



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on  
Friday, 15 January 2016 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)
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
John Bridge OBE	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Professor Nigel Slater	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
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca

#### Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Glen Richardson	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Steve Count (Cambridgeshire County Council). Councillor Ian Bates was in attendance as his substitute.

### 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

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

### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest by Members of the Board were made.

#### 4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The following questions or statements from members of the public, together with responses by Members of the Board or officers, were noted as follows:

##### 1) Dorcas Fowler

Dorcas Fowler spoke as a resident of Milton Road and said that the ideas put forward for Milton Road as part of the City Deal scheme were premised on the assumption that large numbers of people in the new developments, such as Waterbeach, would be adding to peak traffic. She asked what evidence there was of growth of jobs in the City Centre as opposed to the periphery, such as on the Addenbrooke's site.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, made the point that people visited Cambridge for a variety of reasons and said that there was significant congestion both in the City Centre and radial routes, meaning that several issues would need addressing to improve access in and out of Cambridge.

Mr Hughes said that a significant amount of new employment sites were planned as part of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils' respective Local Development Plans. Some of these sites were located on the periphery, but it was not always possible for people to travel around Cambridge to access them efficiently, resulting in people travelling through the City itself. He also referred to the CB1 Cambridge Railway Station, which had seen a considerable rise in employment numbers.

Mr Hughes believed that there would be continued employment growth in the Greater Cambridge area, which he said was reflected in the proposals put forward as part of the City Deal package.

##### 2) Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor stated that proposals for structural changes to Milton Road and Histon Road were based on an initial technical study by external consultants and said that they would have been given a brief when they were commissioned by the City Deal Executive Board to undertake the work. She asked where the brief had been published.

Mr Hughes said that the brief would be made available on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website.

##### 3) Lynn Hieatt

Lynn Hieatt referred to the Government's official guidance on transport modelling and appraisal and the emphasis made throughout the City Deal programme that proposals for transport infrastructure must be evidence-based. She said that, given the proposals for Milton Road, Histon Road and the A428 Madingley Road corridor had at their centre the introduction of separate bus-only lanes, residents were asking for the evidence that these measures were necessary and would work. She asked for examples of where bus-only lanes had been successful and questioned when and where this evidence would be published.

Mr Hughes reflected on a number of examples he had given in the past in response to other public questions submitted to the Executive Board and Joint Assembly in respect of successful bus lane schemes. He said that there were plenty of examples from around the world where significant changes to networks had led to a higher quality of service, with

better reliability and frequency which in turn generate more patronage and usage as a result. He gave the guided busway as an example in Cambridgeshire, the introduction of which saw a very dramatic growth in patronage locally.

Mr Hughes confirmed that, whichever options were chosen for the transport infrastructure schemes cited as part of this question, provision for buses would be of very high quality and consist of appropriate technologies for the area.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, highlighted that statistical information regarding the guided busway was set out in a performance report scheduled for consideration by the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee on 19 January 2016.

#### **4) Michael Page**

Michael Page referred to the public consultation on the Milton Road City Deal scheme and referred to the options that had been included in the consultation document, which he said had omitted some of the options originally included in the consultant's draft options report. He therefore asked by what process the first two options proposed by the consultants had been removed, on what evidence this was based and what steps the Board was prepared to take to consider all of the original options.

Mr Hughes explained that the consultant's draft options report consisted of a wide range of options for the scheme at Milton Road. In reviewing the draft options and in working with internal teams, as well as with the consultants themselves, officers, in making a recommendation to the Board, put forward a consultation document that included what they felt would lead to an effective consultation process for the scheme. The consultation had been supported by the Joint Assembly and subsequently approved by the Executive Board.

In addressing the question regarding what evidence was used to determine which options were presented, Mr Hughes said that the experience of officers and their knowledge of how that specific section of the network operated, together with how the scheme could build the different elements together, was the ultimate determining factor in officers providing a recommendation to the Board. He made the point that a significant number of the recommendations made to decision-makers in respect of schemes such as this were based on the experience of officers.

