



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Thursday, 9 June 2016 at 2.30 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Mark Reeve	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
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network

Officers/advisors:

Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Lewis Herbert was **ELECTED** as Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Francis Burkitt was **ELECTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

The following membership changes to the Executive Board were reported:

- Mr John Bridge OBE had resigned from the Board, with Mark Reeve in attendance at the meeting as his substitute. The Local Enterprise Partnership would be considering a permanent replacement for Mr Bridge in due course;
- Councillor Ian Bates had been appointed to the Board by Cambridgeshire County Council, in place of Councillor Steve Count.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 March 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

6. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, reported that a significant number of people had registered to speak in relation to specific items on the agenda for this meeting. He therefore proposed that those questions be put at the relevant item.

The following questions did not necessarily relate to any items on the agenda for this meeting or it was the preference of the speaker to ask the question at this stage of proceedings. Questions were therefore asked and answered at this stage of the meeting, as follows:

Question by Dorcus Fowler

Dorcus Fowler said that enhancing Park and Ride was acknowledged as an important element under the Greater Cambridge City Deal and added that if the aim was to accommodate additional commuter numbers by making the best use of existing sites, as well as creating new ones, it was obvious to her that there was potential in the North Cambridge Station site. As a transport hub, with provision for more than the current 400 parking spaces, she said it could in effect serve as a Park and Ride and also help to ease congestion caused by school traffic. She asked whether any further work would be done on exploiting the North Cambridge Station site to its full potential.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that the site was being developed as a transport hub, which included a high level of cycle parking. He said that the number of car parking spaces at the site would not be increasing and that it was not the right site for a Park and Ride facility, in view of it being too close to the city centre and there being other Park and Ride sites in the area. Mr Menzies said that the prospect of a further Park and Ride site as part of the A10 scheme was being investigated.

Question by Stephen Brown

Stephen Brown explained that the timing of meetings of the Executive Board and Joint Assembly, being during working hours, effectively meant that the working population was being excluded and that this limited those able to attend. He asked whether it was fair and democratic to hold these meetings at times when a large section of the population would be excluded from attending.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged that this was not something that had recently been considered. He agreed, in principle, that the Board could benefit from evening meetings and confirmed that he and the Board would take this issue away for further consideration.

Question by Robin Heydon

Robin Heydon referred to the minutes of a previous meeting in answer to a question he had asked about world-class cycling infrastructure. The commitment given to him at that meeting in answer to the question, he felt, was not supported in the Urban and Environmental Design Guidance document scheduled for consideration later at this meeting. He referred specifically to the width of cycle lanes and asked the Board to reject the Design Guidance document. Mr Heydon also offered the services of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign, for free, to assist in updating the document to reflect at least recent Cambridge standards with a desire for world-class infrastructure.

Councillor Herbert highlighted that this item would be considered later at this meeting and that the Joint Assembly had submitted a recommendation to request that further work be undertaken on the document. He accepted the offer from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign to have an input in any further work that took place.

7. PETITIONS

Three petitions had been received, as follows:

'Save the trees and verges on Milton Road'

Charles Nisbet, Chairman of the Milton Road Residents' Association, presented the petition and reported concerns of local residents who he said were horrified at the prospect of the Milton Road avenue being turned into an urban highway and losing the trees and greenery associated with the road.

He highlighted some of the benefits of grass verges, vegetation and trees at the roadside, which included drainage and the impact on people's health and wellbeing and said that such greenery should be at the forefront of developments.

Mr Nisbett reported that the paper version of the petition totalled 1250 signatures, with a further 1201 signatures received online.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the petition, in view of the issues raised relating to an item due for consideration later at this meeting.

'Milton Road segregated cycleways'

Roxanne de Beaux, on behalf of Hester Wells, presented the petition which requested that Milton Road improvements under the City Deal should include high-quality cycleways, physically separated from both motor traffic and pedestrians.

She said that poor facilities would simply not get used, wasting time, money and missing an opportunity to get new people cycling in an environment in which they felt safe. She highlighted a guide produced by Camcycle entitled 'Making Space for Cycling' which had been endorsed by national bodies and set out principles of good cycle infrastructure.

Ms de Beaux reported that 640 verified signatures had been received in support of the petition and asked the Executive Board what measures were being taken to ensure the proposed cycleways were of sufficient quality to increase cycling modal share on the route.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the petition, in view of the issues raised relating to an item due for consideration later at this meeting.

'Petition to oppose the Histon Road schemes'

The lead petitioner was not in attendance to present this petition, but it was noted that the petition contained 755 signatures.

8. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, welcomed Councillor Roger Hickford to his first meeting of the Board in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Assembly.

Councillor Hickford confirmed that he would provide a report on the Joint Assembly's recommendations further to its meeting on 2 June 2016 at the relevant item on the agenda for this meeting.

9. CAMBRIDGE ACCESS AND CAPACITY STUDY

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. Questions were grouped together based on their subject and were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Robin Pellew

Robin Pellew asked whether it was fair that the people of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should be denied the opportunity to have their say in the choice of alternative packages to reduce congestion. In particular, he reflected on a congestion charge package which he said had been rejected largely on the grounds of fairness and equality so asked, on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future:

- whether it was fair that the proposed peak hour control points would leave some people's commuting journey completely unaffected whilst others would have their lives turned upside-down;
- whether it was fair that people, particularly in rural areas of South Cambridgeshire, would be forced to put up with a lousy bus service when the funding that could substantially improve the service was denied them;
- whether it was fair that people living in the vicinity of these control points would be subject to displaced traffic on quiet resident streets and rat-runs.

