



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

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

Councillor Lewis Herbert
Councillor Francis Burkitt
Phil Allmendinger
Councillor Ian Bates
Mark Reeve

Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
University of Cambridge
Cambridgeshire County Council
Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find attached answers to the questions asked at the meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which was held in **THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SHIRE HALL, CAMBRIDGE** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 8 MARCH 2017** at 4.00 p.m.

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.

AGENDA

4. Questions from Members of the Public

**PAGES
1 - 8**

This page is left blank intentionally.

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
6	Cllr Susan van de Ven	25 th January 2017	A10	<p>The A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme is continuing to attract match funding opportunities. In order to complete the scheme we must find a way of funding the Melbourn-Royston missing link, which traverses the Hertfordshire border.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridgeshire/Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership, which includes North Hertfordshire in its economic zone, discussed the case for funding the Melbourn-Royston link at their December Board meeting. A report by cross-border, crossparty councillors was presented to the LEP for consideration and is published on the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign website.</p> <p>The LEP authorizes to me to say to you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board was supportive of finding a multi-agency route to finalise delivery • The Board understood the commercial and environmental advantages of the link • That local sources should be utilised alongside private sector support • The Board would be prepared to consider a financial ask provided other mechanisms were supportive too. <p>I would like to ask the City Deal Executive Board to consider joining forces with the LEP to fund the final link, which is shovel-ready and could present a finished product even this year, all sticking to City Deal core principles of collaboration, match-funding, economic growth and modal shift to reduce car use on key corridors into Cambridge.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
19	Cllr Bridget Smith	25 th January 2017	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	Does the GCCD Board agree that the new Combined Authority, instead of working in collaboration with the City Deal, might actually pose a threat to its future? Might public criticism and the recent external report result in future tranches of money being paid directly to the CA? What is the GCCD Board going to do to mitigate this risk?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
8	Stephen Coates	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	When will the independent review of the City Deal by Mouchel become an agenda item for both the City Deal Assembly and the City Deal Board so there will be a full discussion and full Q&A session in both forums on the report? Many people who should have been consulted for the preparation of this report were not, including some Assembly members. Will there be a mechanism for residents groups or councillors to share further concerns on governance issues that either flow from this report or should have been included in this report?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
9	Carolyn Postage	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	<p>I have read the Mouchel's Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review. I can see that some of the recommendations have already been put in place, such as limiting questions at public meetings and recruiting dedicated staff to the City Deal.</p> <p>However, the report also highlighted that the officers were unclear of the GCCD objectives, the Board reports were not "fit for purpose" and that recommendations have been made on out-of-date evidence. Therefore can the Board explain why it is still progressing with recommendations based on out-of-date evidence and why is option 3/3a still being worked up?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
18	Edward Leigh	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	1) Will the Board move quickly to commission an external review of the appropriateness and rigourness of the procedures used to prioritise and develop schemes?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				2) So will you, as members of the City Deal Board and representatives of the LA' s. LEP and Cambridge University, commit to developing this year a clear vision for the Greater Cambridge region in the 2030's along with a new coherent transport strategy?	http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	
1	Dr Joanna Gumula	25 th January 2017	City Access – bus routes	<p>1) Among the “number of projects to help to achieve” the transport vision set out by the Greater Cambridge City Deal, what new bus routes have been planned or are being considered (in addition to the bus route from Cambourne to Cambridge along the A1307) to ensure better bus services into, out of and around Cambridge?</p> <p>2) Are there any new bus routes under consideration that would allow the area of Newnham to be properly linked with the rest of Cambridge by bus?</p> <p>3) Do the projects related to the vision of the Greater Cambridge City Deal include new bus routes and services, which would allow students of schools located in the areas subject to traffic congestion to reach and leave their respective schools by bus? Have the schools been consulted regarding this issue and have any co-operative arrangements or projects been proposed to the schools by the City Deal team?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
