



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

23 January 2017

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

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find below a list questions from the public with answers that were provided at the meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which will be held in **THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL, CAMBOURNE** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 25 JANUARY 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 - 18**

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 4

Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board – 25 January 2017

Notice of public questions

To be taken under agenda item 4

6) Cllr Susan van de Ven

The A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme is continuing to attract match funding opportunities.

As you know, the scheme has already received several lots of Department for Transport Cycling Ambition match funding, totalling £2.5 million, plus one lot of City Deal funding, totalling £550K.

AstraZeneca, whose employees living along the A10 will use the cycle path to get to work in Cambridge, has committed two years' worth of funding to maintain the path over and above what Cambridgeshire County Council can afford, in order to ensure a high standard.

A grant from the Department for Transport Local Sustainable Transport Fund to carry out a Personalized Travel Planning exercise has already evidenced modal shift away from single car use.

All of this match funding has enabled most of what is a shovel-ready scheme to be delivered quickly. The City Deal-funded segment will be completed in February and a local business has offered to host and provide refreshments for the grand opening in March.

In order to complete the scheme we must find a way of funding the Melbourn-Royston missing link, which traverses the Hertfordshire border.

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.

The LEP authorizes to me to say to you:

- 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.

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.

Melbourn County Councillor Susan van de Ven

Answer

- We welcome Cllr Van de Ven's input on this, and recognise it is a scheme that would bring benefits in terms of linking significant employment sites.
- The Executive Board agreed in November to require business cases to accompany requests for funding, so that would need to be forthcoming before we could commit to funding.
- The most appropriate way to handle this would be to consider it for prioritisation as part of the tranche 2 programme, recognising that the tranche 1 programme has been prioritised and is fully committed.

Please note that questions 8, 9 & 18 will be taken consecutively and answered by a single officer response

8) Stephen Coates

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?

9) Carolyn Postgate

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.

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?

18) Edward Leigh (see attached)

Answer

General

The External Assurance Review was to assess delivery confidence for the transport work stream and make recommendations to ensure high delivery confidence. External assurance is good practice for a programme of this size and nature.

Implementing the recommendations is a key priority and updates on progress here can be covered in the regular progress reporting to the Board – a progress update at the June meeting would be recommended.

Question 8

- Residents' groups, Councillors and residents more broadly have recently fed in views through the survey that has been undertaken as part of the communications review.
- Outside of formal meetings and going forward there will be regular and publicised opportunities for engagement..

Question 9 & Question 18 pt 1

- In terms of the evidence base, the report highlighted that there would be benefits in reviewing this and this will also be implemented – the collection of good quality supportive evidence is a continual process and will benefit the ongoing decision making.
- We are confident of the basis on which the current City Deal proposals have been developed. At the same time, it is important to keep key evidence bases updated, for example through refreshing the transport model and using the evidence base the LEP and Combined Authority are developing where appropriate.
- The original prioritisation of schemes was linked closely to the potential for economic growth and the development strategy in the emerging Local Plans and that still remains relevant.
- The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme is at Outline Business case stage and the business case will continue to be developed. The evidence and business case development is following DfT guidance. [If needed – for background] evidence used for that scheme includes:
 - Initial strategic modelling
 - High level transport planning/engineering of different options
 - Assessment of Wider Economic Benefits
 - Initial mapping of key environmental constraints
 - High level cost estimates
 - Benefit to Cost Ratios
 - Evidence from public consultation
 - Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework, by which the options were considered against key local priorities
- This work is in line with DfT assessment guidance.

Question 18 pt2

- Further response points awaited on strategy plans

19) Cllr Bridget Smith

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?

Answer

There are two paragraphs in the devolution deal document that refer to the City Deal:

- Para. 2: The local authorities of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough recognise and have agreed that the principle of subsidiarity should apply to the discharge of functions by the Mayor and Combined Authority and governance of this devolution deal. This includes the delegation of responsibility from the Combined Authority to individual Councils or appropriate bodies, such as City deal mechanisms, for delivery.
- Para. 23: Cambridge is internationally renowned for its world-leading university and its global strengths in technology and life sciences. In addition to the commitments to support housing delivery outlined above, the Combined Authority will also work with Government and Greater Cambridge partners to support delivery of the existing Greater Cambridge City Deal which is ensuring the future success of the city and surrounding district of

South Cambridgeshire by investing in housing, transport infrastructure, and skills needed to see future economic growth.