Councillor Lewis Herbert reminded members of the public that any alternatives submitted to the options set out in the consultation document would be carefully considered when analysing the responses to the consultation, emphasising that people's views would be listened to as part of the process.

#### **5) Gabriel Fox**

Gabriel Fox referred to the recent call for evidence in respect of congestion and Dr Steve Melia, Senior Lecturer in Transport and Planning at the University of the West of England, who had been invited to provide expert input and had advised that the best examples of sustainable urban transport often had a 'wow factor', which was largely absent in the United Kingdom. Gabriel Fox stated that Bus Rapid Transit was one of the fastest growing urban transport solutions with hundreds of successful installations worldwide, including more than a dozen in the United Kingdom, with several more under construction.

She asked the Executive Board if it agreed with Dr Melia on the importance of a 'wow factor' and whether the Board would be prepared to provide competitive grant funding for one or two projects to assess the viability of a Bus Rapid Transit system for Cambridge.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, in providing an initial response, said that the Board welcomed innovative proposals.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, said that Bus Rapid Transit and high quality public transport was already part of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. She agreed that Bus Rapid Transit was a cheaper and better way of delivering public transport services where existing railway lines were not already in place, but highlighted that there were space constraints in Cambridge and also emphasised the need to protect other user groups and modes of transport.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged the question regarding grant funding, saying that he would give the issue some further consideration and provide a response in writing.

## **6) Edward Leigh**

Edward Leigh asked officers to refer him to the modelling that had been done on future traffic flows on and within the inner ring road and, in particular, was interested to know what modelling had been undertaken on the impact of increasing road capacity on radials with the introduction of new bus lanes.

Mr Leigh had estimated that the number of bus arrivals in the City at peak times in 2031 would be between 250 and 300 buses per hour on the eight major radials. He thought it was highly unlikely that Drummer Street or any of the connecting streets could accommodate that frequency of bus movements in addition to over 10,000 people an hour disembarking in the City Centre. This suggested to him that bus operators would have to use a ring-and-spoke routing model, where buses circulated the City Centre but did not traverse it, which he said would have some advantages over the current hub-and-spoke routing model. However, he noted that this would make the inner ring road the most crucial part of the bus route network and questioned whether this had been studied or modelled. Mr Leigh suggested that what was needed to support this model was Smart Traffic Management and Inbound Flow Control, rather than new bus lanes. He therefore asked how it made sense to commission engineering consultants to propose bus priority schemes on isolated parts of the outer road network before having a clear understanding of the capacity constraints at the centre of the network.

Mr Hughes reported that a huge amount of modelling had taken place and continued to take place with regard to traffic flow in the City Centre and on radial route networks. As part of the Long-Term Transport Plan development, significant work had been undertaken around the ring road which had fed into the Local Development Plan processes of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. Links to this modelling work would be made available on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website.

Mr Hughes referred to Mr Leigh's estimations for bus capacity in 2031 and said that forecasting undertaken by consultants a few years ago resulted in similar projections, suggesting 200 to 220 buses per hour. He also said the point Mr Leigh raised regarding the criticality of the ring road was one consistently shared by officers as well as the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board in debating the issue.

Mr Hughes said that the City Centre's core scheme had moved traffic onto the ring road which resulted in the ring road itself becoming particularly congested. This meant the ring road was a key problem, with blocked junctions subsequently impacting radial routes and

causing congestion and gridlock. He said that Smart Traffic Management would no doubt be a component of proposals introduced to change the way in which the network operated, but emphasised that it would take something more than solely Smart Traffic Management to solve the issue. The call for evidence sessions saw a number of innovative ideas come forward and it was hoped that they could be developed into packages that would contribute to an effective solution. He acknowledged that the ring road needed addressing but emphasised that this had to be via a system-wide approach.