2	Andrew Dutton	25 th January 2017	Workplace parking levy.	<p>I note that you still intend to introduce the non-progressive parking tax on those who work in Cambridge. Whilst £1.75 might not be significant to many of the well paid workers in Cambridge (Most companies will pass this charge on to their employees) for the low paid or disabled this is a significant an unfair burden. Many of these people have no option but to drive due, physical disability or time constraints of running a family i.e. getting children to schools and working. I am surprised a socially responsible party such as yourselves have not considered the negative implications of this.</p> <p>How do you plan to resolve this unfair burden on some of the lowest paid workers in Cambridge? These people have to drive due to housing costs and cannot use public transport or cycling due to physical disability or time constraints and the need to both work a full day and take children to schools. Would you consider a wage limit below which it cannot be passed on or an exemption for those below a certain wage or for those with disabilities?</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
3	Dr Drew Milne	25 th January 2017	Air pollution	<p>In beginning to tackle air pollution in Cambridge, could the City Deal Executive Board address the problem of diesel cars?</p> <p>In years to come, when the full damage done by diesel cars in particular is understood, it will turn out to be a tragedy that institutions with a responsibility for considering air pollution did not act sooner. Please take action.</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes.
4	Magda Werno	25 th January 2017	City Access	<p>1. Please can you elaborate on the current plans in relation to the planned <i>traffic management measures</i> and the <i>local interventions in the most congested areas of central Cambridge</i> mentioned in the press release?</p> <p>2. Please can you explain what specific measures will be taken <i>to improve bus journeys</i>? What criteria for improvement are you going to use, and how will this improvement be measured?</p> <p>3. What are your plans in terms of making public transport more affordable for the local residents?</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
7	Nichola Harrison	25 th January 2017	City Access	Will you please confirm whether your plan for physical demand management measures, illustrated by the flower petals drawing with the title "Concept diagram of local area accessibility" that was tabled at last week's Assembly meeting, might involve partial or full road closures at peak times in Cambridge?	The question was answered in the meeting as part of the discussion on agenda item 7, and was published as part of the minutes. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
12	Cambridge Past Present and Future	25 th January 2017	City Access	Will you listen to the advice of the Assembly and undertake a six-month assessment to quantify all of the options so that a better informed decisions making process can take place OR will the Board merely rubber stamp what it is being given to agree a package of measures with no clear idea of the outcome or future consequences?	The question was answered in the meeting as part of the discussion on agenda item 7, and was published as part of the minutes http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
16	Lynn Hieatt	25 th January 2017	City Access	In three 'zones' surveyed [1], 3,612 non-residents' cars parked on residential streets in the morning. That's higher than the capacity of our 5 multi-storey carparks [2] and parked at Park/Rides. [3] 42,149 vehicles come in between 7am-10am [4] – commuter parkers = 8.5% of all morning traffic. Add in areas not surveyed, and that's 10%. CJAC policy [5] for parking controls is a start.[6] The City Deal could propose alternatives for commuters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased P/R capacity • Improved bus frequency, directness, start/end times • Deter residents from filling de-congested streets • Employers could create 'travel-to-work' plans.[7] • Rail commuters should be able to use Cambridge Leisure carpark for the same price as at the station.[8] A 'carrots & sticks' package could be developed – and it could work. Will the City Deal Board seize this opportunity for a joined-up plan to tackle congestion and the problems commuters face?	The question was presented by Edward Leigh. It was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
17	Robin Heydon	25 th January 2017	City Access	With regard to Agenda item 7, paragraph 3.b.v, we believe that the Greater Cambridge City Deal is missing a long term vision of the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure that it will need to accommodate the modal shift expected. As shown with the proposed City Deal Design Guide there is a significant lack of ambition for the high quality of infrastructure needed to enable the modal shift required. Our estimates have determined that the number of people cycling will double within the city and the surrounding area by 2031 [1]. This vision would provide the Greater Cambridge City Deal Board with a strategic view of what is needed to accommodate this increase in cycling and walking traffic so that the city doesn't grind to a complete stop and help validate the cycling provision delivery plan. We would like to offer to work in partnership with the members of the City Deal, the County Council officers, and other stakeholders and partners to create this long term walking and cycling vision, and help create the delivery plan that could over the next 15 years provide infrastructure that caters for people walking and cycling of all ages and abilities. Is this possible?	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