Question by Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor referred to the vast sum of £40 million to £44 million that could potentially be gained from congestion charging and be used to subsidise public buses, including Park and Ride facilities, by extending the hours and frequency of bus services. She therefore asked why a congestion charge was being dismissed without going to public consultation.

Question by Charles Nisbet

Charles Nisbet was of the opinion that the Council's traffic officers were determined to press ahead with destructive works, such as schemes identified at Histon Road, Milton Road and Cambourne to Cambridge. He said that anti-congestion measures proposed for other parts of Cambridge would undoubtedly also have a beneficial impact in the Histon Road, Milton Road and Madingley Road areas so questioned the need to rush into irreversible and intensely unpopular engineering works without waiting to see if they were actually needed.

He therefore asked whether the Board would set these plans aside at least until the outcome of the traffic reduction measures proposed elsewhere had been studied and evaluated.

Councillor Herbert, in response to all three questions, said that comments had been received as part of the call for evidence sessions which had been assessed in accordance with the agreed criteria. In collating the responses in line with the criteria, officers had put forward recommended options that best met the City Deal objectives. He made the point that advocates for congestion charging would be able to make their views known as part of the public consultation, which would be taken into account when assessing the responses and outcomes of the consultation. Councillor Herbert confirmed that the debate at this meeting would focus on what the Board felt the best option would be to consult upon to address congestion in Cambridge, but recognised this would not limit what members of the public might choose to submit as part of the consultation process.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, emphasised that officers were not solely pursuing schemes in order to get the money spent. He reminded those present that the City Deal's objectives were very clear, as set by the Board, in relation to future growth and taking into account the Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This particular scheme had been prioritised as part of the City Deal's Tranche 1 programme, with significant links to employment and housing.

Mr Menzies was pleased that the call for evidence sessions confirmed, through people's comments and contributions, that something needed to be done to address congestion and public transport in Cambridge and that there were differences of opinion on the detail of how to do that, which he said was a positive thing. He also emphasised that the Board at this meeting was not making any decisions about which scheme to implement and that significant consultation still needed to take place.

It was noted that, as other transport schemes moved forward, associated modelling works would take place simultaneously. The proposed peak time congestion control points would have already been put in place by the time final decisions on those schemes were made, so the impact of that intervention would be taken into account as part of the development of other schemes, ensuring a joined-up approach.

Mr Menzies also made the point that other cities from around the world, in successfully addressing congestion, had incorporated both the constraining of car use as well as investment in public transport infrastructure.

Councillor Herbert reiterated that the Board and Assembly had considerable discussions over what should be included as priorities in the first tranche of the City Deal. He acknowledged that the Government's funding mechanism did provide challenges, in terms of targets for the first tranche having to be met in order to achieve the next tranche of funding for the following five years. Schemes at Hilton Road, Milton Road and the A428 were included in the first tranche as priorities, alongside a commitment to improve cycling and public transport as part of those schemes. This scheme, seeking to address the problem of peak time congestion in Cambridge, was also a key scheme in the Tranche 1 programme.

In terms of this scheme, Councillor Herbert said that the process had resulted in a proposed package consisting of a range of measures which sought to address congestion caused by people travelling in and out of the city, taking into account the needs of residents living on or close to affected roads and improving congestion, cycling and the city centre itself. He was of the view that a range of measures was important, incorporating local transport infrastructure schemes and the city centre congestion scheme, and that congestion could not be resolved by a single solution.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that there had been significant discussion on this item at the meeting of the Assembly on 2 June 2016. The following points from that meeting were noted:

- an amendment requesting an alternative congestion reduction package as part of the consultation, led by peak hour congestion charging, was proposed but with 8 votes against compared to 3 votes in favour the amendment was lost;
- concerns were put forward regarding peak time congestion control points in respect of the possibility of traffic displacement and whether the correct modal shift would occur;
- Assembly Members were keen for the workplace parking levy not to be seen as an additional tax on businesses, noting that the business community would need to understand the reasons why such a levy would be introduced, together with a clear plan as to what the revenue would be spent on;
- some employers had already removed car parking spaces from their premises, prior to the proposed introduction of a levy;
- a comment was noted that many businesses in the area did not know about the City Deal, so it was important for necessary communication and engagement to take place.

Councillor Hickford confirmed that the officer recommendations contained in the report were supported by the Joint Assembly.

Mr Menzies presented the report to the Board, stating that the call for evidence sessions had generated a great deal of evidence. The six main themes that materialised were noted as:

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

Taking this into account, and working with consultants to analyse the ideas submitted, the proposed package of measures consisted of:

- better bus services and expanded usage of Park and Ride sites;
- better pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
- better streetscape and public realm;
- peak time congestion control points in the weekday morning and evening peak periods;
- a workplace parking levy;
- on-street parking controls, including residents' parking;
- smart technology;
- travel planning.

In terms of peak time congestion control points, Mr Menzies reported that these sought to reduce peak time car trips in congested areas and also free up space for buses, cyclists and pedestrians. It was proposed that they would:

- operate only during weekdays at peak times;
- provide access only to buses, taxis and emergency vehicles;
- be controlled through automatic number plate recognition cameras.

It was noted that the peak time congestion control points would be coupled with the workplace parking levy, providing revenue funding to improve public transport and supporting a reduction in car use. Mr Menzies explained that a proposed bespoke scheme for Cambridge would be based on the principles of the Nottingham scheme, with income used to fund transport infrastructure and services to support the transport needs of employers. He added that bus providers in Cambridgeshire had indicated that they would invest in additional bus services, including addressing some of the gaps in rural areas, if the necessary infrastructure was in place and the issue of congestion in the centre of Cambridge was addressed. Mr Menzies was of the view that this additional revenue stream would support the City Deal partnership in being able to do that.