To be taken under agenda 7

21) Pete Howard (Petition organiser for “Stop the City Deal”)

"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?"

Answer

Engagement, including with business is recommended here and that would include small business. The LEP is offering to lead on business engagement.

1) Dr Joanna Gomula

I have re-formulated my questions and based them on the documents attached to the Board's agenda, showing the link (direct relevance) between the issues raised in my questions and the agenda. I would like to pose the following questions to the Executive Board, in conformity with the three-day notice requirement:

- 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?
- 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?
- 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?

Answer

- 1) The growth planned in and around Cambridge demands a strong transport response to ensure that sustainable travel behaviour can be enabled and to reduce the harmful and unsustainable impacts of traffic congestion and poor air quality.

The current bus network provides the basis for a much expanded and improved set of services designed to meet the needs of the emerging economy and new pattern of development. Working collaboratively with bus operators, enhanced and additional services can be introduced as development takes place, building on the services within the city and improving those beyond, linking the city more effectively with its surrounds. To make bus the first choice for many journeys, the offer must include consistent and reliable journeys. This can only be enabled as part of the wider transport strategy that restrains vehicle movements in favour of buses, walking and cycling. On-street measures to support bus movements need to be comprehensive so that more buses can be accommodated and their journey times improved. As the guided busways have demonstrated, growth in the demand for bus services can be

achieved very successfully provided that a complete package is in place to make the bus offer attractive, especially when compared with the other options available.

The City Deal proposes improvements to services across and beyond the city. These include operating the core urban services more frequently building on the established 'citi' network. In combination with measures to ensure that journeys are punctual and predictable, increased service frequency will be an attractive proposition for potential users. More use of the existing busways is possible and desirable, serving new areas of development. Improved inter-urban and other services beyond the city will help make the connections that people need. Not all of the additional services need to access to city centre as they have done historically and existing transport hubs and new rail stations can help relieve the constrained centre. Park and Ride has helped remove many car journeys from the central area and further Park and Ride sites will help to transfer motorists to more efficient means of completing their journeys.

For the new settlements to be built beyond the city, a regular bus service must be in place throughout the day and during evenings and weekends to offer an attractive alternative to car use. These new services will benefit from (and be reliant on) new busways and on-street bus priority measures. With an imaginative and planned approach, the bus network of the future has much to offer and will be an essential element of the package of transport measures that will enable the growth to be achieved successfully.

2) extract from above: The City Deal proposes improvements to services across and beyond the city. These include operating the core urban services more frequently building on the established 'citi' network.

3) Travel for Cambridgeshire has engaged in travel planning discussions with many private schools who have responded enthusiastically to the option of expanding bus shuttles. Going forward, action to make this a reality is envisaged to be progressed under the Travel Planning delivery plan within the City Access programme.

2) Andrew Dutton

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 and 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.

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?

Answer

Officers working on the City Deal are recommending proposing a process of co-design of a scheme so have not yet confirmed who would be exempt from the workplace parking levy. However, in Nottingham, disabled spaces are exempt.

Employers would be liable to pay the workplace parking levy and would have the freedom to implement a wage-related approach to guide how they pass on the charge to employees.

3) Dr Drew Milne

In beginning to tackle air pollution in Cambridge, **could the City Deal Executive Board address the problem of diesel cars?**

Recent studies have shown that diesel cars are especially toxic and responsible for numerous unnecessary deaths and respiratory problems due to the particulates they emit. Cambridge has a number of hot spots for pollution – notably Hills Road / Lensfield Road / East Road, which are next to schools. St Matthews Primary School is perhaps the most obvious school that is close to a busy road. Children, but also toddlers in buggies, are low to the ground and at great risk from fumes from diesel cars. Proximity to main roads has also been linked now to a higher preponderance of dementia in people living near main roads. Cambridge could make a real difference by addressing the risks to Cambridge children by banning private diesel cars from the city centre, especially in the vicinity of schools. Cambridge City could also make a difference by insisting the Cambridge taxis, many of which are diesel, conform to the highest EU standards for the way their emissions are filtered.

Germany's Bundesrat voted in October to ban not just diesel cars - an immediate priority – but the internal combustion engine itself by 2030, sending a clear signal to car manufacturers to invest in electric car technology. Cambridge could take a similar stance by setting a date by which all cars in the city centre must be electric.

