

6 January 2016

**To: Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:**

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
John Bridge OBE DL	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Professor Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

Dear Sir / Madam

You are invited to attend the next meeting of the **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which will be held in **COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 AND 2, AT THE GUILDHALL, CAMBRIDGE** on **FRIDAY, 15 JANUARY 2016** at **2.00 p.m.**

## AGENDA

	PAGES
1. <b>Apologies for absence</b> To receive any apologies for absence.	
2. <b>Minutes of the previous meeting</b> To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 December 2015 as a correct record.	1 - 8
3. <b>Declarations of interest</b> To receive any declarations of interest by Members of the Executive Board.	
4. <b>Questions by members of the public</b> To receive any questions from members of the public. The standard protocol to be observed by public speakers is attached.	9 - 10
5. <b>Reports and recommendations from the Joint Assembly</b> Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, will be in attendance to present the recommendations from the meeting of the Joint Assembly held on 17 December 2015.	11 - 14
6. <b>Tackling congestion: call for evidence</b> To consider a report by Graham Hughes, Executive Director (Cambridgeshire County Council).	15 - 44
7. <b>Workstream update</b> To consider a report by Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director.	45 - 50
8. <b>Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan</b>	51 - 56

To consider the City Deal Executive Board's Forward Plan, as attached.  
Changes made to the Forward Plan are purposely highlighted in the document using 'tracked changes'.

# Agenda Item 2



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on  
Thursday, 3 December 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

### PRESENT:

#### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
John Bridge OBE	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders CBE	University of Cambridge

#### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in attendance:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Professor Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

#### Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Michaela Eschbach	Form the Future
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, took this opportunity to thank Professor Jeremy Sanders from the University of Cambridge for his significant contributions to the Greater Cambridge City Deal as a Member of the Board. This would be Professor Sanders' last meeting, with Professor Nigel Slater appointed as his replacement representing the University with effect from 1 January 2016.

Having received a nomination from the University of Cambridge to fill a vacant position on the Joint Assembly, the Executive Board **AGREED** to co-opt Dr John Wells, Chief Operating Officer at the Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute, onto the Assembly.

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

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

## **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

### **Statement from Edward Leigh**

Mr Leigh had circulated a report on smart traffic management, which he explained was a system where centrally-controlled traffic signals and sensors regulated the flow of traffic through the city in response to demand. He said that benefits of introducing such a system to the network could include:

- smoother traffic flow, responsive to demand;
- reduced pollution because of less stop-start driving;
- more priority for buses;
- faster and more effective responses to traffic incidents, especially on the A14 and M11 using predetermined responses to sudden increases in traffic on any of the ten radials;
- enabling inbound flow control, which was the name now used for the term 'gating'.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, referred to the call for evidence sessions that were in the process of being held with regard to dealing with congestion in Cambridge. He said that the concept of flow control and other such measures would be included as part of ideas submitted at those sessions. A report on outcomes would be reported to the Joint Assembly on 17 December 2015 and the Executive Board on 15 January 2016, further to which it was likely that proposals would be put forward for further consideration in the Summer.

Councillor Herbert thanked Mr Leigh for his report and said that all responses to the call for evidence sessions would be made available on the City Deal website.

## **5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented his report on recommendations agreed further to the meeting of the Assembly on 13 November 2015.

It was agreed that Councillor Bick would introduce recommendations relating to items on the agenda for this meeting at the relevant part of the meeting.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

## **6. WESTERN ORBITAL - OPTIONS AND APPROVAL TO CONSULT**

The Executive Board considered a report which set out the early development work that had occurred for the Western Orbital project, together with a proposed timetable for further work to link with the emerging A428/A1303 Maddingley Road corridor scheme.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and reminded Executive Board Members that the Western Orbital had not been included in the list of prioritised schemes for tranche one of the City Deal, but was approved for early development as a tranche two scheme. There were strategic links between the Western Orbital and the A428/A1303 schemes, so there was a case for bringing forward work for the Western Orbital in order that full consideration could be given to the preferred option for each scheme.

Mr Walmsley emphasised that the scheme was at a very early stage in its development and presented a map, set out as Figure 1 in the report, providing the key locations within the Western Orbital study area and outlining the merits of the scheme. The report set out provisional options, including high-level key benefits and early estimated indicative costs. It was noted that the purpose of the project at this stage was to test acceptance of the scheme in terms of viability, deliverability, its business case and whether there were any commercial opportunities. A detailed feasibility assessment would form part of the next stage, including a public consultation on the principles of the scheme and further stakeholder engagement.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 13 November 2015. He highlighted the following points agreed with officers during discussion at the meeting in relation to the report:

- it had been confirmed that the prospect of agreement to use the accommodation bridge over the M11 at Junction 11 for buses would be confirmed prior to any initial public consultation;
- officers had agreed to consider how they could explain in the consultation the constraints that existed on varying individual traffic management measures solely to support traffic flow on and off the M11, as they each had a role to play within the broader system;
- a study of home addresses of commuters to the Biomedical Campus had been carried out by employers, showing a concentration in the CB23 and CB24 postcode areas, implicitly strengthening the case for a western orbital bus route. The results of this study would be shared with officers;
- a suggestion was made for bus operators to be invited to meet with the Joint Assembly to discuss their approach to orbital routes of the kind proposed;
- the potential contribution of a Park and Ride site on Huntingdon Road to intercept southbound traffic from the A14 would be evaluated alongside the options identified in the report.

Councillor Bick reported that a number of Joint Assembly Members had expressed support for encouraging cycling from Park and Ride sites or providing additional, specific Park and Cycle points.

In terms of the proposed consultation, even given it was at the initial, conceptual stage, Members of the Assembly indicated that they would like to be satisfied that the above issues were addressed before the consultation was published in order that they could be confident that what was sent out to the public was clear and well explained. He acknowledged that this would cause a slight delay to the start of the consultation, but the Assembly considered this should be tolerable given that the project was expected to be delivered only in tranche 2 and that there would still be sufficient time for development work during tranche 1. The Joint Assembly supported the recommendations contained within the report, subject to the public consultation timetable being amended so that it commenced in the Spring 2016 in order that a draft of the consultation document could be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their February and March

meetings, respectively.

Mr Walmsley confirmed that consideration of a Huntingdon Road Park and Ride site would be included in the consultation as part of the overall package of measures. He highlighted, however, that this would be dependant on Highways England in view of the fact that it owned the A14, although it was noted that this was not directly related to the Western Orbital corridor scheme.

John Bridge, representing the Local Enterprise Partnership, asked for an update on the stand alone project relating to bus priority options for Junction 11 of the M11, which the Board had previously agreed. Mr Walmsley referred to a briefing note within the agenda pack for this meeting and said that officers had been in discussions with Highways England. He gave an assurance that officers were committed to this project and that a great deal of work had been undertaken behind the scenes. Mr Bridge responded and was frustrated with the delay in progressing this project further. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that there were still a number of uncertainties with this project in terms of whether Highways England would agree that it was an acceptable scheme and whether the scheme's business case would be sufficient enough to meet the very strict criteria set by the Department for Transport. He confirmed that a more substantial report would be submitted to the Board as soon as any further information became available.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, in discussing the Joint Assembly's recommendation to delay the consultation, was of the opinion that any further consideration of the consultation document could become restrictive. In view of it being a high-level, conceptual consultation he believed that it should go ahead in accordance with the originally proposed timetable.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, made the point that this scheme would undergo a minimum of two public consultations as part of the process and agreed that it should proceed as originally proposed. He emphasised that there would be further opportunities as part of further stages of the scheme for Joint Assembly and Executive Board Members to have an input. Councillor Herbert thanked Councillor Bick and the Joint Assembly for their comments and suggested that the draft document could be shared with all Executive Board and Joint Assembly Members prior to its publication.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the findings from the early Western Orbital technical report.
- (b) **APPROVED** the development of further work on the scheme for public consultation in February and March 2016 on the basis of the options set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- (c) **NOTED** the progress made on assessing stand alone bus priority options for M11 Junction 11.

## **7. INITIAL PRIORITISATION OF SCHEMES FOR TRANCHE 2 - REPORT ON FURTHER ECONOMIC APPRAISAL**

The Executive Board considered a report which outlined the proposed process and timescale for making decisions on priority schemes for tranche 2 of the Greater Cambridge City Deal infrastructure programme.

Stuart Walmsley, Cambridgeshire County Council's Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery, presented the report and reminded the Executive Board that it had agreed to prioritise £180 million worth of projects in tranche 1 of the City Deal programme for the £100 million of grant funding available over that five year period. The schemes that remained from the indicative City Deal programme that were not prioritised for investment in tranche 1 were set out in the report at paragraph 8. It was emphasised that in addition to these schemes other proposals or schemes may come forward from the work underway on the Cambridge Access Study or from the Smart Cities project.

A proposed approach and timeline for the tranche 2 programme prioritisation was set out in table 1 of the report.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 13 November 2015.

He highlighted that County Councillor Susan van de Ven provided the Assembly with a statement on progress with the Cambridge to Royston A10 cycle scheme. She had reported that the southern part of the route between Royston and Meldreth remained unfunded and sought inclusion of this as a scheme within tranche 2 of the City Deal programme.

Councillor Bick reported that the Joint Assembly had recommended the addition of the following two schemes to the list of schemes set out in the report for assessment as part of tranche 2:

- a city centre bus and coach capacity management scheme;
- a Huntingdon Park and Ride site.

The Assembly had also proposed the deletion of the word 'Station' in respect of the Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station scheme included within the report, so that it was not limited to the new railway station.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, asked whether city centre bus and coach capacity management would be included in the Cambridge Access Study. Mr Walmsley confirmed that this issue would be incorporated as part of the wider capacity study of the city centre.