Mr Menzies also referred to parking controls which would seek to limit commuter parking, as well as manage impacts of the work place levy and peak time congestion control points. He added that behaviour change and travel planning would consist of travel planning advice and support for employers, schools and individuals.

Officers had considered congestion charging as an alternative, which could consist of several variations such as zoned, cordoned or a city wide zone. The London scheme incurred a daily cost of £11.50 and a £5 a day rate for a congestion charge in Cambridge had been estimated to create £40 million to £44 million per year. Mr Menzies, however, highlighted the following potential issues with introducing congestion charging:

- alternatives needed to be put in place before implementation of a congestion charging scheme;
- a congestion charge scheme could only be implemented as part of Tranche 2 of the City Deal programme at the earliest;
- a congestion charge scheme raised questions of equity;
- the price of the scheme would need to increase over time.

Mr Menzies made the point that officers were not suggesting a congestion charging scheme would not work, but reiterated that in his professional opinion the measures proposed as a package in the report were more deliverable and equitable in accordance with the City Deal's objectives.

Mark Reeve, representing the Local Enterprise Partnership, was supportive of the measures set out in the report, stating that the business community wanted to see action and something change in order to move forward. He added, however, that he did not see this as a final solution and that the workplace parking levy needed to involve businesses at an early opportunity.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, in terms of parking restrictions asked about the potential introduction of residents' parking schemes. Mr Menzies confirmed that Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority was responsible for on-street parking and residents' parking schemes. The Cambridge Joint Area Committee was in the process of reviewing the scheme, but it was current policy to introduce such a scheme if the majority of residents were in favour of it.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, asked for further details regarding the introduction and trialling of peak time congestion control points. Mr Menzies explained that technical work already undertaken had tested proof of concept options and it was proposed that implementation would be carried out on a trial basis through an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order from Autumn 2017, with consultation taking place during the trial. It was noted that this would be very similar to the Cambridge Core Scheme but would be controlled through automatic number plate recognition cameras, requiring appropriate signage. The trial would last for 18 months and in the first six months people would be able to put forward representations or objections as to how it was operating. After the subsequent 12 months a decision would then have to be made as to whether to remove the scheme, make changes or introduce it permanently, dependant on the representations received and the way it worked in practice over the period of the trial.

Councillor Burkitt agreed with the dual approach to demand management and revenue, outlining that South Cambridgeshire District Council's position in respect of congestion charging when it considered the issue a few years ago was that it was against the principle of congestion charging. He welcomed the prospect of more buses in rural areas, which he felt the additional revenue as a result of the workplace parking levy could deliver. Councillor Burkitt also looked forward to the introduction of smart city measures.

Councillor Bates reminded those present that this scheme sought to address future housing and economic growth and so he supported the proposed package of measures on that basis, saying that the impact of peak time congestion control points would not be truly known until the trial went ahead. Councillor Bates also reiterated the importance of early engagement with employers regarding the workplace parking levy and, in addition, welcomed the introduction of smart city measures as well as travel planning. He said that the principal issue behind this and other City Deal schemes was about changing people's behaviour.

Professor Nigel Slater, representing the University of Cambridge, said that he had seen the very large amount of detailed modelling work undertaken and confirmed that a number of different options had been looked at. He said that the modelling indicated that the proposed package of measures would have an incredible effect on the balance of traffic in the most optimal way, providing a much better public transport system as a result. He acknowledged that it was difficult to predict how many people would change their behaviour in terms of switching from cars to other modes of transport.

Councillor Herbert reflected on the key themes that had arisen from the call for evidence sessions and said that additional and reliable bus services and a reduction in car use during peak times would be key to addressing congestion in the city. He was therefore supportive of the proposed measures going forward for public consultation.

The Executive Board unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** the call for evidence analysis and the Cambridge Access Study Long List and Short List reports and outcomes.
- (b) **AGREED** the policy approach for a congestion reduction package, incorporating:
- better bus services and expanded usage of Park and Rides;
 - better pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
 - better streetscape and public realm;
 - peak time congestion control points in the weekday morning and evening peak periods;
 - a workplace parking levy;
 - on-street parking controls (including residents' parking)
 - smart technology;
 - travel planning.
- (c) **NOTED** the consultation and engagement principles attached to the report at Appendix D and agrees the principles of the engagement process on the proposed congestion reduction package, to commence in July 2016.
- (d) **ENDORSED** the proposal for a trial implementation of peak congestion control points, possibly on a phased basis in late 2017 using an experimental Traffic Regulation Order, with consultation on the Order held during the experimental period.

10. HISTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: REPORT ON INITIAL CONSULTATION AND SELECTION OF A PREFERRED ROUTE

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public or local Members who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. Questions were grouped together based on their subject and were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh reflected on recent references to a report by Greener Journeys which claimed that experience from schemes around the country showed that bus lanes may reduce bus travel times by seven to nine minutes along a 10km congested route and also improve their reliability. He said that this equated to an average saving of less than one minute per kilometre of bus lane and asked whether that really represented value for money or constituted a step change in the attractiveness of bus travel. He also referred to conclusions from a Transport Research Laboratory paper in support of bus lanes that bus journey times had been decreased by two minutes, but that no consistent results regarding patronage were obtained. Another quote, from Mott MacDonald's report said that, after bus lanes were suspended in Liverpool for nine months, evidence showed that these bus lanes were generally only providing minor benefits to bus journey times and that whilst reliability was adversely affected in some cases, more significant bus delay and unreliability was typically the result of other factors. Mr Leigh said that for better bus journeys, once the city had been de-congested, two areas would need addressing. These were access to bus services and ease of interchanging. He therefore asked the Board whether it would reject the officer recommendation to rush ahead with bus lane schemes for Histon Road and Milton Road.