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.

Answer

“The problem of diesel cars” is actively being addressed by the newly formed Air Quality Action Plan Steering Group led by the City Council – a City Deal representative sits on this. You may be interested to know that the Annual Status Report on Air Quality in Cambridge was submitted to Defra last year. It has been accepted, and Defra’s assessors noted that it was an example of good practice. The report is newly available from the City Council website

https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/annual_status_report_cambridge_city_council_2016_.pdf

Recommendation 3.b.iii.1. in the report prepared for this meeting is: *It is recommended that the Executive Board agrees that officers should assess the possibility of establishing a Clean Air Zone and the potential for the introduction of a pollution charge in central Cambridge within the existing Air Quality Management Area. Key criteria for assessing this should be its impacts on: health; the local environment, including air quality and public realm; bus reliability and cycling; business and the economy; deliverability and value for money.*

5) Magda Werno (cannot attend)

1. I very strongly opposed the original plans to close the Cambridge city centre to traffic during peak hours. Like many other residents and stakeholders in the area, I did not believe that preventing people from getting to and from work was the right solution to the congestion problem in Cambridge. However,

having read the latest press release, I'm not clear about the council's current plans to tackle this issue.

Please can you elaborate on the current plans in relation to the planned traffic management measures and the local interventions in the most congested areas of central Cambridge mentioned in the press release?

2. Like many Cambridge residents, I (occasionally) use public transport. Unfortunately, the quality to price ratio for the bus and train services is very disappointing. I think this country could learn a lot from public transport solutions in other countries (my most recent observation includes northern Poland, where the public transport links are incredible – cheap, frequent and reliable, with very clear and specific timetables at each bus stop. These cover all areas within the city boundaries, including suburbs and surrounding villages).

Please can you explain what specific measures will be taken to improve bus journeys? What criteria for improvement are you going to use, and how will this improvement be measured?

I strongly believe that the only effective way to encourage local residents and commuters to use public transport instead of driving, would be to provide services which are frequent, reliable and, importantly, affordable. Neither of these adjectives currently apply to public transport in Cambridge, I'm afraid. And this is a widely held view of people who use these services, not just my personal opinion. Until these three areas are addressed, no amount of restrictions or fines are going to help.

3. On a similar note, many (I'm tempted to say all) commuters think that the City buses, Park & Ride, and guided buses present a very poor value for money. It's not surprising that many of them choose to drive into Cambridge because, other than for convenience reasons, it's often much cheaper and faster. No one has time to wait for a bus for 40 minutes in the morning, and then spend another 30 minutes stopping at every single bus stop because it was the only bus that turned up that morning. And this is just Arbury to Cambridge centre type of example. This scenario occurring most mornings, coupled with very high prices of single and multiple-use tickets, understandably leaves the passengers feeling they do not get a good deal. As explained before, not only the reliability and frequency, but also the affordability of public transport in Cambridge needs to be addressed.

What are your plans in terms of making public transport more affordable for the local residents?

Answer

1. Recommendations 3.a.i and 3.1.ii in the report prepared for this meeting states that: *It is recommended that the Executive Board agrees that officers should work up and assess options for a package of physical demand management measures. These measures should make the best use of the limited road space and capacity in Cambridge, in order to improve bus reliability, cycling and walking, particularly within the designated Air Quality Management Area.*

This aligns with Policy TSCSC 2 of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy which states that *Pedestrians, cyclists and buses will be prioritised for trips across the city. General vehicular traffic will not be prohibited and accessibility will be maintained, but a car journey may be longer and more time consuming than at present for many trips.*

1. The petal diagram used in the Joint Assembly meeting is purely conceptual and shows one of the draft ideas behind the work we are doing to develop options for managing general traffic - to retain access for those who need it while restricting cross-city through movement for those who don't. It tries to show that the areas between the main routes coming into the city centre are surrounded by quieter residential streets where rat runs need to be prevented. This idea is less disruptive than the PCCPs, as it restricts access on local streets, rather than on main radial roads.
2. See answer above to question from Dr Joanna Gumula
3. We want to turn the "vicious circle" of low bus use leading to high fares into a "virtuous circle" where high bus use leads to lower bus fares. This will only be achieved by making bus the first choice for many journeys, which requires consistent and reliable journeys, working collaboratively with bus operators. In the near term there will be a need for the public sector to continue to financially support off-peak bus services so that a reasonable level of service is maintained. The funding available from the County Council has declined over recent years which has seen a contraction in the level of bus service. The City Access plan contains a revenue source through a workplace parking levy. This will provide an income stream that the City Deal may wish to invest in local bus services and/or in making buses more affordable for local residents.