Discussion ensued on the proposal to remove the word 'Station' from the Newmarket to Cambridge Science Park Station scheme. The Board agreed that the word 'Station' should be retained as removing it would give the wrong impression as to what the scheme sought to achieve.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, referred to the County Council's local highways improvement fund which was a fund that the County Council allocated on a match-fund basis and he cited this as a good example of how match-funding could work. Councillor Count asked whether there were any opportunities for a similar arrangement to be put in place for tranche 2 of the City Deal programme. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, agreed that the local highways improvement fund had been successful but explained that the scale of the schemes delivered through that funding mechanism had been quite small in comparison to the schemes proposed as part of the City Deal. However, he supported the principle and said it would be worth investigating opportunities for match-funding in this way for City Deal schemes.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **APPROVED** the process and timescales for agreeing the Tranche 2 prioritised infrastructure investment programme.
- (b) **APPROVED** preparatory work to support and inform Tranche 2 decisions, including scheme assessment and interim work for the Local Plans regarding Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and **APPROVED** funding from the prioritised 'Tranche 2 programme development' budget to cover one third of the cost of the Cambridge Northern East Fringe work (estimated at £70,000) as part of the pipeline work.
- (c) **AGREED** to make the following amendments to the list of schemes set out in paragraph 8 of the report:
  - the inclusion of a scheme which comprises city centre bus and coach capacity management;
  - the addition of a Huntingdon Road Park and Ride scheme.
- (d) **REQUESTED** that officers investigate options for match-funding in respect of Tranche 2 schemes.

## 8. WORKSTREAM UPDATE

The Executive Board considered a briefing note which set out updates for each City Deal workstream and took this opportunity to consider the Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the briefing note and highlighted the following points:

- the A1307 corridor scheme would now be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board later than anticipated and was scheduled for inclusion on agendas for the February and March meetings, respectively;
- recruitment for the Strategic Communications Manager position was ongoing, with the deadline for applications having now passed;
- the Joint Assembly meeting in December and subsequent Executive Board meeting on 15 January 2016 would consider the outcomes of the call for evidence sessions in relation to City centre congestion.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this workstream update at its meeting on 13 November 2015 and reported the following points registered by Assembly Members:

- some anxiety was expressed about the continued delay in appointing a Strategic Communications Manager;
- concerns were expressed over the revised timetabling of the A1307 transport scheme in terms of reporting to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board and questions had also been raised as to whether the work officers were doing on this scheme addressed the entirety of the scheme the Board had approved;
- a request was made for an update on progress in the formation of a Greater Cambridge Combined Authority, embracing the City Deal, and its relationship to the other current agenda for a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.



Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, agreed with the comments in respect of the Strategic Communications Manager post. He said that he and officers had been looking at key communications messages required early in 2016 in order that progress was being made prior to the post holder being in place. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, was confident that an appointment would be made as a result of this latest recruitment process.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment confirmed that he had investigated the A1307 scheme and was confident that his team would deliver a package of works that reflected what had been agreed by the Board through the City Deal infrastructure scheme prioritisation process. Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, highlighted that, despite the revised timetable for this scheme, the results of the initial public consultation would still be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board as part of their November 2016 meeting cycle as originally proposed. He therefore asked whether proposed timetables for City Deal infrastructure scheme consultations should be revisited and suggested seeking external advice to see how the consultation process could potentially be speeded up. The Board agreed that it should be challenging itself and asked officers to follow this up.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal Workstream update report.

## **9. SIX-MONTHLY REPORT ON SKILLS**

Consideration was given to a report which outlined progress towards a Skills Service for the Greater Cambridge area.

Michaela Eschbach of Form the Future presented the report and highlighted that the Skills Service would help to achieve the City Deal objective of promoting at least an additional 420 apprenticeships in key areas of need over the first five years of the City Deal and generally increase the employability of young people. She reported that her organisation, Form the Future, had been appointed to deliver the Skills Service following a tendering process and that it was preparing to launch the service now that the contract had been signed. A number of examples were put forward of events that had already taken place across the Greater Cambridge and East Cambridgeshire areas. Appended to the report was a set of key performance indicators for the Skills Service, which had been agreed as part of finalising the contract with Form the Future.

It was noted that routine monitoring of the progress of the service against the achievement of the core objectives would be undertaken by an Advisory Group comprising the City Deal Joint Assembly sub-group with update reports to the Assembly and Board when necessary.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 13 November 2015 and that it welcomed the award of the Skills Service contract to Form the Future. He said that the Assembly looked forward to the convening of the sub-group to fulfil its advisory and reporting role with the Skills Service. He expected the group to discuss key performance indicators in more detail with the Skills Team, including consideration of some measure of outcomes in terms of supply meeting demand, to supplement the measures of activity.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, was very impressed with the professionalism of Form the Future and felt that the Key Performance Indicators were a good set of indicators by which to take the Skills Service forward. He asked how Members of the Board and Assembly would be kept informed of progress and it was noted

that the Advisory Group would receive regular reports, with reports also submitted back to the Assembly and Board as appropriate. In addition, Board Members suggested inviting representatives from Form the Future to a future meeting of the Executive Board.

In terms of meeting demand for skills that were needed by the local economy, John Bridge, Chairman of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce and Local Enterprise Partnership representative on the Board, emphasised the importance of working with colleges to ensure that they were providing the right opportunities for young people. He cited Peterborough Regional College as an example of an institution that was already delivering this well and said that this engagement with colleges in the Greater Cambridge area would be needed.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the six-monthly report and progress towards the establishment of a Greater Cambridgeshire Skills Service.

#### **10. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

Consideration was given to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan.

Discussion ensued on the meeting of the Executive Board scheduled to be held on 8 April 2016 and the fact that it had a relatively light agenda, consisting of items on cross-city cycling and a workstream update, and that this was scheduled to be held during the election period. It was suggested that this meeting, and the corresponding meeting of the Joint Assembly, should be cancelled, unless there was anything contentious received as part of the consultation that specifically required consideration by the Board and Assembly. This would mean that background work could still take place on the scheme prior to a decision by the Board being made at the June cycle of meetings, ensuring that the cancellation of meetings in April did not delay delivery of the scheme. Members agreed with this as a way forward and noted that a report would still be circulated, for information, to all Members of the Board and Assembly on the results of the consultation in April.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal Forward Plan.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.25 p.m.**

---

# Agenda Item 4

## **Questions by the public and public speaking**

At the discretion of the Chairman, members of the public may ask questions at meetings of the Executive Board. This standard protocol is to be observed by public speakers:

- (a) notice of the question should be given to the Democratic Services team at South Cambridgeshire District Council (as administering authority) by 10am the day before the meeting;
- (b) questioners will not be permitted to raise the competence or performance of a member, officer or representative of any partner on the Executive Board, nor any matter involving exempt information (normally considered as 'confidential');
- (c) questioners cannot make any abusive or defamatory comments;
- (d) if any clarification of what the questioner has said is required, the Chairman will have the discretion to allow other Executive Board members to ask questions;
- (e) the questioner will not be permitted to participate in any subsequent discussion and will not be entitled to vote;
- (f) the Chairman will decide when and what time will be set aside for questions depending on the amount of business on the agenda for the meeting. Normally questions will be received as the first substantive item of the meeting;
- (g) individual questioners will be permitted to speak for a maximum of three minutes;
- (h) in the event of questions considered by the Chairman as duplicating one another, it may be necessary for a spokesperson to be nominated to put forward the question on behalf of other questioners. If a spokesperson cannot be nominated or agreed, the questioner of the first such question received will be entitled to put forward their question.

This page is left blank intentionally.

# Agenda Item 5

## **Chairman's report of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly meeting held on 17 December 2015**

### **1. General Report**

We received a number of questions from members of the public which are addressed in this report under relevant agenda items. We also received one question which did not correspond to an agenda item:

**Edward Leigh** asked about the level of co-ordination and engagement between the City Deal and other agencies, namely Highways England and Network Rail, which had transport programmes relating to, or with the capacity to relate to City Deal objectives. Officers confirmed that they worked closely with these strategic partners and many of the issues arising were captured in the County Council's long term strategy for the area, from which most of the City Deal projects were drawn. The remits of these national partners required them to build their own business cases recognising broader dynamics than the more local focus of the City Deal; although, with input, these had capacity to deliver on both agendas, as was indicated by Network Rail's current improvement programme.

Officers agreed with a suggestion that they provide and circulate an 'engagement map', assisting an understanding of the type of engagement that was taking place along the lines described and on what subjects.

### **2. Recommendations on reports to the Board**

#### **2(a) Opportunities for Public Realm and Green Landscaping enhancement within City Deal Delivery**

We then received a presentation from Glenn Richardson, Urban Design and Conservation Manager at Cambridge City Council, and Andrew Cameron, Director of Urban Design at WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff consultancy on opportunities for public realm and landscaping enhancement within City Deal delivery.

Points made in the presentation included:

- The role of public thoroughfares both as facilitators of movement ("roads") and as definers of place and creators of communities ("streets")
- Trees and greenery and ease of crossing contribute to the values of place and community
- Attractive examples exist of combinations of a high quality public realm and enhanced infrastructure to support more sustainable modes of travel and a number of these were shown
- Constrained space will provoke trade-offs to be made as well as challenge creativity; some of these were illustrated in relation to the Milton Road proposals
- Options need to respond to context

The presentation generated much further discussion and there was a consensus that the perspectives that had been shared would assist a positive public discussion of the proposals in relation to Milton Road, Histon Road and Madingley Road.

Assembly members drew out further points as follows:

- The wide range of benefits coming from the inclusion of trees and greenery in streets, including slowing of traffic, pride and identity with an area and improvements in property value, retail base, mental health, air quality and surface water drainage
- The potential for cycle paths in parallel streets dependent on context
- The need to examine all factors associated with tidal bus routes before concluding that they could form a viable part of any trade-off
- It was natural for different user groups to have different views as to what the priority should be for a scheme, and this called for balance and compromise in decision making.

Three public questions were received related to this agenda item.

**Mike Sargeant** asked for reassurance that ideas and concerns expressed in relation to the Milton Road scheme would be listened to and that the forthcoming consultation on it would be meaningful. He also asked why the loss of trees and grass verges had not been included in the consultation documentation and sought reassurance that keeping a green, residential character to Milton Road was a priority. Officers emphasised that the schemes currently out for consultation were at a first, conceptual stage of consultation. The responses would be reported back to the Assembly and the Board and taken into account when framing more detailed proposals for further consultation. It was also pointed out that the City Deal was criticised in some quarters for the time taken in the successive rounds of consultation that it planned; it would certainly not be undertaking these if it was not serious about wanting to hear people's views.