Question by Councillor Damian Tunnicliffe

Councillor Damian Tunnicliffe asked how it was possible, since the impact of the proposed congestion package had not yet been assessed in respect of the impact on journey times for these streets, to conclude that these schemes were essential.

Question by Lynn Hieatt

Lynn Hieatt felt that people's views were not being listened to and that the research and work done by residents and experts over the past years, for free and in their own time, in proposing workable, sustainable and more imaginative alternatives to bus lanes had been largely ignored. She said that people again wanted to know why all the other, better, ideas for spending tranche one money were being overlooked in favour of bus lanes.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, in response to these questions, said that the most important factor influencing patronage of buses was that buses themselves were stuck in traffic. Unless buses were freed up from congestion people would not use them as they were unreliable. Mr Menzies cited the guided busway as a good example of where bus lanes could be effective, reporting that it continued to be reliable and had met all of its targets in respect of patronage. He added that evidence was very strong to support the use of bus lanes, in the right locations.

Mr Menzies said that alternatives had been investigated, but none of the alternatives had the same benefits as those that could be realised by those options set out in the report. He accepted that the journey time savings appeared relatively small, but said that three minutes on a corridor such as this in the city was a substantial saving and should be considered in terms of a three minute saving per passenger on every journey, equating to a considerable amount of time saved. The cumulative package would ensure that the network kept moving, making reliability of services the key benefit to impact patronage. Mr Menzies was confident that if the right infrastructure and service was in place it would attract patronage, with the guided busway being an example supporting that statement.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, made the point that these schemes did not necessarily rely on bus lanes, but that of bus priority through junctions which would enable buses to flow through the network. He reiterated that the key issue for public transport was reliability and confirmed that if improvements were put in place the bus operators had indicated that they would run more bus services, including express services coming through the radial routes.

Question by Gerry Rose

Gerry Rose referred to data files relating to the Histon Road and Milton Road consultations which he said had eventually been put on the City Deal website a few hours before the Joint Assembly meeting earlier in the month, stating that unredacted versions of the files had been available to the City Deal team for nearly three months. He was concerned that submissions had been provided in 19 PDF documents and were in a non-searchable format. He therefore questioned how officers were able to extract meaningful information and how submissions were properly analysed and taken into account.

Question by Alison Murray

Alison Murray asked, given the overwhelmingly negative response from the public to proposals and the limited benefits to be realised, why no steps were being taken to consider alternative proposals to the Do Something and Do Maximum options, stating that they were not the only options.

Question by Jane Kroese

Jane Kroese referred to the climate change and environmental heading of the implications section of the report, referring to a short statement under that heading. She felt that this seemed a short and insufficient statement regarding environmental issues in light of the size of the project and asked whether there was a plan to undertake a full Environmental Impact Assessment and publish an Environmental Statement to cover both the construction and operational phases of the project.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, in response to these questions, firstly referred to the consultation process and said that the volume of responses for these two schemes had been a significant issue to manage and it had taken longer than anticipated to properly analyse and consider each response. A breakdown of themes had been produced which had developed from the representations received. He gave an additional assurance that all comments received as part of the process were taken very seriously and made the point that changes had already been made as a result of submissions made. Mr Walmsley explained that some of the information contained in responses included personal or sensitive information which officers had a duty to ensure was protected and not placed in the public domain, stating that this had taken a sufficient amount of time. It was agreed that officers would take away the point in relation to the non-searchable format of PDF files uploaded onto the website and provide a written response to Mr Rose.

In terms of Environmental Impact Assessments and an Environmental Statement, Mr Walmsley confirmed that, due to the size and scale of both this scheme and the Milton Road Scheme, an Environmental Impact Assessment or Environmental Statement was not a requirement. He stated, however, that as part of both schemes an important aspect would be public realm and how this could be improved, seeking to mitigate both corridors in terms of green infrastructure. Mr Menzies highlighted that the County Council's overarching Transport Strategy, which the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes were included as part of, had itself undergone an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Question by Lilian Rundbland

Lilian Rundbland's question related to the Citi8 bus along the Cambridge Histon Road as well as the villages north of the A14. She said that residents had expressed a request in the consultation that the Guided Bus, as promised in the early stages, should make one stop along Histon Road. However, in Figure 1 of the report she felt that the plan clearly showed that the Guided Bus would cross Histon Road and continue into Darwin Green towards Huntingdon Road, suggesting that there would be no improvement as a result for local residents. She therefore asked what action the City Deal Board would take to live up to the transport vision of the City Deal project, in terms of connecting people and places for the residents along Histon Road.

Question by Sean Martin

Sean Martin's question related to the proposal to stop cars turning between Histon Road and Victoria Road in both directions at the junction between these two roads. He felt that such a restriction would have a major impact on residents and businesses on both sides of Victoria Road. He set out a number of observations he had made in respect of this proposal, including safety concerns from the perspective of cyclists, delays in journey times for buses particularly in the morning rush hour, the fact that only 6% of traffic along Histon Road in the morning rush hour turned left into Victoria Road and that the current junction could be improved by much better co-ordination between the two sets of traffic lights. He said that these observations were made over several days in the morning rush

hour at this junction and asked what plans the City Deal had on this specific point.