7) Nichola Harrison

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?

12) Cambridge Past, Present and Future

We all agree that to improve access and reduce congestion we need a modal shift from cars to public transport. We also all agree that such a modal shift cannot emerge unless we can provide a high quality public transport services that is sufficiently attractive to get drivers out of their cars. So, how is this high quality service going to emerge?

The City Deal can provide the tarmac on which the buses will run, but it cannot subsidise or underpin the operation of a quality public transport system. The only realistic option for substantial additional funding is the income derived from some of fiscal demand management which can be reinvested into creating an improved public transport system.

Most people agree that demand management must form part of the congestion package, with options for both physical measures- such as road closures and parking restrictions, but also for fiscal measures, such as workplace parking levies and congestion charging. The problem is that the City Deal are seeking to select from a basket of measures that include options based upon inadequate analysis and evidence demonstrating their likelihood of success. Do we know what effect a workplace parking levy will have on future inward investment? Do we know if the business community in the area would support this? Do we know what the level of transport investment a congestion charge might generate? Do we know what the

effect on car use will be of progressively removing the existing 40,000 on street parking spaces?

We simply do not have the quantitative information on which to base a rational decision on at this time. Yet, the decision (whatever combination of measures is eventually adopted) will have a profound impact on the future prosperity of Cambridge. We are dealing with very high, indeed the highest, stakes of all and yet the decision on how to proceed is being based largely on supposition, subjective opinions and preconceived thinking, which we believe is irresponsible and inappropriate for the significance of the proposal.

The Assembly, last week, recognised that a decision of such magnitude must be informed through an even-handed comprehensive comparison of existing information and evidence of all of the options- including both physical and fiscal demand measures.

So, our question to the Executive Board is:

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?

Answer

The Board answered this in its discussion on item 7.

16) Lynn Hieatt

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 car parks[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:

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 CambridgeLeisure 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?

[1] Mott MacDonald Parking Survey, commissioned by City Deal.

[2] Capacity of Cambridge's 5 multi-storey car parks = 3,040

[3] Figures from May 2015 = 2,615

[4] From the City Deal's published schematic for AM and PM traffic flows (which the 2015 Traffic Monitoring Report doesn't show).

[5] The CJAC draft policy has considered seriously the needs of those who receive and administer care, both professionals, family and friends. There is a welcome degree of

experimentation in the proposal, in that people can cancel their scheme after a year. There is some flexibility as to scheme hours, as determined by local communities. The City Deal's agreement to help defray set-up costs is a positive element in the 'extension' of the programme.

[6] There are some things that could be changed to make this new policy more effective and fair. Executive Board and Assembly members now have a full copy of our comments on the proposal [attached].

[7] Currently a mere 18% of reporting employers do so, according to Cambridge Ahead.

[8] Discussions should be opened between Abellio, Cambridge Leisure and the City Deal to agree

Answer

The City Access plan is a balanced 8-point plan that is designed to be joined up. All elements of the plan need to be progressed in parallel.

17) Robin Heydon

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?

[1] in 2011 Census, table WU03UK, showed that in 2011 that 10,919 people used public transport to travel to work in Cambridge, 46,815 people used a motor vehicle (motorbike, car, or passenger in a car), and 25,966 people walked or cycled. A total of 81,317 travelled to work. We have only considered people from South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge for walk and cycle traffic.

With an additional 33,500 homes, and assuming that each home generates 1.5 travel to work trips (for example three people working for every two homes), this would require an additional 50,250 travel to work trips. If public transport use doubled, and car use is constant, then the number of cycle trips would increase to 65,297. If public transport use tripled, then cycle trips would still double to 54,378.

Answer

Recommendation 3.b.v. in the report prepared for this meeting is: *It is recommended that the Executive Board agrees that officers should continue to work with other partners to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.* This includes measures

that contribute to the long term vision of the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure that it will need to accommodate the modal shift expected.