**Wendy Blythe** asked how potential loss of grass verges, trees, gardens and nature and the public health impact of arterial road schemes would be assessed. Officers said that when the initial consultation had identified all the issues, they would be examining how best to address them. It was too early to evaluate the public health implications, as no specific scheme had yet been proposed; health and environmental issues would be among the factors assessed in the preparation of a business case when that stage came.

**Nichola Harrison** proposed that the City Deal should adopt an Environmental Design Code for its transport schemes, of the kind that had been successfully employed in the context of the development of new communities in the area, utilising landscaping and public realm experts. She saw this as a means of ensuring that environmental considerations were not simply an optional extra but were at the centre of proposals for highway projects: not only protecting what existed, but improving it. Officers suggested that a Design Guide setting out parameters may be more appropriate and useful for members of the Assembly and Board as a basis for their decision making as schemes were developed. This approach was supported by the Assembly and is included in our recommendations below.

**The Assembly:**

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

## 2(b) Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence

We received three public questions relating to this item.

**Penny Heath** asked why the criteria proposed by officers for evaluating ideas to regulate demand for road space did not include environmental impact, including pollution, character, conservation and landscape. In the discussion that followed, the Assembly resolved unanimously to recommend to the Board that a criterion to assess environmental impact and design be added to the other criteria.

**Lynn Hieatt** asked what steps were envisaged for further public debate and consultation on parking controls and congestion charging, ideas which has arisen through the Call for Evidence. Graham Hughes responded that the proposals received through the Call for Evidence would be assessed by the consultants, with the outcomes being reported in June 2016 enabling a more informed public debate.

**Robin Pellew** commended the recent Call for Evidence and sought assurances that resources would be available to build on it, through the engagement of consultants to prepare detailed proposals for public consultation. He asked how the ideas arising from the Call for Evidence could be brought to bear on the radial route proposals being consulted on in respect of the A428 corridor, Histon Road and Milton Road, which might come to a head beforehand. He felt that some of the ideas suggested alternative approaches. In response officers confirmed that consultants had been commissioned to assess the Call for Evidence options and that their report would be submitted in June 2016. Graham Hughes said that if the conclusions were pertinent to the radial route projects, there would be sufficient fluidity to weave this in, as the radial projects would not be cast in stone by the summer.

In general discussion of this item, Assembly members were invited to share their early reactions and learnings from what they had heard through the Call for Evidence about its original focus – on demand management and fiscal measures. A number did not wish to do so at this stage, but a range of points were made individually by others:

- A note of concern that additional costs imposed on businesses might work in contradiction to other aims of the City Deal for the economic wellbeing of the area
- A view that if a form of road pricing was to be taken further, the question of fairness between those living within the city and those travelling into it from outside would need to be addressed
- A judgement that although not enough information was available at this stage to form a final view, it was important to take sensible decisions at an early stage to avoid wasting time on ideas that were not realistic
- Congestion charging did not have to be the same model used in London and could for example be applied for peak times in the mornings and evenings
- The income from a congestion charge would enable the City Deal to provide much better quality and frequency of public transport, both in the city and beyond
- There is interest within Cambridge for further parking controls to be examined
- If it was possible to make it clear that the revenue gained from road pricing or a congestion charge would be used to subsidise buses, then people would be open minded about it, as it would seem less like a penalty from an overall perspective

- The idea that any congestion charge should be applied to cyclists was generally not supported by members
- A tax on tourist coaches or buses coming into the city could provide a significant revenue stream
- There are significant practical problems with introducing a system such as gating or queue redistribution which would need considering.

Officers were asked to clarify whether demand management was part of the City Deal strategy, as the Executive Board had been silent on the matter. Graham Hughes confirmed that demand management had been part of the County Council's strategies for ten years and was part of the current long-term Transport Strategy; it was also part of the City Deal strategy and had featured in the original pitches to government. He stated that there was overwhelming evidence from around the world that a strategy based solely on demand management or solely on the provision of alternatives did not work and that a successful programme for the City Deal had to consist of both in order to alleviate Cambridge's congestion problems. The situation as he saw it was that the City Deal had not yet approved a particular approach to demand management and this would be assessed as part of the Call for Evidence process.

The assembly approved the recommendations with the addition highlighted below for the addition of an environmental criterion for the assessment of options arising from the Call for Evidence:

The Joint Assembly recommended to the Executive Board that it:

- (1) **NOTES** the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
- (2) **AGREES** the criteria for assessment of the ideas and proposals submitted to reduce congestion by reducing traffic volumes, managing traffic differently or managing access as part of the Cambridge Access Study, including any further ideas submitted by 31 December 2015, ***subject to the inclusion of an additional criterion to assess environmental impact and design.***
- (3) **NOTES** that the work referred to in resolution (2) above will be brought back to the Executive Board on ***16 June 2016***, including an assessment of impacts of potential City centre measures on other elements of the City Deal programme.
- (4) **AGREES** that where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study (i.e. one of the tranche 1 or prospective future City Deal schemes), that those proposals are taken forward through those routes rather than through the Cambridge Access Study.

## **2(c) Workstream update**

This was noted

## **2(d) Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan**

This was noted



# Agenda Item 6



**Report To:** Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board

15 January 2016

**Lead Officer:** Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council

---

## Tackling congestion: Call for Evidence

### Purpose

1. This paper provides an initial summary of submissions received in response to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence, and seeks agreement to the means of assessment of the submissions received through the Cambridge Access Study or where more relevant, through individual City Deal schemes.

### Recommendations

2. The Board is asked to:
  - A. Note the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
  - B. Agree the criteria for assessment of the ideas and proposals submitted to reduce congestion by reducing traffic volumes, managing traffic differently or managing access as part of the Cambridge Access Study, including any further ideas submitted by 31<sup>st</sup> December.
  - C. Note that the work referred to in recommendation B will be brought back to the Executive Board on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2016, including an assessment of impacts of potential City Centre measures on other elements of the City Deal programme.
  - D. Agree that where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study (i.e. one of the tranche 1 or prospective future City Deal schemes), that those proposals are taken forward through those routes rather than through the Cambridge Access Study.

### Recommendations from the Joint Assembly:

The Joint Assembly recommended to the Executive Board that it:

- (1) notes the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
- (2) agrees the criteria for assessment of the ideas and proposals submitted to reduce congestion by reducing traffic volumes, managing traffic differently or managing access as part of the Cambridge Access Study, including any further ideas submitted by 31 December 2015, subject to the inclusion of an additional criteria to assess environmental impact and design.

- (3) notes that the work referred to in resolution (2) above will be brought back to the Executive Board on 16 June 2016, including an assessment of impacts of potential City centre measures on other elements of the City Deal programme.
- (4) agrees that where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study (i.e. one of the tranche 1 or prospective future City Deal schemes), that those proposals are taken forward through those routes rather than through the Cambridge Access Study.

### **Reasons for Recommendations**

3. The Call for Evidence on tackling congestion received an excellent response from a range of local stakeholders and experts locally and nationally, who have input a range of interesting ideas. Board and Assembly members participated in three hearing sessions, at which they questioned the evidence being given and led the debates that followed. 67 written responses have been received and 21 presentations were made at the hearing sessions.
4. The ideas that came forward were wide ranging but can broadly be grouped as follows, although some proposed an amalgam of all three:
  - Those that sought to reduce congestion by directly or indirectly reducing the volume of traffic or managing the traffic in a different way e.g. through limiting vehicular access.
  - Those that proposed additional infrastructure, either at specific locations or generally e.g. new rail stations.
  - Those that proposed interventions that would require ongoing revenue support e.g. extra bus services.
5. All of this useful input needs to be assessed and it is considered that the best way to do this is through the Cambridge Access Study. It is also considered important that this analysis is based on agreed criteria to ensure it is focused and aligned with Project and broader City Deal objectives.
6. Where proposals relate to additional infrastructure that would be better considered as part of either an existing or future corridor study then it is proposed that these would be taken forward through those routes rather than the Access Study.

### **Background**

7. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) was adopted in March 2014, supports the local plans, and includes a comprehensive programme from which proposals in the Greater Cambridge City Deal are drawn. However, the TSCSC does not yet include detailed proposals for the centre of Cambridge. The Cambridge Access Study, under the umbrellas of the TSCSC and of City Deal, is considering the conditions and challenges on the transport network in and around Cambridge.
8. The Cambridge Access Study will recommend transformative interventions with the aim of considerably improving access, capacity, and movement to, from and within the city. It also aims to reduce congestion and delay, and will look at how we can keep general traffic levels in the city at or below current levels while accommodating the large scale growth that the Cambridge area is experiencing.

9. As part of the study, a Call for Evidence was launched to gather views, ideas and evidence aimed at tackling congestion in Cambridge. Written evidence was invited and interested parties were also able to present their ideas at one of three public hearings which were held on the 16<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> November.
10. In addition, on the 18<sup>th</sup> November, a meeting was held with a number of major “traffic generators” – organisations whose activities generate a large demand for travel.
11. The deadline for written evidence to be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in the December/January cycle was 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015. However, submissions received up until 31<sup>st</sup> December will still be accepted and analysed.
12. 67 written responses were received by 30<sup>th</sup> November, and 21 individuals or organisations gave evidence at the hearing sessions. 77 individuals or organisations in total engaged in the process, as detailed in Table 1 below. All of the submissions received, along with presentations and notes from the three hearings can be viewed at <http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>.

**Table 1            Number of respondents to Call for Evidence**

	<b>Local person / organisation</b>	<b>Invited expert</b>	<b>Total</b>
Written submission	55	1	<b>56</b>
Written submission and spoke at hearing session	11	-	<b>11</b>
Spoke at hearing session	5	5	<b>10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>77</b>

### **Considerations**

13. Appendix 1 of this report notes the main themes and ideas suggested in submissions to the Call for Evidence up to 30<sup>th</sup> November. Appendix 2 provides an initial summary of the evidence received.
14. The submissions include a range of ideas for reducing or spreading out motor vehicle journeys, and also for infrastructure investments and service improvements. Some of the infrastructure investments proposed are already being consulted on or will be considered as part of the agreed Tranche 2 prioritisation process. Where appropriate therefore the analysis will be combined with the analysis of those individual schemes. For example, tidal flow bus lanes may be better assessed as part of the radial scheme consultation analyses, as these have been proposed for Maddingley Mulch to Cambridge.
15. It should be noted that Appendix 2 provides only an initial summary of the submissions, and that detailed analysis will take place guided by the consideration of the submissions by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Given the limited timeframe since the close of the Call for Evidence hearings, it is considered too early to recommend endorsement of any of the measures proposed at this stage.