Mr Menzies clarified that the proposal illustrated in Figure 1 of the report represented additional bus services and not an extension of the Guided Busway.

Mr Walmsley said that the Victoria Road junction was very complex and conceded that it would take some time to develop a workable solution. He was looking at the possibility of modelling the junction with or without closures but said that it would remain a signal junction, making the point that the scheme would include benefits to cyclists.

Councillor John Hipkin, local ward Member from Cambridge City Council, said that the effect of diversions resulting from any banned turns or any other such changes to the road needed to be very closely studied, adding that the closure of Histon Road to traffic coming from Victoria Road was very controversial.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this item at its meeting on 2 June 2016. It was noted that the Joint Assembly had expressed concerns regarding the relatively small saving in journey times that was anticipated to be made as a result of progressing with the scheme. An amendment was also debated for the draft consultation document on further options to come back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for consideration. The amendment was lost as it was noted that this would add at least six weeks onto the project and the majority of Assembly Members felt that the scheme had sufficient consultation planned for the next stages of the process.

Councillor Hickford therefore confirmed that the officer recommendations contained in the report, and an addendum that had been circulated at the meeting, were supported by the Joint Assembly.

Mr Walmsley, in presenting the report, set out the objectives for the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes which consisted of:

- comprehensive priority for buses in both directions wherever practical;
- additional capacity for sustainable trips to employment and education sites;
- increased bus patronage and new services;
- safer and more convenient routes for cycling and walking, segregated where practical and possible;
- maintain or reduce the general traffic levels;
- enhance the environment, streetscape and air quality.

Further to the consultation exercise for both schemes, Mr Walmsley confirmed that the following had been highlighted as key issues resulting from the consultation on initial ideas:

- concerns over the impact of banned turns and restricted access in respect of Victoria Road, Warwick Road, Gilbert Road, Arbury Road, Union Lane and King's Hedges Road;
- concerns over increased traffic lanes, impact on green landscaping and difficulty in crossing wider roads;
- concerns that ideas for cycling improvements did not suit all cyclists;
- impact of junction changes in respect of Union Lane, Elizabeth Way and Victoria Road;
- role of Mitcham's Corner in the Milton Road project.

In respect of Mitcham's Corner, Mr Walmsley explained that this had not been included in the Tranche 1 programme. He acknowledged, however, that there were benefits that could be achieved in respect of public realm so officers were working with the City Council to develop how it could be improved. Mitcham's Corner would be considered for inclusion in the City Deal's Tranche 2 programme by the Executive Board in due course.

Members were referred to an addendum that had been circulated at the meeting of the Joint Assembly which took into account the results of additional data that had become available. This set out a revised recommendation (b) to that set out in the report, as follows:

'Agree to take forward for further design work the initial ideas included in the 'Do Maximum' option, excluding the idea of banning the right turn into Warwick Road and the idea of 'floating' bus stops, to develop two preferred design options, one including and one excluding the changes at the Victoria Road junction.'

Councillor Bates proposed two additional paragraphs to the officer recommendations, as follows:

'(g) the Executive Board instructs officers to ensure that the preferred option design for consultation includes details of proposed landscape areas and tree planting as set out in the report.'

'(h) the Executive Board notes the important role of the Local Liaison Forum in involving local Councillors and stakeholder groups in the development of the detailed layout plans for consultation.'

Discussion ensued on the Local Liaison Forum that would be established in respect of the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes. Mr Menzies reminded the Board that meetings of the Local Liaison Forums were open to the public, with the terms of reference set by local elected Members from the County Council and City Council, who would also determine which stakeholders were appointed and who would be entitled to speak at meetings. It had been originally proposed to establish one Forum for both schemes, since it was felt that the areas impacted by both schemes would be represented by the same local elected Members. However, the Board was of the view that these schemes affected two different communities and therefore supported the establishment of two separate Local Liaison Forums, one for each scheme.

Councillor Herbert made the point that Local Liaison Forums were not decision-making bodies and asked whether the issues that had been raised at this meeting by public questioners, such as segregated cycleways and concerns with the public realm for example, would be picked up. Mr Menzies confirmed that one of the Local Liaison Forum's key roles was engagement with the community and he fully expected the issues put forward to be raised and discussed in more detail at Local Liaison Forum meetings.

Supporting the above amendments to the officer recommendations contained within the report, the Executive Board unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** the findings in the initial consultation report.
- (b) **AGREED** to take forward for further design work the initial ideas included in the 'Do Maximum' option, excluding the idea of banning the right turn into Warwick Road and the idea of 'floating' bus stops, to develop two preferred design options, one including and one excluding the changes at the Victoria Road junction'.

- (c) **NOTED** the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period to develop a preferred option layout for further consultation.
- (d) **SUPPORTED** the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation.
- (e) **DELEGATED** authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve further consultation for a preferred option scheme.
- (f) **NOTED** the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.
- (g) **INSTRUCTED** officers to ensure that the preferred option design for consultation includes details of proposed landscape areas and tree planting as set out in the report.
- (h) **NOTED** the important role of the Local Liaison Forum in involving local Councillors and stakeholder groups in the development of the detailed layout plans for consultation.

11. MILTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: REPORT ON INITIAL CONSULTATION AND SELECTION OF A PREFERRED ROUTE

The presentation of the report and some public questions considered as part of the item on Histon Road at minute number 10, also related to this item.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. Questions were grouped together based on their subject and were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Sheila Butcher

Sheila Butcher could not understand why this road would be dug up, with beautiful and mature trees and grass verges removed, to make way for bus lanes that would stay empty for most of the day. She asked why all the other options for tackling congestion had not been tried first.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, acknowledged that this question was similar to that of Mr Nisbet's in the previous item, and said that no decisions would be made to implement works or dig up roads until after peak congestion control points had been put in place.