## **7) Robin Pellew**

Robin Pellew reported that Cambridge Past, Present and Future strongly endorsed the recommendation for the production of an Environmental Design Guide for City Deal transport infrastructure schemes. It urged that a statement of design principles was prepared, incorporating both social and environmental issues as a standard consideration in the planning of all City Deal transport infrastructure projects, with the aim of creating a high quality public realm.

Mr Pellew said that his organisation was becoming increasingly concerned about the manifest disconnect between the various infrastructure engineering projects the City Deal was now pursuing and the search for an appropriate demand management scheme to alleviate congestion across the whole City. He reflected that the City Deal had a duty to proceed on an evidence-led basis, but because no evidence had been forthcoming, Cambridge Past, Present and Future did not know whether there would be a need for the scale of heavy engineering proposed for the Milton and Histon Road schemes once effective demand management measures were in place.

He added that reassurance that the outcomes from the consultant's review of the call for evidence would in some way be included into these engineering projects at a future date, in his organisation's view, was not good enough. He therefore called on the City Deal Executive Board to defer the current consultations on radial road projects until, firstly, a comprehensive transport strategy had been produced that included a better balance between demand management and infrastructure engineering and, secondly, until the necessary social and environmental design guidelines had been agreed for all transport infrastructure projects.

Mr Hughes made the point that whatever came out of the process that had been started by the call for evidence sessions would be reported to the Executive Board well before any final decisions were scheduled to be taken on those transport infrastructure schemes where consultation had already commenced, such as the A428 Madingley Road corridor scheme. He confirmed, therefore, that it would be possible for these things to come together and ensure that they were not misaligned.

He said that significant improvements were needed to bus infrastructure, principally on the radial routes, to get the very large numbers of people living in the areas surrounding Cambridge into the City Centre in a way that did not cause the same problems that currently existed with regard to congestion. His professional opinion was that some sort of demand or congestion management system would be the answer, but this had to include much better facilities for buses and cyclists. Schemes were therefore being developed to ensure that provision for buses and cyclists, in particular, were of very high quality, which would be reflected in their final designs.

Councillor Herbert confirmed that options as part of a City-wide package would be presented to the Executive Board in June for consideration, which would be before any final decisions were made on transport infrastructure schemes thereby reiterating the point that any outcomes following the call for evidence sessions could be combined if

necessary.

## **8) Mal Schofield**

Mal Schofield referred to the minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 3 December 2015 in relation to the Western Orbital technical report and a study of home addresses of commuters to the Biomedical Campus that had been carried out by employers. This showed a concentration in the CB23 and CB24 postcode areas, which it was claimed implicitly strengthened the case for a Western Orbital bus route. He asked for confirmation of the statistics and fuller context for this commentary and questioned whether it was not more urgent to support an alternative travel mode such as cycling. He felt that commuters in the areas cited would, in a majority, have their needs better served by a Park and Cycle facility adjacent to Barton Road, providing a cross-city commute of less than 20 minutes.

Mr Hughes reminded the Board that the Western Orbital scheme was at a very early stage. The basis of the question in respect of the Western Orbital scheme focussed on use of the Biomedical Campus, but Mr Hughes said that another key element was orbital capacity and the ability to distribute traffic around Cambridge rather than it going into the City Centre. He extended an offer to Mr Schofield for representatives of his team to meet with him outside of the meeting regarding the specifics of the work that they had carried out in this respect.

Mr Hughes also took this opportunity to remind Board Members that all schemes needed to consist of a viable business case before the Executive Board would be able to make any decisions on them, and reiterated that, in respect of the Western Orbital scheme, there was a lot of work to do. He did believe, however, that there would be a valid case as part of the Western Orbital scheme to allow traffic to move around the City.