## Assessment Criteria for Call for Evidence submissions and proposals

16. To ensure that analysis supports project and overall City Deal objectives, the following criteria are proposed for the assessment of options through the 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?
17. 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 the consequential impact on the time frame in which proposals could be implemented.

### Next steps

18. The criteria above are not designed to determine any next steps or decisions. They will focus the analysis of the suggested measures so that it can inform decision-making on which idea or package of ideas, if any, should be taken forward for consultation and development.
19. If the Board agrees the recommendations, the analysis of the ideas submitted against the criteria noted in paragraphs 16 and 17 above will be brought to the Executive Board on 22<sup>nd</sup> July. This report will recommend options that could achieve the aims of the Board and Assembly, and indicate the timescales and dependencies that are associated with them. This will include consideration of what might be achieved in the Tranche 1 period to 2020. It will also consider whether there are options that might be initially trialled.

### Implications

20. In the writing of this report, taking into account financial, legal, staffing, risk management, equality and diversity, climate change, community safety and any other key issues, the following implications have been considered:

### ***Financial and other resources***

21. Resources for the further work on the Cambridge Access Study and on analysis of the Call for Evidence submissions are in place.

### **Consultation responses and Communication**

22. This report details the Call for Evidence, and provides links to submissions made as part of that process.

### **Background Papers**

The Cambridge Access Study web page can be found at:

<http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>

This page provides details of the study, including the [Audit Report](#).

In addition, the following can be accessed from the Cambridge Access Study web page.

- Written submissions to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence.
- Presentations made at the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings.
- Initial Summary of the evidence received, including notes of the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings and of the 'Traffic Generators' meeting (*also included in Appendix 2 to this report*).
- Presentations made at the 'Traffic Generators' meeting.

The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire can be viewed at:

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/tscsc/>

**Report Author:** Jeremy Smith, Head Transport & Infrastructure Policy & Funding  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Telephone: 01223 715483

**Appendix 1: Summary of main themes and ideas raised by respondents to the Call for Evidence**

Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
<b>Demand Management &amp; Fiscal Measures</b>	
Further limiting access to the city centre and further Selective Road Closures (Includes: extension of Core Scheme, pedestrianisation etc.)	14
Further Parking Controls (Includes: more residents parking zones, reductions in city centre car parks, reduction in free street parking)	20
Road Pricing (Includes: Congestion charge – various forms suggested for testing)	22
Workplace Parking Levy (Includes: taxing private non-residential parking in the city)	8
'Gating' and Queue Redistribution	4
Tourist Tax	2
<b>Technology</b>	
Smart Traffic Management (Includes: syncing signals more efficiently and further use of SCOOT system)	10
Data Collection Tools	2
Smart Card Tickets, RTPI, Journey Planning etc. (Includes: multi-modal, multi-operator tickets too)	5
Autonomous Vehicles	2
<b>Public Transport Infrastructure &amp; Service Improvements</b>	
Bus Lanes, Tidal-flow Bus Lanes, Bus Priority Measures	10
Bus Rapid Transit	5
More Attractive Bus Journeys (Includes: reliability, nicer buses, quality bus partnerships and contacts)	16
Rail Investment (Includes: new stations, re-opening old lines, increasing capacity)	5
Underground Public Transport Systems (Includes: tunnelling for buses, metros etc.)	9
Transport Hubs & Interchanges (Includes: new ones, upgrades to existing and linking of modes)	9
Upgrading/Improving Park and Ride (Includes: Removing charge, new P&R sites, extending capacity of current sites, longer operation of services and free/discounted travel on P&R)	28
<b>Infrastructure Improvements for Active Modes</b>	
Enhanced Cycle Networks (in/from rural areas) (Includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes, links to services and Cambridge, joining the villages etc.)	17
Enhanced Cycle Networks (urban/city) (Includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes)	25
Further Cycle Priority at Junctions (Includes: priority at junctions etc.)	11
Cycle Parking (Includes new city centre facility, additional, secure racks at businesses/schools/leisure etc.)	11
Improved Pedestrian Facilities	7

Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
<b>Highway Capacity Enhancements</b>	
Junction Improvements (Includes: measures aimed at traffic flow improvements)	9
New Roads (Includes: orbital movements to the east of the city and a southern relief road)	6
Re-Classify Roads by Use	1
Promote / priority for Motorcycles/Scooters (Includes use of bus lanes)	3
<b>Behavioural Change</b>	
Last Mile Delivery & Consolidation Points and More Management of Delivery Vehicles (Includes reducing freight/HGVs etc.)	9
Tackling School & Sixth Form Traffic (Includes. using P&R sites as drop-off pick up, spreading hour of opening	15
Peak hour spreading (Includes business hour change)	5
Car Clubs & Car Sharing	4
Low Emission Vehicles (Includes: electric vehicles, driverless vehicles etc.)	2

**Appendix 2: Initial Summary of the evidence received.**



## Greater Cambridge City Deal

### Initial summary of responses to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence

9<sup>th</sup> December 2015

#### Contents

1.	Introduction and overview .....	2
2.	Purpose and limitations of report .....	3
3.	Expert speakers and the experience from other cities .....	4
	Further expert input.....	5
4.	Local suggestions and ideas.....	7
	Public transport Infrastructure and service improvements .....	10
	Infrastructure improvements for active modes .....	12
	Demand management.....	14
	Highway capacity .....	15
	Technology.....	16
	Behavioural change .....	17
	Environment.....	19
	Process and problems .....	19
5.	Conclusion .....	20
	Links to Call for Evidence submissions and presentations, and other useful information .....	20

## 1. Introduction and overview

- 1.1. One of the key issues that impacts upon the whole City Deal programme is how to solve the current congestion problems in Cambridge. In response to this, the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board prioritised The Cambridge Access Study in the City Deal Tranche 1 programme. This study considers the conditions and challenges on the transport network in and around Cambridge including the City Centre.
- 1.2. This Study will recommend transformative improvements and interventions to considerably improve access, capacity, and movement to and within the city. It also aims to reduce congestion and delay, and general traffic levels in the city to below current levels. The Study will also consider opportunities for enhancing the public realm and quality of the environment. Mott MacDonald has been appointed to provide consultants support with this work.
- 1.3. To inform and tie in with this work, Members of the City Deal Executive Board and Assembly invited individuals or organisations to put forward their thoughts on how they believe the congestion issues in Cambridge can be solved. As well as inviting written submissions, three public sessions were arranged where people or organisations could present their perspectives on the problem and potential solutions. These sessions included a mix of local people and organisations, and expert speakers in the transport field who were able to put forward ideas and discuss various congestion tackling proposals, drawing from a wealth of recent experience. Table 1 summarises the number of submissions received along with attendance at the hearings.

**Table 1      Number of respondents to Call for Evidence**

	<b>Local person / organisation</b>	<b>Invited expert</b>	<b>Total</b>
Written submission	55	1	<b>56</b>
Written submission and spoke at hearing session	11	-	<b>11</b>
Spoke at hearing session	5	5	<b>10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>77</b>

## **2. Purpose and limitations of report**

- 2.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the responses received to the Call for Evidence. The report identifies common themes that have emerged from the responses and attempts to present them in a way that will assist the Assembly and Board in their initial consideration of which ideas should be taken forward for analysis.
- 2.2. This summary does not detail each and every proposal put forward by each individual, however, each submission is available to view in full at <http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>.
- 2.3. Due to the tight timescale between the end of the Call for Evidence and the publication of Board and Assembly papers, it has not yet been possible to provide any analysis of the merits of each proposal. Once officers are given a steer from the Board and Assembly on further analysis, then this exercise will be undertaken and brought back to Members to discuss.
- 2.4. The Call for Evidence asked for suggestions and ideas that could help tackle congestion problems in Cambridge. Many of the responses are wide ranging in nature, and include ideas that seem unlikely to have a significant impact on congestion or on providing viable alternatives to private car travel. This summary primarily focuses on the suggestions that directly address the question that was raised by the Board and Assembly.

### 3. Expert speakers and the experience from other cities

- 3.1. Alongside suggestions from local people and organisations, the Board and Assembly were keen to call on the expertise of eminent transport experts and also from other cities where different demand management measures had been used. A number of these were invited to speak and answer questions from Board and Assembly Members at the hearings. The following appeared:
- Transport for London (congestion charging)
  - Nottingham City Council (workplace parking levy)
  - Imperial College (congestion charging)
  - The Campaign for Better Transport (a range of sustainable travel initiatives)
  - RAC Foundation (congestion charging and fiscal measures)
- 3.2. The full details of the presentations and questions asked can be viewed at <http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>. The following paragraphs provide a brief overview of their presentations.
- 3.3. Stephen Joseph from The Campaign for Better Transport discussed how growth doesn't necessarily need to mean more and more cars and that investment in sustainable travel can help grow the economy. He also gave examples of how new development can be less car dependent and suggested that experience in European cities showed that traffic growth could not only be halted; traffic could be reduced. He also highlighted the need for not only capital investment but also a revenue source.
- 3.4. Steve Gooding from the RAC Foundation talked about the importance of having good data so you know where people are coming from and going to. He also talked about the pros and cons of various demand management measures such as congestion charging, workplace parking levy and parking charges, in conjunction with road space reallocation. A key point was that authorities need to be clear on exactly what the aim of each measure is, for example revenue raising or limiting traffic growth.
- 3.5. Peter Wright from Transport for London (TfL) spoke about the experience of congestion charging in the capital. He highlighted that to implement such a scheme, political commitment is vital, and also the importance of public information campaigns prior to a scheme going live so that people understand how it is going to work.
- 3.6. The London scheme was expensive to implement as much investment was made into back office set up to ensure that the scheme was guaranteed to work from day 1, although developments in technology in subsequent years

mean that set up costs have reduced. Running costs are now approximately 30% of revenue so it does provide a revenue source.

