road and P&R options. Officers anticipate that the initial results of the feasibility design review will be available for the proposed Local Liaison Forums in early February.

Officers have provided a series of answers explaining the Option 1 and the role of the J13 Bridge in that option and have made clear that the possible provision of a one way bus lane over the J13 Bridge has only been tested at the most elemental level on a structural engineering and traffic management basis and in addition to that the provision of such a lane would not have changed the strategic case in relation to Option 1 which had already assumed buses would obtain priority up to the Bridge. The Economic Case published in October 2016 has been developed in compliance with Department for Transport Assessment Guidance in line with Treasury Green Book requirements. The Economic Case has been tested and quality assured by the commissioned consultants. The basis of the Economic Case and methodology is set out in the published reports. As was made clear in the report, the Economic Case – at this stage is more informed by the Strategic Case rather than visa versa. This is because given the relatively low level of detailed scheme information on specific costs and benefits (e.g. construction costs, traffic management issues, bus service patterns, environmental mitigation) the key reliance is on the established policy objectives. Given that the decision made in October 2016 was not to pursue one option for construction but rather to assess an option in more detail where the Economic Case will be refined, this is entirely consistent with the recommended approach to major transport scheme development.

As part of the Strategic Case, officers also published an assessment of Wider Economic Benefits. This assessment was undertaken using a method already used by other local authorities to engage with the Department for Transport on capturing the economic benefits of transport schemes which are not only attributable to direct users of the scheme. This approach is now becoming more mainstream in terms of scheme assessment and the Department for Transport has recently updated its guidance on it.

The capturing of wider economic benefits in particularly really reflects a much wider strategic horizon regarding the impact of the scheme. Although journey times do form one part of the consideration, further key considerations also revolve around the reliability and capacity of the infrastructure and very crucially the permanence of it.

The potential provision of a new dedicated regional transit route along the A428 corridor was considered within the report to be a major driver of investment and growth.

Journey time estimates within the October report were based on strategic modelling assumptions. This does limit the extent to which specific point to point journeys can be fully measured, particularly given that there are many variables which will impact 'real world' journey time including the congestion on the road network which can only be fully understood using detailed traffic modelling which would form part of the detailed final scheme assessment. Nevertheless the journey times provided in the October report have been based on a fair and comparable basis. Officers do not accept they were presented to favour option 3/3a and in fact unreliability which could further impact Option 1 was not highlighted to the full extent due to the lack of an agreed measure of reliability.

During the current phase of scheme development officers are seeking to refine journey time estimates for both Option 1 and Option 3/3a and will discuss the approach to measuring and comparing journey times with the Local Liaison Forum.

18) Lynn Hieatt

To consider this under agenda item 7

I have asked many questions about the City Deal's genuine commitment to tackling congestion, as opposed to spending vast sums on heavy-engineering projects to allow buses to circumnavigate it.

It is encouraging to see that the City Deal Executive Board have now agreed in principle to 'fund consultation on new residents parking zones and the costs of implementation'. However, we have yet to see anything to 'consult' on; even after a full year of work, the joint County/City committee charged with reviewing city parking controls have not yet agreed on a proposal. This may or may not happen in the next few weeks. Their proposal, which may have been published in draft before this Assembly meeting, may or may not be a city-wide solution, though the City Deal's commitment is clearly city-wide.

We now have data*: nearly 4,000 cars find free parking spaces in the morning hours on weekdays in neighbourhood streets. The availability of free parking is a magnet for congestion, pollution, danger and inconvenience. It is also a disincentive for people to use what rural bus services there are, or even the park & rides. I feel sure that the Assembly will agree that getting 4,000 cars out of morning traffic is a goal worth achieving.

My question: In advance of any County proposals, will the City Deal Assembly today unambiguously support the principle of (1) a city-wide solution to what is now an uncontrolled parking free-for-all; (2) a scheme designed in partnership with residents and businesses, allowing local flexibility and experiment, so that neighbourhoods can get the system that works for them and supports the City Deal's objective of controlling congestion?

*Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Survey, 2017 [attached]

Answer

- A new Residents' Parking Policy for Cambridgeshire has been developed by a CJAC working group.
- The new Policy and a Cambridge Residents' Parking Extension Delivery Plan are going to CJAC 24th January 2017

- Then to H&CI 14th March– for final approval.
- CJAC is working with City Deal and discussing the principle of City Deal encouraging the increased take-up of residential parking zones in Cambridge by funding the implementation costs.
- Increasing on street parking controls cannot be seen as only solution to tackling congestion as it needs to be part of the bigger picture.

19) Antony Carpen

To consider this under agenda item 4

Please can members - in particular the representatives from Cambridge Regional College and Anglia Ruskin University update the Assembly on what actions they've taken to ensure they are systematically engaging with and getting ideas from young people - in particular in the run up to tranche 2 of funding.

Answer

Anglian Ruskin University have spoken to their Students Union about the City Deal and are happy to try and engage with the wider student body but their experience so far is that this is not a subject which has engendered widespread student engagement and enthusiasm thus far. The Student Union will be asked again how we might best seek to get ideas and inputs from our students.

Cambridge Regional College have also discussed City Deal with its students union but have not yet seen significant levels of student engagement. It will also revisit this with the Student Union as to how we might best obtain student engagement regarding City Deal beyond apprenticeships, which we already promote widely, and which does generate interest and take up.