Jeremy Smith, Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding at Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that the study referred to in the question had been commissioned by AstraZeneca, noting that the results showed interesting statistics in respect of maximising use of public transport for cyclists and pedestrians. In terms of the CB23 postcode, Mr Smith reminded the Board that a significant number of new houses were proposed for development in that area and that Papworth Hospital would soon be moving, with its staff consequently and subsequently seeking to access the campus too. He reiterated the point that there was currently no reliable or timely public transport option that could guarantee efficient travel from the CB23 area to the Biomedical Campus.

## **9) Councillor Susan van de Ven**

Councillor van de Ven updated the Board on efforts that had been undertaken to realise the Cambridge to Royston A10 cycle link.

It was noted that the northern half of the route had won funding from the Department for Transport's Cycling Ambition Grant. The core cycle link between Harston and Foxton was completed a few weeks ago, with minimum disruption, in the space of about ten weeks. Councillor van de Ven said that, even in winter, this had been described as transformative for people who were finding cycling to Cambridge much quicker than driving.

She reported that the southern half of the corridor that included Melbourn and Royston was without funding, consisting of two components. The first was a bridge over the A505 roundabout near Royston. It was noted that Hertfordshire County Council had completed its feasibility study with a conclusive costed option for a bridge and the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership had also indicated that it

was keen to help find a funding solution. The second component was the cycle link in and out of Melbourn, consisting of approximately two miles and was entirely Cambridgeshire County Council owned land.

Councillor van de Ven was pleased to report that the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign had organised fundraising for a community contribution towards the missing Melbourn to Royston link and exceeded its initial target of £1,000 managing to raise £1,500. Employees at several local businesses were now planning fundraising to add to that community contribution. She closed by saying that this scheme had demonstrated how quickly A10 cycle links could be delivered and how instantly transformative small links a mile or two in length could be for people needing to get to work. She therefore urged the Executive Board to keep in mind the relatively small amount of funding needed to complete the A10 scheme.

Councillor Herbert said that the Executive Board would review how the first wave of City Deal funding had been spent at the end of the first tranche programme.

John Bridge, representing the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, committed to take this issue back to the Enterprise Partnership as a separate issue and establish what help it could provide.

#### **10) Robin Heydon**

Reflecting on the increase of the number of people driving to work in Greater Cambridge between 2001 and 2011 being 6.9%, Mr Heydon reported that the increase in the number of people cycling to work in the same timespan had increased by 34%. He said that the numbers for Cambridge were even more dramatic, with almost a 36% increase in the number of people cycling to work and a decrease of 2.5% in the number of people driving to work.

He added that these increases should be considered in the context of the working population increasing by over 10,000 people. If these population increases were extrapolated out to 2031, then he claimed that the number of people cycling to work in Greater Cambridge could be almost 42,000 people, compared to 75,500 people driving to work without taking into account that the available space for cars was severely limited already.

Mr Heydon reported that the Cambridge Cycling Campaign believed that the only way to enable 38% of people to cycle to work in 2031, reducing the pressure on roads, was to provide world-class bicycle infrastructure. He therefore asked the Executive Board to recognise the valuable contribution that cycling made to Greater Cambridge, to the productivity of its businesses, to the health of the population and to reducing congestion in the region. He also asked the Board to make a clear commitment that world-class bicycle infrastructure must be included in all City Deal infrastructure projects.

Councillor Herbert questioned the definition of 'world-class' and said that different people would probably have a different perception as to what this should represent. He added, however, that the Board would commit to providing a far higher standard of cycling provision as part of transport infrastructure schemes to that which was already in place. He was of the opinion that cycling was a central part of transport in Cambridge and he appreciated the expertise that the Cycling Campaign was able to provide.

Mr Hughes explained that there was already a significant amount of investment going into cycling with lots of work taking place, citing the Chisholm Trail as an example which would see a £10 million investment to link employers in and around Cambridge. He felt that

schemes such as this would help address the issues set out in Mr Haydon's question. Mr Hughes added that all transport infrastructure schemes, such as the A428 Madingley Road corridor scheme and the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes for example, would include high quality cycling and walking provision as part of them. He reminded the Board, however, that the schemes had to balance the needs of all users and different modes of transport.