20	Neil Mackay	25 th January	City Access	Given that Cambridge small businesses were at the heart of the recent protests	The question was answered in the meeting and was	.Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
		2017		<p>against the introduction of peak time road closures by the use of PCCP cameras. Why is it that small business is not now being fully consulted with, in an attempt to find a solution to the problem.</p> <p>The future of a considerable number of small businesses and the livelihoods of all those employed by those businesses depend on the correct solution being implemented. We feel that rather than you simply concocting an 'even more Scary City Deal' and then effectively paying 'lips service' to consultation once more. It is our opinion that you should be inviting the 'involvement' of all the small business potentially effected, to be included in the process of developing the proposals. Are you willing to do so?</p>	<p>published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	
21	Pete Howard	25 th January 2017	City Access	Given the concerns raised from the 10,000 plus residents and businesses who signed the petition against the planned road and traffic restrictions, will the council now agree to consult and listen to all stake holders regarding its planned roads closures or traffic congestion measures, well before any degree of implementation?	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
15	Richard Taylor	25 th January 2017	Milton Road	<p>When the board next considers plans for Milton Road will it receive a report: collating the results of responses to the initial public consultation which ran until February 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying who attended the private workshop events, and the basis on which they were invited. Addressing the 200 responses from 300 families to a Milton Road Primary School consultation on the Milton Road plans [1], and if the school representative reflected the views expressed when participating in the private workshops. Clarifying if the report on private workshops stating: "The majority of attendees were keen to retain as much green verge and as many trees as possible"[2], is referring to the retention of the existing trees and verges? <p>When the board next considers Milton Road will it formally endorse the letter dated 14 September 2016 from the board chair to the LLF and Assembly chairs [3]?</p> <p>Could a Local Liaison Forum (or Cambridge City Council North Area Committee) meeting be held between publication of the next City Deal Board report on Milton Rd and its consideration by the board so recommendations get discussed locally, by the area's councillors, before decisions are made? Such a meeting could include a detailed public presentation of, and opportunity for the public to ask questions on, the LLF endorsed "Do Optimum" plan.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
5	Bob Jarman	25 th January 2017	Histon Road	Cambridge City Council has a nature conservation strategy with the Wildlife Trust entitled "Enhancing Biodiversity". Recommendation BU4 says: "Maintain and seek to increase the number of street trees"; and recommendation BU6 says : "Prevent the loss...of street trees". Do you plan to remove the street trees in Histon Road?	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions related to an item scheduled for the March agenda.	The questioner was contacted and invited to re-submit the question at the March meeting.
10	Alistair Burford	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	1. Residents have raised serious concerns about a flawed consultation only to be told that it is not an agenda item. When members of the public raise concerns of this nature does the Board not think that they should be listened to regardless of whether it's an agenda item or not?	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>2. Will the Board (not officers) undertake to investigate my concerns and provide a full written response?</p> <p>3. Mr Menzies stated at the Joint Assembly that all Atkins reports are available to the public, would he mind providing the link to the 2 Atkins reports on the Park and Ride Locations?</p>		
11	Dr Marilyn Treacy	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>Many Coton residents are dismayed by the stance that the City Deal executive has taken in avoiding answering their questions submitted by email or in a public forum.</p> <p>If the residents of Coton do not receive adequate answers to their questions regarding the lack of transparency in factors leading to option 3/3a being chosen as the preferred option they may have no alternative but to take legal action .What action will the City Deal take to avoid this scenario?</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