Question by Peter Fenton

Peter Fenton referred to proposed city-wide measures designed to reduce the flow of traffic into and out of Cambridge. In the light of these measures and the imminent North Cambridge railway station, he asked whether the Board thought that the proposals for Milton Road had become obsolete even before they had started. He added that all of the traffic flow projections were already out of date and suggested it would be better to shelve the project and wait to see how the other measures worked.

Mr Menzies acknowledged that further modelling would be required, but confirmed that this would be carried out prior to the public consultation, with any changes to the proposals as a result being made publicly available.

Question by Glyn Burton

Glyn Burton was concerned of the impact that a new banned turn proposed for outbound vehicles in respect of Elizabeth Way would cause for people living in the area, together with any rat-running that she felt would occur as a result. She asked for assurance that this new option would receive full and fair public consultation before any decisions were taken.

Mr Menzies emphasised that this had been identified as something to explore further and was not being proposed as part of the scheme at this stage.

Question by Duncan Astill

Duncan Astill said that 90% of traffic turned left at the roundabout down Elizabeth Way and then queued both at the Chesterton Road roundabout and the Newmarket Road roundabout. He therefore asked why they were not being considered as part of any scheme of improvements.

Councillor Kevin Price, local ward Member from Cambridge City Council, referred to a revised set of recommendations that he had proposed at the Joint Assembly meeting on 2 June 2016 which he felt better reflected the needs of local residents, including mature tree planting and improvements to the existing public realm to be included along the full length of the road. He drew the Board's attention to the fact that residents of East Chesterton currently had only three exits in view of the fact that the area was bordered by the river, the A14 and the railway line and said that the proposed closure of Union Lane meant reducing this number of exit points to two.

Councillor Mike Sargeant, local ward Member from Cambridge City Council, said that that the inclusion of two bus lanes at the Elizabeth Way junction did not seem appropriate. He was also of the view that it was extremely important to incorporate two-way cycleways at Gilbert Road and Arbury Road. He was concerned about the amount of money spent on cycling as part of the City Deal when improvements to Mitcham's Corner had not been included in the Tranche 1 programme.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that this junction was particularly complex and emphasised that further modelling work would be taking place. He added that consideration needed to be given about what mitigation measures could be put in place to address traffic displacement.

Mr Walmsley reported that alternative measures had been considered, but the junction was important in order for the bus priority aspect of the scheme to work, taking into account the safety of cyclists as well.

Councillor Herbert highlighted opportunities for public input as being a common theme as part of questions from local Members and members of the public and asked how far the Local Liaison Forums would go to ensure that people had an opportunity to look into the detail of some of the comments they were making. Mr Walmsley said that he fully expected Local Liaison Forums to provide opportunities for issues such as those raised as part of this item to be considered and discussed in more detail.

Councillor Jocelyn Scutt, local ward Member from Cambridgeshire County Council, referred to paragraph 4 of an addendum report that had been published in respect of this item which read:

'If the Executive Board approves the report recommendations for preferred options as the basis for further detailed design work, this will fix the carriageway layout ...'

Councillor Scutt said that residents had strongly objected to the term 'this will fix the carriageway layout' and called for the Board to redact this wording from the report.

Councillor Herbert felt that this, and landscaping in general, would be considered by the Local Liaison Forum. The Executive Board, however, agreed to the redaction of the words 'this will fix the carriageway layout' from the report.

Question by John Beasley

John Beasley made reference to the Department for Transport Design Manual for roads and bridges document TD 27/05 which stated that the lane width required for urban, all-purpose roads and connector roads should be 3.65 metres. He therefore asked whether, for safety reasons, the City Deal team would consider either revising the lane widths to 3.65 metres throughout and changing the four-lane section to three lanes, or restricting the width of vehicles allowed to travel along Milton Road.

Question by John Cornish

John Cornish referred to the pavement on the north/west side of Milton Road between Mitcham's Corner and Arbury Road, which was generally over four metres wide and mixed use. He therefore sought reassurance that there would be a commitment by the project team to keep the pavement and off-road cycleway as a minimum four metres wide for the stretch from Mitcham's Corner through to Arbury Road.

Mr Walmsley confirmed that the design standards highlighted by Mr Beasley actually related to trunk roads, whereas Milton Road was a local road. In that respect the scheme had to be developed and designed in accordance with the network available to it. In terms of Mr Cornish's question, it was noted that this would feature as part of the next stage of the process and would be an issue for discussion by the Local Liaison Forum at the relevant time.

Question by Jane Wheatley

Jane Wheatley expressed her concerns about access to the shops on Milton Road coming up to the Arbury Road junction, which currently enjoyed two laybys directly outside of the shops, a small amount of forecourt parking and two laybys opposite. Diagrams in the interim report showed bus lanes on both sides of Milton Road and no street parking, thus severely limiting access to the shops. She therefore asked what measures the City Deal would put in place to ensure the safety of these small businesses and protect the community and passing trade that they served.

Question by Maureen Mace

Maureen Mace was concerned that there were significant differences between the diagram for the 'do something' option included in the questionnaire sent out to residents in comparison to the version included in the interim report submitted to the Joint Assembly on 2 June 2016. This included additional bus lanes from Hurst Park Avenue to Arbury Road, areas for potential parking instead of trees and the removal of all of the trees from

the whole length of the eastern side of the road. She said that it could not be assumed that the public would know what the new proposal consisted of, especially since not everyone had access to a computer or found it easy to view or download large amounts of data. Maureen Mace therefore asked whether hard copies of the interim report, including the updated diagram for Milton Road, had been lodged in the Central Library and the Milton Road Library.