- 3.7. Although congestion is now back to previous levels, he emphasised that this is in large part due to the freed up space being reallocated to sustainable modes or to the public realm, such as in Trafalgar Square. Traffic levels are still down on levels seen before the congestion charge was introduced. He made the point that congestion in London would be much worse without the congestion charge. The London congestion charge is now £11.50 per day.
- 3.8. Stephen Glaister from Imperial College London also spoke about congestion charging. He too emphasised the importance of clear messages and good communications when explaining such a scheme to the public and being absolutely clear on what the charge was and who it was for.
- 3.9. He talked about the difficulty in persuading people of the benefits before a charge was brought in, citing the difficulties in Manchester and the eventual no-vote when a referendum was held. However he pointed to evidence that shows that once a scheme is in place, it is supported. He also suggested that a scheme wouldn't work - including in London – if residents received a discount.
- 3.10. Jason Gooding and Nigel Hallam from Nottingham City Council spoke about the Workplace Parking Levy. The scheme targets peak time congestion by levying an annual fee on employers of £375 per parking space. £25m has been raised in five years and has helped fund the expansion of the tram network including some Park & Ride provision, redevelopment of the railway station and some bus links.
- 3.11. The Workplace Parking Levy has low operating costs of 5% and importantly gives a source of revenue which allows the authority to lever more money from government by having its own revenue stream. As the tram line has only just started operation, it is too early to definitively assess whether there is a significant impact on levels of congestion.

### Further expert input

- 3.12. A written response was provided by Professor Jonas Eliasson from Sweden's Royal Institute of Technology, detailing the impact of congestion charging in Stockholm.
- 3.13. Doctor Steve Melia of the University of the West of England could not attend any of the Call for Evidence hearings but was available to meet with four members of the Board and Assembly on 4<sup>th</sup> December.

- 3.14. He suggested that congestion was potentially an insolvable problem and the focus should be on alternatives to private car travel. Ensuring people can still travel and maintaining quality of life using alternatives was the key and new communities had a role to play here – use of existing railway infrastructure and ‘car free’ developments with good public transport from the early days can help.
- 3.15. He also pointed out that many places in Europe seen as exemplars of sustainable transport are not transport nirvanas, and their successes had been very hard won politically. However, the best examples often have a ‘wow factor’ that is largely absent in this country, for example, the removal of mass parking along the River Rhone in Lyon.

## 4. Local suggestions and ideas

- 4.1. In addition to hearing evidence from expert speakers, the Board and Assembly also heard many suggestions put forward from local people and interested groups with ideas on how the congestion problem in Cambridge could be tackled.
- 4.2. Sixteen local people or organisations spoke at the hearings; eleven of these also submitted written evidence. A further 55 local people or organisations submitted written evidence. Written evidence was requested by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015. While further submissions received by the end of the year will be considered, they are not discussed in this paper. The suggestions received were both wide ranging and varied. Full submissions can be found at <http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>.
- 4.3. The range of suggestions can broadly be categorised into the themes below:
- What is an acceptable level of congestion
  - Public transport Infrastructure and service improvements (carrots)
  - Infrastructure improvements for active modes (carrots)
  - Demand management (sticks)
  - Highway capacity
  - Technology
  - Behavioural change
  - Environment
- 4.4. A recurring theme which is worth highlighting at the outset was what constitutes an acceptable level of congestion, and how much change would need to take place to reach that position. Several referred to the ‘half term effect’ and how levels of traffic seem more acceptable during the school holidays. One submission went into more detail about the misconception between ‘delay’ and ‘flow’ on the network. It was suggested that whilst most people when asked guess that delay decreases by 30% or more during school holidays, generally traffic flow falls by less than 10%. This led the contributor to suggest that under current conditions you only need to create conditions that encourage one in twenty to start using the bus and a similar number to start cycling to realise relatively delay-free conditions on the vast majority of days.
- 4.5. The subsequent commentary in this section provides a summary of responses categorised into the remaining headings listed above. Table 2 shows these categories and the range of points that were made under each, with an indication of the frequency with which the theme was raised. It should be noted that no assessment has been made of the effectiveness or achievability of any of the responses summarised below.

**Table 2      Number of submissions addressing particular themes / suggestions**

Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
<b>Demand Management &amp; Fiscal Measures</b>	
Further limiting access to the city centre and Further Selective Road Closures (includes: extension of Core Scheme, pedestrianisation etc.)	14
Further Parking Controls (includes: more residents parking zones, reductions in city centre car parks, reduction in free street parking)	20
Road Pricing (includes: Congestion charge – various forms suggested for testing)	22
Workplace Parking Levy (includes: taxing private non-residential parking in the city)	8
'Gating' and Queue Redistribution	4
Tourist Tax	2
<b>Technology</b>	
Smart Traffic Management (includes: syncing signals more efficiently and further use of SCOOT system)	10
Data Collection Tools (to better understand actual trips and movements)	2
Smart Card Tickets, RTPI, Journey Planning etc. (includes multi-modal, multi-operator tickets too)	5
Autonomous Vehicles	2
<b>Public Transport Infrastructure &amp; Service Improvements</b>	
Bus Lanes, Tidal-flow Bus Lanes, Bus Priority Measures	10
Bus Rapid Transit	5
More Attractive Bus Journeys (includes: improving reliability, re-routing, nicer buses, quality bus partnerships and contacts)	16
Rail Investment (includes: new stations, re-opening old lines, increasing capacity)	5
Underground Public Transport Systems (includes: tunnelling for buses, metros etc.)	9
Transport Hubs & Interchanges (includes new ones, upgrades to existing and linking of modes)	9
Upgrading/Improving Park and Ride (includes: Removing charge, new P&R sites, extending capacity of current sites, longer operation of services and free/discounted travel on P&R)	28



Theme / Suggestion	Number of representations
<b>Infrastructure Improvements for Active Modes</b>	
Enhanced Cycle Networks (in/from rural areas) (includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes, links to services and Cambridge, joining the villages etc.)	17
Enhanced Cycle Networks (urban/city) (includes: more cycle lanes, more segregation of cycle lanes)	25
Further Cycle Priority at Junctions (includes: priority at junctions etc.)	11
Cycle Parking (includes: new city centre facility, additional, secure racks at businesses/schools/leisure etc.)	11
Improved Pedestrian Facilities	7
<b>Highway Capacity Enhancements</b>	
Junction Improvements (includes: measures aimed at traffic flow improvements)	9
New Roads (includes: orbital movements, southern relief road etc.)	6
Re-Classify Roads by Use	1
Promote/Priority for Motorcycles/Scooters (includes: use of bus lanes)	3
<b>Behavioural Change</b>	
Last Mile Delivery & Consolidation Points and More Management of Delivery Vehicles (includes: reducing freight/HGVs etc.)	9
Tackling School & Sixth Form Traffic (includes: using P&R sites as drop-off pick up, spreading hour of opening)	15
Peak hour spreading (includes: business hour change)	5
Car Clubs & Car Sharing	4
Low Emission Vehicles (includes: electric vehicles, driverless vehicles etc.)	2

4.6. The following sections of this paper provide a summary of the range of responses received under each theme.

## Public transport Infrastructure and service improvements

### Road space redistribution

- 4.7. A number of suggestions were made about the redistribution of road space, primarily in favour of buses and cycles. One idea put forward included reconfiguring a number of the radial routes into the city in order to make space for dedicated bus lanes and segregated cycle lanes. It highlighted the current problem of not enough space for both and suggested that by making the radials bus-only for the inbound journey, then some road space could be reconfigured. The idea would need the completion of a link between the A14 and the A11 and better bus service frequencies.

### Rail

- 4.8. A number of representations called for greater investment in rail to help solve the congestion issues in the Cambridge area.
- 4.9. Specific examples included a comprehensive idea for a Cambridge and District railway, which involves separating local train services in the area around Cambridge from long distance routes to London and other cities. New stations would be built / rebuilt at Hinxton Hall, Harston, Cherry Hinton, Fulbourn and Six Mile Bottom. The new stations would allow long distance trains to overtake local ones, which pull into platforms on separate outside tracks. This local network would integrate with the cycle network through some carriages giving more space over to cycle storage, such as on the S-train network in Copenhagen.
- 4.10. Expanding the local network with a similar scheme to the Bristol City Deal MetroWest scheme was also put forward, to tie in with a package of rail and public transport proposals for the existing corridors.
- 4.11. In addition to new railway stations, further investment in the railway network was suggested through the reopening of the Haverhill line and also the upgrade of the Newmarket line. Frequency increases were also suggested as these would make rail usage even more attractive, along with integration with other modes of transport and multimodal ticketing.

### Buses

- 4.12. The issue of bus management in the city centre was raised with suggestions for improving efficiency around the bus station made. Opposing suggestions included both reducing the number of services terminating in the city centre and reducing the number of services that run through. Indeed a number of suggestions were made for re-routing buses more efficiently. Other suggestions included better scheduling of layover and driver changes so they

take place at the end of routes rather than in the city centre. More legislative approaches, such as Bus Quality Contracts were also mentioned. It was suggested that long-distance buses should be removed from terminating in and travelling through the city centre and that the fleet of buses should be upgraded to look more attractive and include more comforts such as wifi. One idea for achieving this was for Cambridge to take control of its own bus services.

- 4.13. There are a couple of ideas for linking together the south-east science parks, either by a loop service serving the parks, or by an on-demand service that picks up passengers and travels directly back to the parks or to the station.
- 4.14. The suggestion of further guided bus routes was also made. One option put forward was to build a guideway out towards Newmarket and Burwell where house prices are cheaper. There were also suggestions about improving the frequency of bus services out to the South Cambs villages to 2-hourly and extending morning, evening and weekend running.

#### Park & Ride

- 4.15. The cost of using public transport came up as a barrier to people using alternatives to the private car. A recurring theme was that the Park & Ride system should be free to use if we want people to make the shift, with a number of responses also calling for the removal of the parking charge at the sites.
- 4.16. The importance of the Park & Ride system was highlighted by a large number of respondents with ideas for further expansion of the Park and Ride network in the area. A suggestion put forward by a number of people is for regular bus services to run from and through outlying areas and villages into the Park & Ride sites seven days a week. A system to deliver shopping to the Park & Ride sites was also put forward. The existing Park & Ride sites could be increased in size by building multi-storeys and there were suggestions that Park & Ride should not only be provided on every entry to the city, but also a 'double ring' so that other Park & Rides are provided further out.
- 4.17. Suggestions were also made about encouraging people to Park & Cycle from the Park & Ride sites and using the sites as long distance coach drop off points.