13	Chris Pratten	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>I submitted a question to the Assembly meeting on 18th Jan 2017 asking that Assembly members recommend that officers release a list of all documents and reports produced by Atkins regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor.</p> <p>This request was made in light of the discovery, via FOI, of an internally published report from Atkins from 2015 that was shared with City Deal Partners including, we assume, the University of Cambridge.</p> <p>The response from the Assembly Chair was encouraging and Mr Menzies stated at the Assembly meeting that he was comfortable making information freely available.</p> <p>Email communication with Mr Menzies since the Assembly meeting has met with a very different response. I have been told that I will need to use Freedom of Information requests to get any information.</p> <p>Will the Board demand that officers immediately produce a list of all documents produced by Atkins and then make copies of the documents available to the public?</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
14	Allan Treacy	25 th January 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	On what grounds could the City Deal executive contemplate backing a £207m off road solution if there is a circa £40m on road alternative? Should not the City Deal be prioritising the saving of £160m of public money to be put towards more progressive solutions for the area's transport challenges?	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
4	Stephen Coates	8 th March 2017	Conflicts of interest	<p>Mark Reeve is on the Board of the City Deal and is Chair of the LEP. Senior figures like Steve Barclay MP and Steve Count, Leader of Cambs CC, are asking serious questions about business conflicts at the LEP. They both do not feel they have had adequate answers from Mark Reeve. Can Lewis Herbert explain why he is not taking action on this as Chair of the City Deal?</p> <p>Through FOI, we have now established the clear intent of the Barton Road Landowners to get a busway crossing their land. Regardless of Cambridge University being a minority member of NBRLOG this seems to contradict prior statements by Nigel Slater. Will Lewis Herbert examine the 800 pages of evidence we have obtained and then reconsider whether he has handled this conflict properly?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6854&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				The Board has a duty to examine conflicts. Yet these are never on the Board's agenda. How can the Board and the Assembly deny questions on this and also decline questions on the cost of the A428 project?		
2	Antony Carpen	8 th March 2017	A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge	<p>The City Deal Board announced an award of £50,000 of funding for research into the Cambridge Bullet Bus (reported at http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/cambridge-news/city-deal-invests-futuristic-120-12124803). I have not been able to find any explanation into this project online - the complete opposite of the case for Rail Haverhill and for Cambridge Connect Light Rail.</p> <p>Please can the City Deal Board:</p> <p>1) release a formal document explaining at least the basics of what the bullet bus project actually is, and the considerations made before approving the release of £50,000 of funding for research for this project (which seemed to come out of the blue)</p> <p>2) please comment on whether they will be willing to fund the necessary technical and financial feasibility studies for Rail Haverhill and the Cambridge Connect proposals in tranche 2 as part of the research budgets. I find it astonishing that such proposals were swept aside in tranche 1 given the levels of growing public support for both projects which have had extended publicity on the work already done, compared to the bullet bus project</p> <p>3) please comment on how you will ensure the public - and in particular the academic community & experts in & around Cambridge will be able to scrutinise the assessments you make on the cost/benefits of proposals put forward given the disquiet of your conclusions originally for the rail haverhill project.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6854&Ver=4</p>	Yes
3	Barbara Taylor	8 th March 2017	Milton Road	<p>In Note number 3 under Appendix 2 on page 26, it states that the delivery plans for the bus, cycling and walking improvements for Milton Road 'assume two further rounds of consultation in late 2017 and early 2018'. However in the Milestones Plan, on page 29, it shows only one consultation event to take place in quarter 3 of 2017/18.</p> <p>Can we be assured that there will indeed be two further rounds of consultation and that these will be reflected in the Milestones Plan?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>Whilst Milton Road bus priority was not an item on the agenda for discussion, the question related specifically to the Progress Report item, hence it being taken at this meeting.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6854&Ver=4</p>	Yes
1	Bob Jarman	8 th March 2017	Histon Road	<p>Cambridge City Council has a nature conservation strategy with the Wildlife Trust entitled "Enhancing Biodiversity". Recommendation BU4 says: "Maintain and seek to increase the number of street trees..."; and recommendation BU6 says: "Prevent the loss...of street trees". Do you plan to remove the street trees in Histon Road?</p>	<p>Standing Orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item.</p> <p>This question relates to an item that is not on the agenda for discussion, but is on the agenda for the June meeting cycle. It is therefore not an issue that warrants an exception to the presumption in the Standing Orders that questions should relate to agenda items.</p> <p>A written response was provided to Bob Jarman's question to the 1st March 2017 Joint Assembly</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
					meeting, which also answered this question. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&MId=6848&Ver=4	

This page is left blank intentionally.