Question by Yu Lee Paul

Yu Lee Paul had some concerns about the proposals for Milton Road. She said the road was a tree lined avenue of huge importance not just to local residents but to visitors and the nature and heritage of Cambridge. As such as city should thought that the City Deal should be looking to improve upon, not take away from, the greenery it already had.

Yu Lee Paul referred to the Urban Design Guide which stated that the choice and use of materials and trees must not be considered as an 'add on' or last minute thought. She said that residents would not be prepared to settle for having trees and verges 'where possible', as an afterthought. She therefore asked for a commitment that at least one metre's width of trees and verges along both sides of Milton Road could be maintained and that any trees removed were replaced with mature, flowering trees.

Mr Walmsley was aware of the economic viability of the businesses located along Milton Road but highlighted the effectiveness of passing trade by cyclists and pedestrians as well as cars. He confirmed that some of the laybys would have to be removed in order to accommodate the different modes of transport required as part of the scheme, with the specific details yet to be worked up.

Mr Walmsley also made the point that lot of the issues discussed at this meeting would be picked up at a later stage of the process as proposals developed, with the Local Liaison Forum assisting with that aspect of the project. Mr Menzies reiterated that specific plans for the scheme had yet to be developed and Appendix 5 to the report reflected a piece of work undertaken by consultants as an initial options study.

Councillor Herbert, in response to the question by Maurine Mace, asked officers to ensure that the necessary documents were made available in local libraries.

Mr Walmsley, in response to the question by Yu Lee Paul, said that a commitment to maintain at least one metre's width of trees and verges along both sides of Milton Road would be too constraining and that this may not be the best solution for the scheme. He said that this might be achievable in parts of the road, but said it was too early to make any such commitments and limit the options available at this stage.

Councillor Herbert agreed with Yu Lee Paul that these elements of the scheme were not introduced as afterthoughts, making the point that the Local Liaison Forum would be an essential way of ensuring that they continued to be discussed and taken into consideration.

Mr Menzies highlighted that public speakers at this meeting had requested different things in relation to this scheme and the scheme at Histon Road, all of which were impossible to be delivered together due to them conflicting or contradicting one another. He therefore made the point that compromises would need to be made as part of developing these schemes.

Question by Michael Page

Michael Page supported Councillor Kevin Price's amendment that he had put forward at the meeting of the Joint Assembly and felt that the process between the initial consultation and the decision-making at this meeting was so curtailed that he feared it would be brought further into disrepute in the eyes of the public. He asked whether a mechanism to review the success of schemes at Histon Road and Milton Road would be undertaken before any design work took place.

Mr Menzies confirmed that a review had already been undertaken as part of floating bus stops, the results of which would be available shortly.

Question by Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor said that it appeared officers were seeking the Board's approval of the principle of the layout of the traffic lanes shown in the 'do something' option for Milton Road, but not the layout of the planting, parking, cycleways and pavements. If the Board intended to support the officer recommendations he suggested amending the wording in-line with officers' intent and to clarify which elements of the 'do something' plans the Board was endorsing. He also asked for clarity around which version of the 'do something' option would be put out to public consultation due to different versions having been published following the Board's decision in November 2015 and the document that appeared in the interim options report on the City Deal website in May 2016.

Mr Menzies said that the Addendum recently published in support of the original report included in the agenda pack for this meeting sought to clarify this point.

Question by Miriam Kubica

Miriam Kubica asked for assurance that Highworth Avenue would remain as a no through road for vehicular traffic.

Mr Walmsley confirmed that Highworth Avenue would remain as a no through road for vehicular traffic.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this item at its meeting on 2 June 2016. As reported in the previous item, Members of the Joint Assembly were content with the further consultation that would take place in respect of this scheme. An amendment to the officer recommendations had been debated, which the proposer felt better reflected local resident's needs. The amendment was lost and the Joint Assembly therefore supported the officer recommendations, with 6 votes in favour compared to 3 against.

In line with the previous item, Councillor Ian Bates proposed two additional paragraphs to the officer recommendations, as follows:

- '(h) the Executive Board instructs officers to ensure that the preferred option design for consultation includes details of proposed landscape areas and tree planting as set out in the report.'
- '(i) the Executive Board notes the important role of the Local Liaison Forum in involving local Councillors and stakeholder groups in the development of the detailed layout plans for consultation.'

The Executive Board unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** the findings in the initial consultation report.
- (b) **AGREED** to take forward the initial ideas in the 'Do Something' option for further design work including the Union Lane closure and Elizabeth Way roundabout ideas and 'floating bus stops', where highway space permitted, but excluding the ideas for banned turns at the Gilbert Road, Arbury Road and King's Hedges Road junctions.
- (c) **AGREED** to consider major changes to the highway layout at the Mitcham's Corner junction for implementation as part of the ongoing tranche 2 prioritisation work.
- (d) **NOTED** the further technical work that would be undertaken over the summer period.
- (e) **SUPPORTED** the development of traffic management measures to mitigate displaced traffic and parking for the purposes of further consultation.
- (f) **DELEGATED** authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, to approve a further consultation for a preferred option scheme design, as detailed in section 43 of the report.
- (g) **NOTED** the procurement plan for project delivery, the revised project programme and the consultation plan set out in the report.
- (h) **INSTRUCTED** officers to ensure that the preferred option design for consultation includes details of proposed landscape areas and tree planting as set out in the report.
- (i) **NOTED** the important role of the Local Liaison Forum in involving local Councillors and stakeholder groups in the development of the detailed layout plans for consultation.