## 5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented his report on the recommendations and key issues raised further to the meeting of the Assembly held on 17 December 2015.

Councillor Bick outlined the content of a public question that did not relate to any items on the agenda for the meeting of the Assembly, which focussed on engagement between the City Deal and other key external agencies such as Highways England and Network Rail. Officers had agreed to provide and circulate an 'engagement map', which would assist with understanding the type of engagement that took place with agencies such as these, and on what subjects.

The Joint Assembly had 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 Brinkerhoff consultancy on opportunities for public realm and landscaping enhancement within the City Deal. Further to public questions received that related to this item, the Joint Assembly supported the development of an Environment Design Guide for City Deal infrastructure schemes. It requested that officers be asked 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. The Executive Board supported this approach as a statement of environmental principles that should apply to City Deal transport infrastructure schemes.

It was agreed that Councillor Bick would introduce his report on the Joint Assembly's recommendations in relation to the tackling congestion call for evidence item under item 6 at this meeting.

At the request of the Executive Board, Mr Richardson provided Members with a version of the presentation the Joint Assembly had received at its meeting on 17 December 2015. As part of the presentation, the following points were noted in respect of creating streets and how space could be allocated:

- streets were persistent, hardly ever changed in their nature and held urban areas together, creating a sense of community;
- street layout and dimensions remained constant over many centuries, with buildings changing rather than the streets they were built around;
- roads facilitated movement and divided communities, whereas streets defined a place and helped create communities. It was therefore streets rather than roads that the City Deal should be aiming to provide in residential areas.

Numerous visual examples, both national and international, were shown which provided before and after perspectives of where trees, greenery and sustainable urban drainage systems had been incorporated as part of street improvements. This included indications of rationalisation of space, areas showing plenty of room for movement for all users, the greening of major arterial routes and ease of pedestrian movement.



Visual examples were also shown of successful models of sharing space on streets in terms of motorised vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and highway features that were not 'over-engineered'. These included pedestrian first crossing points, gateways, courtesy crossings, pedestrian orientated design, two-way cycle paths, segregated cycle paths and median zones.

In terms of addressing use of the street and adding trees and greenery, a number of scenarios were given of the different options available using a 20 metre right of way as an example. Scenarios included:

- 'do-maximum' consisting of pedestrian access, cycleways bus lanes, and motor vehicle access all with two-way access with no trees or greenery;
- the addition of trees on one side, with reduced width cycle lanes to compensate;
- trees on both sides of the street with bus access only in one direction;
- a tree-lined street with two-way cycle lane segregated from the street, with bus access only in one direction;
- shared footpath and cycleway, reduced width running lanes and a median strip.

Specific examples were also presented of how trees and greenery could be introduced into the urban street setting, with photographs of a street where this had taken place in Cambridge being shown.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the report by the Chairman of the Joint Assembly.
- (b) **NOTED** the presentation on opportunities for public realm and landscaping enhancement within the City Deal.
- (c) **SUPPORTED**, in principle, the production of an Environmental Design Guide to be used as a statement of environmental principles that should apply to City Deal transport infrastructure schemes.

## 6. TACKLING CONGESTION: CALL FOR EVIDENCE

Consideration was given to a report which provided an initial summary of submissions received in response to the tackling congestion call for evidence sessions that had recently been held and sought agreement to the means of assessment of the submissions received through the Cambridge Access Study or, where more relevant, through individual City Deal schemes. Jeremy Smith, Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and informed the Executive Board that a further seven responses had been received in addition to the 77 responses set out in the report. The main areas of focus had been captured in Appendix 1 of the report and were separated into the following categories:

- demand management and fiscal measures;
- technology;
- public transport infrastructure and service improvements;
- infrastructure improvements for active modes;
- highway capacity enhancements;
- behavioural change.