#### Transport Hubs

- 4.18. The increased use of transport hubs or interchanges outside of the city for people to switch modes was suggested.

- 4.19. Two areas of land have been suggested as potential sites for a new transport hub at Whittlesford Station, which would open the potential for more multimodal trips. It was suggested that this would allow greater east-west bus travel and enable more cycle trips to be made to the station. One area is close to Whittlesford Parkway station itself, the other is located at the A1307/A11 junction and would serve as a new Park & Ride site.
- 4.20. Other hubs around the city were also suggested; at West Cambridge with links to Addenbrooke's and the Science Park, with the point being made that not everyone wants to get to the city centre.

#### Metro

- 4.21. More bold suggestions included a metro line linking in to the historic core as part of a multimodal package of improvements. The line would connect to a hub at Girton Interchange that would also be home to a new long-distance bus station as well as an orbital public transport system. In addition, one of the presenters at the third hearing session also put forward ideas for a metro style public transport system to feed into the existing public transport network.

#### Tunnels

- 4.22. A package of improvements that would be brought forward in conjunction with a congestion charging scheme was proposed. In addition to walking and cycling measures, tunnels under the city are proposed for use by bus rapid transit. One east-west tunnel and another north-south was proposed, allowing buses to reach a remodelled bus station and the main railway station. A similar idea from another contributor proposed three tunnels radiating out from Market Hill. One would head north-east to the Science Park and new station, one to the south towards Addenbrooke's and another to the west towards Maddingley Road P&R, with 13 stations across the network.

### **Infrastructure improvements for active modes**

#### Cycling

- 4.23. Some detailed proposals for new cycle routes were received. One proposal was for the development of an urban 'City Ring' which is linked to a series of rural 'Rings'. The benefits of the rings would be to encourage both local journeys between villages, as well as encouraging long commuter distances by bike, through feeding into the 'City Ring'. The proposal would also help to connect young people to village colleges in locations such as Comberton, Bottisham and Sawston. The proposed rings are the City Ring, the Landbeach Ring, the Waterbeach Ring, the Bottisham Ring, the Babraham Ring, the Comberton Ring and the Bar Hill Ring. Additional routes were also proposed

along the Cambridge-Royston, Cambridge-Ely and Cambridge-Cambourne corridors.

- 4.24. A number of measures were also proposed to address the major barriers to riding bicycles in the city area, including dangerous junctions, cycle parking and the enabling of intermodal journeys. One such suggestion was the classification of roads by function as in the Netherlands. In the Greater Cambridge context, a simple three level classification of Access, Distributor or through route was suggested. Once roads are classified, future public realm improvements, removal of rat-runs and road engineering of the streets can be designed according to the classification. Related to this, one contributor suggested the use of clearly colour coded surface colours that identify pedestrian/vehicular/cycle use on highways where mixed use occurs.
- 4.25. Other engineering solutions put forward included segregated cycleways on every main road; the removal of side junctions on main roads; safe junction designs that segregate cycle movements from heavy vehicles; massive increase in cycle parking in city centre and at employment sites; a comprehensive cycleway network plan with clear route planning, new park and ride sites on radial routes into Cambridge with bicycle rental; rural cycleways that connect residents to local services. In addition to engineering measures, a 'bicycle account' is proposed, which reflects the reality of and aspirations of the population by documenting the current state of the bicycle network, the people who use it, what they like and dislike about current provision and long-term plans. It was suggested that changes to where cyclists can cycle may also be beneficial, such as crossing minor traffic lights where there is very little traffic, in the same way that pedestrians cross on a red light if it is safe; cycling down the quieter one way streets, therefore accessing safer "back" routes, avoiding more major roads; being allowed to use some pavements with care.
- 4.26. Ideas were also put forward to help solve the issue of a need for more cycle parking in the centre of Cambridge. This included proposals for new, large cycle parks such as using more of or even all of the Grand Arcade car park under City Hotel as a cycle park.
- 4.27. A number of individual route upgrades were also put forward. These included: Upgrading the Coton Footpath to a cycle superhighway, safe river crossing from the Backs to the city centre to separate cyclists from pedestrians and tourists, a safe route between Ely and Cambridge, linking Orchard Park and Arbury with Histon, Impington and Cottenham, linking Madingley to Girton, linking Coton to Long Road, Hardwick and Caldecote, linking Grantchester to Haslingfield and Barton and linking Trumpington Park & Ride to Hauxton.

## Demand management

- 4.28. There were various ideas that were suggested in relation to possible demand management techniques or 'sticks'. One contributor suggested that traffic control should not prohibit traffic as much as it does. Using a floodplain analogy, it was suggested that traffic should be allowed to find its own level with local traffic finding its own way through the suburbs and external traffic coming into the centre using major thoroughfares.

### Access controls

- 4.29. Several contributors proposed a traffic-free city centre as part of a package of measures – essentially an expansion of the current Core Scheme area. From the suggestions received, boundaries could include Chesterton Road/Northampton St/Queen's Road/East Road/Fen Causeway. There were also numerous calls for other access controls and route management to stop rat running and make key routes more free for buses and cyclists.
- 4.30. Conversely, a suggestion to reopen Silver Street to general traffic was also made as part of a statement that much of the problem with congestion in the city is due to areas being restricted. Other suggestions included a ban on taxis in the centre and small electric vehicles to ferry people around the central zone. The removal of tourist buses from The Backs and city centre was also put forward, with an alternative suggestion of using the Park & Ride sites as a base to bus people in on small electric vehicles.

### Parking

- 4.31. Restricting parking, in all its forms featured several times in proposals. It was suggested in a number of responses that parking was either too cheap or too easy and this formed a barrier to mode switch.
- 4.32. There were a number of proposals to get rid of the city centre car parks and turn them over to other uses; for example to use as a location for recharging electric vehicles, or for delivery vehicles to unload. It was suggested that the Grand Arcade car park could be used as a public or university exhibition centre, with a small area for disabled parking and Shopmobility centre. Another suggestion was to remove or reduce all free and pay & display street parking across the city, also to make higher charges for residential parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 4.33. A review of the parking available was also suggested, as was restricting the leasing of Council garages to local residents for the use of parking.
- 4.34. An alternative suggestion to reducing the city centre car parking was to introduce a new, large underground car park below Parkers Piece.

## Fiscal

- 4.35. The topic of congestion charging featured positively in a significant number of responses. Its benefits both as a tool for managing demand on the network and also a source of revenue with which to fund non-car alternatives were highlighted. Different systems were suggested, with both the London system and the Singapore point system being cited. Written evidence was also received from a Swedish academic on the success of the Stockholm system, where the system consists of 18 charging points located at the main bottlenecks on arterials leading into and out of the inner city, with a time-differentiated toll being charged in each direction. Vehicles are charged each time they pass a control point, with a maximum amount per vehicle and day of 6 Euros. Traffic across the cordon was reduced by around 20% after implementation, leading to substantial congestion reductions in and around the city.
- 4.36. A workplace parking levy was suggested locally as a potential means of raising revenue to invest in transport measures. However there were also concerns that it would make Cambridge uncompetitive
- 4.37. Other fiscal measures which were suggested included the introduction of a 'room tax' on hotel rooms which can be used to help improve bike and pedestrian paths and subsidise bus travel as is done in towns in the US; tax increases for businesses providing car parking spaces and tax breaks for businesses providing cycle racks or employee buses.
- 4.38. There were also proposals the cost of parking in the city centre should increase; there should be higher charges for residents' parking and that the retail parks on Newmarket Road should charge for parking to discourage people from using them as cheaper parking alternatives to the city centre car parks. A refund could be offered to shoppers genuinely using the Newmarket Road stores if they spend over £20 for example.

## **Highway capacity**

### Junction improvements and Highway Capacity

- 4.39. A number of suggestions were made regarding improving traffic flow by improving 'problem' junctions and clearing key radials for smoother traffic flows. For example, congestion problems in the Newmarket Road area were highlighted, with proposals for the introduction of traffic lights on the Wadloes Road/Barnwell Road/Newmarket Road roundabout put forward. A suggestion that more road space should be given to vehicles travelling straight ahead at the Ditton Lane/Newmarket Road junction was also made, to solve the problem of vehicles travelling straight on getting caught up in traffic queuing to

turn right into Ditton Lane. Improve junctions around the 'ring road' of Cambridge was another suggestion made

- 4.40. The timing and sequence of traffic lights at the Catholic Church junction was identified as a problem which it was considered caused the capacity of the junction to be greatly reduced and could be improved with some tweaking. Another suggestion was to replace complicated junctions such as the Huntingdon Road/Histon Road/Victoria Road junction with a roundabout.
- 4.41. Looking further out of Cambridge, a suggestion was made about how to upgrade the A1301 / A505 roundabout to the south east of the city. A proposal has been submitted to increase capacity at the junction while at the same time making it attractive for cyclists and pedestrians to use. A new junction for the M11 / A11 was also suggested, as well as upgrade works to the A1301 itself. The redesign of the Girton Interchange to provide an all-ways junction and a location for a Park & Ride was also put forward, as was linking the A14, M11 and A428 junction (M11 junction 14) with Madingley Road / M11 junction (M11 junction 13) to create a free flowing gyratory.
- 4.42. The idea of increasing the road access from conurbations within South Cambridgeshire to other towns with good transport links, such as railway stations, was also put forward. An example given was improving links between Cambourne and St Neots railway station to discourage people from coming into Cambridge.
- 4.43. Another major piece of infrastructure suggested was that of an orbital road around Cambridge with link roads running parallel to the A14 and M11 to cater for local traffic and tunnels under Shelford and the hills south of the city to reduce its environmental impact – the so called southern relief road.
- 4.44. Submissions were also received encouraging the use of motorbikes, scooters and powered two-wheelers to help alleviate congestion. An example put forward to achieve this is allowing them to use bus lanes and provide them with free car parking in the city centre – measures introduced in some other cities.