The City Access team will be working with the County Council Cycling Projects Delivery Team that is delivering on the elements proposed in Policy TSCSC 12 of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy. The schemes they are currently delivering accord with this policy. It is anticipated that this discussion will lead to workshop/s including officers, members and stakeholder groups to seek views on the issues and interventions needed. A specific strand of this work could be a working party to investigate cycle parking and in particular a new large covered cycle park.

If needed – best to keep answer short though [The strategy for Cambridge in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ High quality cycle provision, bringing in Dutch-style segregation along the main radial and orbital roads.
- ☐ Cycle safety measures at major junctions which could include innovative solutions such as separate signals for cyclists.
- ☐ Safe, convenient and frequent crossings for pedestrians, employing zebra crossings where possible and a pedestrian phase at signalised junctions.
- ☐ Review of on road car parking on roads forming part of the city cycle network to improve cycle provision.
- ☐ Using the opportunity that the new developments in and around the city present to create a step-change in the level and quality of walking and cycling facilities that are provided, which can in turn be plugged into the wider network.
- ☐ Provision of additional links on the existing network to join up key destinations that are already partially served by the network (for example the Chisholm Trail).
- ☐ As part of the wider corridor treatment, seek to widen existing cycle and pedestrian paths and introduce new segregated paths where appropriate. (Seek to ensure bus/cycle lanes are wide enough for a bus to overtake a cyclist without leaving the lane where space constraints allow).
- ☐ Increasing cycle parking capacity so this does not present a major barrier to certain cycling trips.
- ☐ Working with Cambridge City council to investigate opportunities for new city centre cycle parks or expansion of existing cycle parks.
- ☐ Working towards 20mph speed limits on all but major routes, which will make cycling safer and more attractive.
- ☐ Improving publicity and the legibility of the pedestrian and cycle network – in particular improving signage, providing information to tourists/visitors and marketing and promotion to new residents.
- ☐ Working with partners such as the NHS to publicise the health benefits associated with cycling and walking.

20) Neil Mackay (Petition: Keep Cambridge Open for Business)

Given that Cambridge small businesses were at the heart of the recent protests 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. 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?

Answer

Engagement, including with business is recommended here and that would include small business. The LEP is offering to lead on business engagement.

To be taken under agenda item 9

15) Richard Taylor

Submission related to Item 9 – Progress Report – Upcoming Milestones

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.

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?

I was surprised the public consultation responses do not appear to have been used to inform the private workshop events or the local liaison forum meetings.

I would like to take this opportunity to stress to the board that while the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum meetings took place in public they largely spent their time discussing arrangements for workshop sessions which then took place behind closed doors with selected invitees.

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]?

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.

1.<http://www.miltonroadschool.org.uk/uploads/29/bwnhOBs0qsngtWgi.pdf>

2.http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/download/downloads/id/423/mr_sh_report_final.pdf

3.http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/download/downloads/id/359/letter_from_executive_board_chair_to_milton_rd_llf_14916.pdf

Answer

- The initial public consultation was considered by the Board last year. Milton Road Primary School's views were taken into account in the report.
- The next report will summarise the LLF and design workshop process. Stakeholders invited to the workshops were agreed with the LLF. They were selected to provide local input into the scheme design process. The minutes of the LLF are available on-line.
- All key design principles have been further consolidated into resolutions which will be reported to the Board.
- The consultation considered initial design ideas, whereas the workshops' objective and remit was to scrutinise the preferred "do something" option that emerged following consultation and to give an opportunity to reflect on modifications that may take into account local objectives and meet the scheme objectives.
- The workshops were held as invitation only meetings to ensure they were productive for attendees. The outcome of the workshops was reported to, and discussed at the LLF meetings.
- The letter from the chair will be referenced in the report. It was also presented to the attendees at the workshops to ensure that its points were taken into account in the design discussions.
- A further LLF meeting on 8th February is being arranged by the LLF Chair.

This page is left blank intentionally.

To: City Deal Executive Board

From: Edward Leigh, Smarter Cambridge Transport (local community organisation)

Subject: External Review

Meeting date: 25 January 2016

Contact: 01223 312 377 / edward@smartertransport.uk / [@SmarterCam](https://twitter.com/SmarterCam)

Question 1: Scheme methodology

May I congratulate the Board on commissioning and publishing an external review, and moving quickly to appoint a new Chief Executive and Transport Director.