Mr Smith highlighted that officers had not yet had the opportunity to carry out any qualitative analysis of the information at this stage, but reported that all submissions were

available for viewing on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website. The report set out a proposed assessment criteria to be used with regard to the call for evidence submissions and proposals. This would ensure that analysis supported City Deal objectives and consisted of the following criteria:

- fairness;
- effectiveness;
- value for money;
- economic impact;
- dependencies and broader benefits;
- implementation.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, took this opportunity to thank those who had contributed to the sessions.

Councillor Ian Bates proposed an amendment to recommendation (b) of the report, to replace the word 'or' with 'and'. This was unanimously supported.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented the Assembly's recommendations following consideration of the same report at its meeting on 17 December 2015. He highlighted those issues raised as part of public questions received in respect of the item, as set out in his report, together with a list of comments made by Assembly Members in debating the contents of the officer's report.

Councillor Bick reported that officers were asked to clarify whether demand management was part of the strategy for the City Deal, further to which Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, had confirmed that demand management had been part of the County Council's strategies for the last ten years and was part of the current Long-Term Transport Strategy. At the Assembly meeting he added that it was part of the City Deal strategy and had featured in the original pitches to Government, but also stated that a strategy based solely on demand management or solely on the provision of alternatives would 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 Joint Assembly supported the recommendations set out in the report, subject to:

- the addition of the words 'subject to the inclusion of an additional criterion to assess environmental impact and design' to recommendation (b);
- the replacement of 22 July 2016 with 16 June 2016 in recommendation (c).

The Executive Board unanimously supported these amendments.

Councillor Bick highlighted that Claire Ruskin, Member of the Joint Assembly representing Cambridge Network, had offered to facilitate the continuation of the successful public engagement that had been achieved as part of this process through the Cambridge Network, to ensure that public interest, momentum and impetus could be maintained.

Councillor Herbert referred to Appendix 1 of the report, which he said was a good categorisation of the range of elements raised as part of responses to the call for evidence sessions. He proposed an additional paragraph to the recommendations set out in the report, as follows:

'That the City Deal officer team bring forward plans for an early City-wide and City Centre package of congestion cutting measures informed by the call for evidence, covering each of the elements in table 2 of the report as well as continuing investigation on other options.'

John Bridge, representing the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, felt that it was too early to comment on how demand management may or may not feature as part of the City Centre congestion project moving forward. He highlighted that a detailed report assessing the outcomes of the responses received to the call for evidence sessions would be submitted to the Executive Board in June 2016 and was of the opinion that committing to anything at this stage would be premature.

Councillor Ray Manning, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, reflected on comments made by the Joint Assembly about congestion charging and referred to a Notice of Motion approved by the District Council in February 2009. This confirmed that the Council, at that time, did not support the proposal of a congestion charge or working place parking charge as this was against the best interests of the residents of South Cambridgeshire. He made the point that he would support demand management, but that he would not be supportive of fiscal measures until other measures had been tried and tested.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the summary of evidence received and the emerging key themes.
- (b) **AGREED** the criteria for assessment of the ideas and proposals submitted to reduce congestion by reducing traffic volumes, managing traffic differently and 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.
- (c) **NOTED** that the work referred to in resolution (b) would 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.
- (d) **AGREED** 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 be taken forward through those routes rather than through the Cambridge Access Study.
- (e) **AGREED** that the City Deal officer team bring forward plans for an early City-wide and City Centre package of congestion cutting measures informed by the call for evidence, covering each of the elements in table 2 of the report as well as continuing investigation on other options.

## 7. **WORKSTREAM UPDATE**

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on each stream of the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the update and reported that Claire Ruskin of the Cambridge Network had offered to attend a future meeting of the Executive Board to provide an update on delivery, to date, of the Cambridge Promotion Agency.

It was also noted that an appointment was anticipated to be made in the near future to the Communications Manager vacancy.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the update.

**8. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

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

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.00 p.m.**

---