## Technology

- 4.45. The importance of good data collection was highlighted by another contributor, who advocated investing significantly in a system of centralised data collection and traffic management within the city. Installing sensors on the traffic lights and allowing centralised control ought to give an immediate improvement to traffic flow, as well as giving us the data with which to plan more ambitious initiatives.



- 4.46. A further suggestion was the use of a series of low-cost telematics solutions that facilitate both the collection and mining of data on traffic patterns and the dissemination of real time traffic information. Ideas include installing GPS telematics machine to machine (m2m) terminals on taxis, delivery vans, the city's own fleet and other professional vehicles deliver. The terminals would provide real-time traffic information 24/7 to improve the management of flows and to generate more precise data for anticipating and resolving problems. The idea could also extend to a fleet of 'Boris' bikes, personal bikes and buses.
- 4.47. The use of smart ticketing was also suggested, with a local equivalent of an Oyster card being introduced that could be used on the buses and trains.
- 4.48. Other technological solutions put forward included discouraging intra-city car trips by installing trackers in cars and introducing a limit to the number of journeys permitted in the city, further use of Real Time Passenger Information and an 'App' that allows users to share journeys on the school run – Lift2School

#### Smart Traffic Management

- 4.49. A suggestion was also made about how traffic signalling and technology can be more efficiently used to help manage the Cambridge traffic better. This could include syncing traffic signals to 'real time' situations, reallocating the queues of general traffic to areas that would need to be provided outside of the city boundaries – a so called "gating" of traffic – all done in conjunction with a range of complimentary measures designed at reducing the traffic entering the city centre.

#### **Behavioural change**

- 4.50. The behavioural change suggestions received were predominantly about spreading out the demand for road space throughout the day through varying the times that people need to travel.

#### Businesses

- 4.51. In relation to commuting, one contributor suggested that employers should be more flexible about the times that their staff are able to start and finish work in order that they can adjust their travelling time to avoid rush hour. They also suggested that a four-day working week would help. Another suggestion was that the planning system could be used to spread out the start/finish times of new employment centres, so that a certain percentage of employees had to arrive or depart before or after certain times.

## Schools

- 4.52. In a similar vein to encouraging employers to take more responsibility to help address the congestion problem, another contributor suggested that schools should take more ownership of the problem and be involved in the solution. The suggestion was that all schools should be made to bring children in on school buses as per the system in the US if they live too far to bike or walk and the schools themselves should enforce this. A number of participants suggested that schools should somehow make use of the park and ride sites and bus their pupils in from there rather than be dropped off at the school if they can't walk or cycle from home. Again, encouraging schools to organise chaperoned buses to the school and promoting them to parents, tax incentives for the schools to actively reduce school and staff usage.
- 4.53. There was a similar suggestion in relation to - amongst other issues - the timing of deliveries. Suggestions varied between deliveries only taking place between 1am and 5am, another suggested that parked delivery vehicles not be allowed in the city centre between 7am and 7pm, especially those in bus lanes.
- 4.54. The issue of deliveries and shopping was a common theme amongst a number of contributors. One person observed that shops should be encouraged to become 'display' only, and the customer collects at an out of town hub associated with the Park & Ride sites. The idea of out of town hubs was echoed in several suggestions. First and last mile goods delivery using a combination of Urban Consolidation Centres and Collection Points, coupled with low emission vehicles or cargo bikes to incentivise responsible deliveries is another idea.

## Low Emission Vehicles, Autonomous Vehicles, Car Clubs and Car Sharing

- 4.55. Some responses also put forward the need to promote car sharing, car clubs and the further use of low emission vehicles. Car clubs and specifically, electric car clubs were suggested and whilst charging infrastructure would be required, it was suggested that this is reasonably cheap to set up.
- 4.56. A suggestion made and indeed presented to the hearing session was for the use of autonomous vehicles, which it was said would become more commonplace within the next two decades. These could form both public and private vehicles and can coexist and link with existing public transport systems<sup>1</sup>. They also allow for the reduction of polluting vehicles in the centre of Cambridge. Work already is already planned as part of the Tranche 2 City

---

<sup>1</sup> Work is already planned as part of the Tranche 2 City Deal scheme development to consider how autonomous vehicles might form part of the passenger transport network, working with Cambridge University's Department of Engineering.

Deal preparation to consider how autonomous vehicles might form part of the passenger transport network, working with Cambridge University's Department of Engineering.

## Environment

### Design, Public Realm and Air Quality

- 4.57. The design of any transport intervention and the need to ensure it does not impact upon the character of the city was a common theme in the responses. The importance of protecting the built and natural environment came across strongly, with good design and improving the public realm being points made.
- 4.58. Responses were received regarding the need to enhance and maintain the verges of all radial routes into Cambridge due to the environmental and social benefits brought about by trees and green spaces.
- 4.59. The point was made that if the roads are widened it just encourages more traffic and changes the nature of the city. Removing the green spaces was also cited as a potential cause for even worse air pollution. Ensuring that air quality issues were tackled was itself a commonly highlighted issue.

## Process and problems

- 4.60. There were some submissions which weren't so much solutions to the congestion problems; rather they were a commentary on the Call for Evidence process and how the City Deal money will be spent.
- 4.61. One of these suggested that those with an expectation that investment in new infrastructure would be proportional to the forecast modal shift are mistaken. A second was a plea to think big, act small and a third was to take a more holistic approach to transport planning in the city as parking charges have increased year on year but nothing has been done to improve public transport and achieve modal shift.
- 4.62. Other comments and suggestions included the establishment of environmental standards against which transport proposals must be judged, a critique of the location of new development which was said to cause more trips than necessary and has fuelled 'foreign investors' buying property in the city centre, which in turn has caused rents to rise. The need for a strong communications campaign about the proposals to win over the hearts and minds of the public was also argued for.
- 4.63. Some responses included comments on governance and legislation and how this process should seize the opportunity to alter the way decisions are made and devolve power and finances to a more local governance structure.



## 5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Members of the City Deal Executive Board and Assembly invited individuals and organisations to put forward their thoughts on how they believe the congestion issues in Cambridge can be solved.
- 5.2. The submissions to this Call for Evidence are summarised in brief in this paper, but have not yet been assessed in terms of how successfully they might address the question raised by the Board and Assembly.

### **Links to Call for Evidence submissions and presentations, and other useful information**

- 5.3. The submissions received to the Call for Evidence and the presentations made at the hearing sessions can be viewed at:  
<http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport/10>
- 5.4. This page also provides details of the Cambridge Access Study, including the [Audit Report](#) prepared by Mott MacDonald.
- 5.5. In addition, the following can be accessed from the above web page.
  - Written submissions to the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence.
  - Presentations made at the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings.
  - Initial Summary of the evidence received (this document).
  - Notes of the Tackling Congestion: Call for Evidence hearings and of the 'Traffic Generators' meeting.
  - Presentations made at the 'Traffic Generators' meeting.
- 5.6. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire can be viewed at:  
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/tscsc/>

This page is left blank intentionally.

## Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board

### 15 January 2015 – City Deal progress report

Workstream	Update	Upcoming milestones
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMME</b> Create and deliver an infrastructure investment programme that draws together national and local funding streams to invest in infrastructure that will drive economic growth in the area.		
<b>A1307 corridor to include bus priority / A1307 additional Park &amp; Ride</b> Achieve faster and more reliable bus journey times between Haverhill, Cambridge and key areas in between, through bus priority at key congestion points on the A1307 and provision of an outer Park & Ride site on the corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial options assessment study work has looked into all transport mode options in the corridor and identified those that are likely to be of most benefit – this is being developed into a full range of options for consideration by the February Assembly and March Board.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 February / 3 March: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to review the outcome of options development work and agree next steps.</li> </ul>
<b>A428-M11 segregated bus route / A428 corridor Park &amp; Ride / Madingley Road bus priority</b> Ensure that bus journeys between Cambourne and Cambridge are direct and unaffected by congestion by providing high quality bus priority measures between the A428/A1303 junction and Queen's Road, Cambridge and one or more Park & Ride or rural interchange sites on the corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation on the route closed on 23 November. Responses received are currently being considered. These will be brought for consideration to the February Assembly and March Board.</li> <li>Over 2,000 responses were received to the consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 February / 3 March: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to consider the outcomes of public consultation on the initial options and agree further work.</li> </ul>
<b>Chisholm Trail cycle links</b> A high quality strategic cycle route from Cambridge Station in the south of the city through to the new [Cambridge North] Station, providing connections between the Science and Business Parks in the north and the commercial hub around Cambridge Station and the Biomedical Campus.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation on the route closed on 30 November. Responses received are currently being considered.</li> <li>Over 1,400 responses were received to the consultation.</li> <li>The Assembly and Board will decide on next steps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 February / 3 March: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to consider consultation outcomes, decide whether to approve the recommended route for detailed design and development and to progress the scheme to a planning application.</li> </ul>