However we are concerned that the report only addresses the delivery of schemes already in progress, and does not examine the strategy or methodology for prioritising and developing schemes.¹

We would not expect Mr Lugg to have conducted a detailed review of schemes, but we would have expected him to examine the methodology involved in:

- drawing up the regional transport strategy;
- prioritising projects; and
- developing schemes.

It would seem to be a wise insurance policy to examine this now, especially in light of Mr Menzies assertion at the October board meeting that a public enquiry into the Cambourne–Cambridge scheme is likely.

Since I have received no response to my request to the Board on 1 September 2016 for documentation, I can only conclude that the City Deal has not adhered to WebTAG² as officers

¹ p.13 Technical Issues: “The question about the overall appropriateness of the transport programme in relation to achieving the City Deal objectives from a technical transport perspective is outside the scope of this review.”

² Paragraph 1.1.5 of the [TAG Transport appraisal process](#) sets out the following summary of principles for the Stage 1 appraisal process (my emphases):

- There must be a **clear rationale for any proposal** and it must be based on a **clear presentation of problems and challenges** that establish the ‘need’ for a project.
- There must be consideration of **genuine, discrete options**, and not an assessment of a previously selected option against some clearly inferior alternatives. **A range of solutions should be considered across networks and modes.**
- **There should be an auditable and documented process** which identifies the best performing options to be taken forward for further appraisal.
- There should be an appropriate level of **public and stakeholder participation** and engagement at suitable points in the process. In most cases **this should inform the evidence-base which establishes the ‘need’ for an intervention, guide the option generation**, sifting and assessment steps, as well as informing further appraisal in Stage 2.

have claimed. For instance, the Stage 1 report for the Cambourne-Cambridge scheme did not consider a number of options that have been suggested subsequently; and there appears to be no Stage 1 Options Appraisal Report for the Milton and Histon Rd schemes.

Implementing schemes in the right way is important; but it's even more important to implement the **right** schemes in the right way.

Will the Board therefore move quickly to commission an external review of the appropriateness and rigorousness of the procedures used to prioritise and develop schemes?

Question 2: Vision and strategy

The external review recommended a “light touch refresh” of the transport strategy. The action plan indicates that this will not happen until spring 2018, after the draft Local Plan has been adopted and the Local Enterprise Partnership has refreshed its Strategic Economic Plan.

We contend that the spatial, economic and transport strategies must be developed together as facets of a *single coherent* strategy.

The current transport strategy was developed and consulted on in 2012, before the City Deal had been conceived. But it's not just five years out of date; it is decades out of date, taking almost no account of transport, technology and social trends in the twenty-first century.

It needs rebuilding from the ground up – and now, so that it can inform the Tranche 2 programme. Otherwise we'll end up with an ill-co-ordinated mix of outmoded engineering schemes and new technologies, with a high risk of some Tranche 1 or 2 investments becoming prematurely redundant.

Mr Lugg also identified a need to more clearly articulate the vision of what Greater Cambridge will look like in 2030³. We, Cambridge PPF, CamCycle, and numerous councillors and residents contend that this vision does not exist. If it did, you would be able to tell us whether it includes:

- Busways or lanes wherever they can be accommodated?
- Underground rail, trams or bullet buses?
- Dutch-style protected-cycle junctions?
- More or less green space in the city?
- Zero emissions zones?
- More or less parking in the city?
- Larger Park & Rides or more Park & Rides?

³ p17 Communications: “There is a need to more clearly articulate the vision as all too often there is lack of understanding of how individual schemes fit into the wider picture. For example having some imagery of what Cambridge will look like in 2030 may help to capture people's imagination of what the GC City Deal is aiming to achieve.”

- Public or community transport serving isolated villages?
- Smart ticketing across the region?
- Road pricing?
- Driverless vehicles?

If you do have answers, where is this vision set out?

Though also in need of updating, the 2030 Vision report⁴ published in 2013 comes closest to offering a coherent vision for the region. But not only was this not adopted, its recommendations on transport have largely been ignored by the councils and City Deal.

So, will you, as members of the City Deal Board, and representatives of the local authorities, LEP and Cambridge University, commit to developing *this year* a clear vision for the Greater Cambridge region in the 2030s, along with a new, coherent transport strategy?

⁴ This report grew out of a series of workshops involving 600 people, representing residents, academia, business, and community organisations. It can be found at: <http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/user/pvl/vision/>

This page is left blank intentionally.