<p><b>City centre capacity improvements</b> Improve the reliability of, and capacity for public transport, cycling and walking movements in the city centre through a variety of potential measures to relieve congestion and manage the city's transport network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The call for evidence on tackling congestion took place throughout November, with responses received by the end of November being fed into the report at this meeting, and responses received by the end of December being fed into the report considered by the Board in January.</li> <li>• 67 written responses were received to the call for evidence by the end of November. Six further written responses were received by the final deadline of 31 December 2015, and will be considered in the analysis of submissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 June / 16 June: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to review the outcomes of the Cambridge access study and decide on next steps for tackling congestion and access in Cambridge.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cross-city cycle improvements</b> Facilitate continued growth and an increased proportion of cycling trips in Cambridge, lifting cycling levels to around 40% by enhancing the connectivity, accessibility and safety of the cycling network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public consultation on options for the programme of improvements opened on 4 January.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 February: Public consultation closes.</li> <li>• 2 June / 16 June: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to consider detailed schemes, informed by public consultation, and to approve delivery of the schemes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Histon Road bus priority / Milton Road bus priority</b> Ensure that bus journeys along Histon and Milton Roads are direct and unaffected by congestion through the provision of high quality on-line bus priority measures between the Histon and Milton Interchanges and Cambridge city centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public consultation on options for the schemes began on 14 December, closing on 15 February.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 February: Close of public consultation.</li> <li>• 2 June / 16 June: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to consider the outcomes of public consultation and select a preferred option for each corridor, to be developed in greater detail.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tranche 2 programme development</b> Develop a prioritised programme of infrastructure investments, informed by an analysis of their anticipated economic impacts, to be delivered during the tranche 2 period (2020/21-2024/25).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board on 3 December agreed the process for developing and prioritising the tranche 2 programme.</li> <li>• The agreed process allows for focus to be maintained on the tranche 1 programme.</li> <li>• At that meeting the Board also approved high-level consultation on the Western Orbital scheme in spring 2016.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autumn 2016: Initial sift and assessment of the long-list of schemes.</li> <li>• Winter 2016: Agreement of initial priorities for preparatory work on tranche 2 schemes to develop to 'options assessment' stage.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board also approved early development of work on the A10(N) corridor, alongside and integrated with the transport study to inform the Area Action Plan for Cambridge Northern Fringe East (around the new station).</li> </ul>	
<b>OTHER WORKSTREAMS</b>		
<b>Communications</b> Communicate the vision and aims of the City Deal to a range of audiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The advert for the Strategic Communications Manager has now closed. Interviews are to take place in December.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January: Recruit Strategic Communications Manager.</li> <li>Refresh and further develop communications strategy once the post is filled.</li> </ul>
<b>Economic development and promotion</b> Enhance the alignment of public and private sector partners in Greater Cambridge to enhance the attractiveness and promotion of the Greater Cambridge economy to high-value investors around the world, and align appropriate activities that support existing businesses to develop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cambridge Promotions Agency (CPA) has achieved the objectives set out for 2015.</li> <li>The CPA has drafted City Deal related promotional projects: a) positive communication material for international business; and b) smart city narrative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January: Steering Group to meet to review progress on milestones due by year end.</li> </ul>
<b>Finance</b> Manage and monitor the delivery of the infrastructure investment programme and relevant City Deal-related expenditure, and bring together appropriate local funding streams to complement and enhance the delivery of City Deal objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2016/17 New Homes Bonus allocations now published – the scheme has not been scrapped as was feared.</li> <li>Government is currently consulting changes to the New Homes Bonus, which would reduce the number of years the payment is made for, withholding from Authorities without a Local Plan and abating it where planning permission is granted on appeal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 March: Executive Board to agree the City Deal's 2016/17 budget.</li> </ul>
<b>Governance</b> Create a governance arrangement for joint decision making between the local Councils that provides a coordinated approach to the overall strategic vision, including exploring the creation of a Combined Authority to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill, which contains among others a provision to allow a County Council to join a Combined Authority for a part of its area, is currently going through Parliament.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January: Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill is anticipated to receive Royal Assent.</li> </ul>

allow the Councils to collaborate more closely to support economic development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions around a prospective devolution deal, which could have significant implications for City Deal governance, are ongoing.</li> </ul>	
<b>Housing</b> Explore the creation of a joint venture to drive quicker delivery of 2,000 of the affordable new homes envisaged in the draft Local Plans, potentially drawing in land holdings from the partners and external investment to deliver more affordable housing, and deliver 1,000 extra new homes on rural exception sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fee structure for the HDA is currently being firmed up with the Councils.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By end March: Establish a Member Reference Group and produce a business plan for the HDA for 2016/17 that indicates the number of schemes that the HDA will delivery and its operational costs.</li> </ul>
<b>Payment-by-results mechanism</b> Implement a payment-by-results mechanism where Greater Cambridge is rewarded for prioritising and investing in projects that deliver the greatest economic impact over 15 years, commencing in 2015-16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officers are working with counterparts from several city-regions around the UK to undertake a combined procurement exercise for the economic assessment panel, which will serve the city-regions' payment-by-results mechanisms up to 2021.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>June: Economic assessment panel anticipated to start its work.</li> </ul>
<b>Skills</b> Create a locally responsive skills system that maximises the impact of public investment, forges stronger links between employers and skills providers, and drives growth across Greater Cambridge, including delivering 420 additional apprenticeships in growth sectors over five years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City Deal Skills Service has come into operation, following the commissioning of 'Form the Future' to deliver the service.</li> <li>Press coverage over the Christmas period was positive.</li> <li>The first operational report has been received, showing that the service is currently on target.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January: City Deal Joint Assembly sub-group to meet to review progress.</li> <li>Date TBC: Launch event for the Skills Service.</li> </ul>
<b>Smart/digital</b> Explore, in partnership with academic and business expertise, technological opportunities to complement the aims of the infrastructure investment programme and improve the functioning of the Greater Cambridge economy, finding smart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board on 3 November agreed in principle to support the investment of up to £280,000 to implement a 'Smart Technology Platform', subject to a more detailed investment proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 February / 3 March: Joint Assembly / Executive Board to consider the business case that has been developed for investment into the Smarter Cambridge programme.</li> <li>February: Joint Assembly / Executive Board workshop.</li> </ul>

solutions to a series of issues constraining the economic growth potential of the area and positioning the area as a Smart Cities leader.		
<b>Strategic planning</b> Underpin and accelerate the delivery of the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, including undertaking an early review of the Local Plans beginning in 2019 to take into account the anticipated changed infrastructure landscape, and work towards developing a combined Local Plan that includes other relevant economic levers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council approved consultation on proposed Local Plan modifications. This launched on 2 December.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25 January: Public consultation on proposed Local Plan modifications closes.</li> <li>March: Councils to submit the further work and proposed modifications to the Inspectors and examination resumes.</li> </ul>

This page is left blank intentionally.

## Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board Forward Plan of decisions

Notice is hereby given of:

- Decisions that that will be taken by the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board, including key decisions as identified in the table below
- Confidential or exempt executive decisions that will be taken in a meeting from which the public will be excluded (for whole or part)

A 'key decision' is one that is likely:

- a) to result in the incurring of expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
- b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in the Greater Cambridge area.

Item title	Summary of decision (including notice of confidential or exempt information, if appropriate)	Officer lead(s)	Key decision?
<b>Meeting date: 3 March 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 24 February 2016</b>	
Consultation results for schemes along the A428 corridor and coming in to western Cambridge: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Madingley Road</li> <li>• A428-M11</li> <li>• Bourn Airfield / Cambourne busway</li> </ul>	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation on the initial options. These options will be subject to further work over the summer to incorporate the consultation outcomes, and will be brought back to the Executive Board for the selection of a preferred option in September.	Graham Hughes	No
Chisholm Trail – consultation results and approval to progress detailed design of selected route	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation, to approve the recommended route of the Trail for further detailed design and development, and to approve progressing the scheme to a planning application. Give approval for Compulsory Purchase Order powers to secure the land needed.	Graham Hughes	Yes

A1307 corridor to include bus priority – options and approval to consult	To review the outcome of options development work and to agree next steps.	Graham Hughes	Yes
Smarter Cambridge investment business case	To consider the business case that has been developed for investment into the Smarter Cambridge programme and approve funding for the delivery of the detailed schemes proposed.	Graham Hughes	Yes
2016/17 budget setting and 2015/16 Quarter 3 financial monitoring report	To agree the City Deal's 2016/17 budget from the pooled New Homes Bonus allocations and to note financial information from October-December 2015.	Chris Malyon	No
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No
<b>Meeting date: 16 June 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 8 June 2016</b>	
Histon Road – consultation results and selection of preferred measures	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation on the initial options and to select a preferred option to develop in greater detail, to be subject to public consultation before being brought back to the Executive Board for approval to progress to detailed design.	Graham Hughes	Yes
Milton Road – consultation results and selection of preferred measures	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation on the initial options and to select a preferred option to develop in greater detail, to be subject to public consultation before being brought back to the Executive Board for approval to progress to detailed design.	Graham Hughes	Yes
Cross-city cycling – scheme detail and approval to deliver	To consider detailed schemes informed by public consultation, and to approve delivery of the schemes.	Graham Hughes	Yes

<u>Cambridge Access and Capacity Study</u>	<u>To review the outcomes of the Cambridge access study and decide on next steps for tackling congestion and access in Cambridge.</u>	<u>Graham Hughes</u>	<u>No</u>
Annual skills review	To note progress made in 2015/16 on delivering the skills workstream and consider any issues arising.	Graham Hughes	No
Annual housing review	To note progress made in 2015/16 on delivering the housing workstream and consider any issues arising.	Alex Colyer	No
2015/16 end of year financial monitoring report	To note financial information from the 2015/16 financial year.	Chris Malyon	No
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No
<b>Meeting date: 22 July 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 14 July 2016</b>	
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No
<b>Meeting date: 8 September 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 31 August 2016</b>	
Selection of preferred options for schemes along the A428 corridor and coming in to western Cambridge: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Madingley Road</li> <li>• A428-M11</li> <li>• Bourn Airfield / Cambourne busway</li> </ul>	To select a preferred option for each of the three schemes for Full Business Case preparation and detailed design, to be subject to further consultation once prepared before being brought back to the Executive Board.	Graham Hughes	Yes

Western Orbital – consultation results	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation on the initial options.	Graham Hughes	No
2016/17 Quarter 1 financial monitoring report	To note financial information from April-June 2016.	Chris Malyon	No
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No
<b>Meeting date: 13 October 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 5 October 2016</b>	
Chisholm Trail – approval of construction	To approve construction of the scheme.	Graham Hughes	Yes
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No
<b>Meeting date: 17 November 2016</b>		<b>Reports for each item to be published: 9 November 2016</b>	
A1307 corridor to include bus priority – consultation results and selection of preferred option	To consider the outcomes of the public consultation on the initial options and to select a preferred option to develop in greater detail, to be subject to public consultation before being brought back to the Executive Board for approval to progress to detailed design.	Graham Hughes	Yes
Six-monthly report on skills	To note progress on delivering the skills workstream and consider any issues arising.	Graham Hughes	No
Six-monthly report on housing	To note progress on delivering the housing workstream and consider any issues arising.	Alex Colyer	No
2016/17 Quarter 2 financial monitoring report	To note financial information from July-September 2016.	Chris Malyon	No
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No



Meeting date: 15 December 2016		Reports for each item to be published: 7 December 2016	
City Deal progress report	To note and discuss progress across the City Deal workstreams.	Tanya Sheridan	No

This page is left blank intentionally.