12. **CROSS CITY CYCLING**

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public or local Members who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. Questions were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Question by Councillor John Williams

Councillor John Williams welcomed the two cross city cycling schemes that involved the Fulbourn division of the County Council and confirmed that they had widespread support. However, he said that this did not address the existing poor cycle and pedestrian crossing at Yarrow Road or the substandard shared cycle path from Fulbourn Road to the Capital Park Business Park. Councillor Williams added that, in order for the Fulbourn Road scheme to be fully utilised and to tackle congestion in the city, it was important that this substandard shared path was also upgraded at the earliest opportunity. He therefore sought confirmation that this was in hand.

Question by Vince Farrar

Vince Farrar reported that Fen Ditton Parish Council had been looking at how to extend the cycleway and join it onto other routes, as well as investigating the possibility of widening Ditton Lane for safety reasons. He asked the Executive Board to consider additional funding to bridge the gap between Horningsea Road and Ditton Road.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report which summarised the results of public consultation and proposed next steps in respect of cross city cycling improvement schemes, as well as setting out details of the following specific schemes:

- Fulbourn Road and Cherry Hinton eastern access;
- Hills Road and Addenbrooke's corridor;
- links to east Cambridge and national cycle route 11;
- Arbury Road;
- links to Cambridge North Station and the Science Park.

In response to the questions, Mr Walmsley said that consideration would be given to the continued development of these schemes as part of Tranche 2 of the City Deal programme.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly, having considered this report at its meeting on 2 June 2016, had unanimously supported the officer recommendations.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, sought clarification as to why the cost of the scheme had increased from the initial estimate. Mr Walmsley explained that the original costs had been estimated in June 2015 without any scheme development taken into account, with the proviso that at that time it was a high level estimate. Now that the scheme had been worked up, the cost of the scheme could be more accurately projected, hence the request for the Board to approve additional funding.

The Executive Board unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** the results and key issues arising from the public consultation.
- (b) **INCREASED** the funding allocated to the schemes due to the expansion of scope.
- (c) **AGREED** to continue localised discussions over trees, hedges and boundaries.
- (d) **APPROVED** implementation of all five schemes, subject to a few minor changes and areas where some further consultation is required, as per the summary table set out in the report.
- (e) **DELEGATED** approval of detailed final scheme layouts to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board.

13. CAMBRIDGE TO ROYSTON CYCLEWAY

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public or local Members who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. Questions were therefore asked and answered, as follows:

Statement by Councillor Susan Van de Ven

Councillor Susan Van de Ven said that this cycleway was a key link, especially from the perspective of Melbourn Business Park and the aspiration to complete a route from Cambridge to Royston. She reported that local businesses were working well with communities along the A10 to achieve changes in travel choices, focussed on more sustainable modes of transport, also stating that AstraZeneca had agreed to sponsor the maintenance of the whole route for two years. She also thanked the Local Enterprise Partnership for its assistance in preparing a bid that would be used to fund the final link to Royston.

Councillor Herbert took this opportunity to pay tribute to the work and commitment demonstrated by Councillor Van de Ven in respect of this route, as well as members of the community who had worked on the project.

Question by Tim Bedford

Tim Bedford asked whether the project would include the building of the planned traffic island near The Weaver's Shed, as he felt that this would be essential to people safely crossing the road when coming from Melbourn.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery, confirmed that this was being considered as part of the scheme.

Mr Walmsley presented the report which explained the details of the proposed route and the major economic benefits that could be realised in the short term.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly, having considered this report at its meeting on 2 June 2016, had unanimously supported the officer recommendations.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the work completed to date to provide a cycle link from Cambridge to Melbourn.
- (b) **APPROVED** the use of £550,000 of City Deal funding to complete the link.

14. CITY DEAL URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN GUIDANCE

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, opened the item by inviting those members of the public who had given notice to put forward questions to the Board. The following statement was noted:

Statement by Lucy Price

Lucy Price asked the Executive Board to consider the use of more creative infrastructure to encourage people to walk and cycle through the city, citing examples of schemes already in place. She felt that low level lighting or safely positioned sculpture or cycle counters could really enhance the space and, more importantly, encourage people to get out of their cars and improve the experience for all travelling through Cambridge.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 2 June 2016. Members of the Joint Assembly had expressed their concerns due to a lack of detail in the document, a lack of reference

to heritage and a general feeling that the document was not aspirational enough. The Joint Assembly had supported the amendment of recommendation (a) so that it read 'requests the improvement of the City Deal Urban and Environmental Design Guidance document' rather than endorsing the document as it stood. The Assembly also supported the following additional recommendations:

- '(d) The Executive Board requests that officers investigate the process of all future City Deal schemes being considered by the Cambridgeshire Quality Design Panel.'
- '(e) The Executive Board requests that officers investigate the introduction of a facility that invites members of the public to provide photographs of aspirational ideas and ideas to be avoided for a website-based montage.'

The Joint Assembly therefore unanimously recommended to the Board approval of the officer recommendations contained within the report, subject to the inclusion of the above amendments.

Stuart Walmsley, Director of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, in presenting the report said that the document set out the principles to be followed and guidance that should be taken into account during the development of City Deal transport infrastructure projects on the major roads into Cambridge and city centre access routes. It intended to capture as much good practice as it could and had been commissioned to be a conceptual design document, reflecting characteristics of Cambridge and the objectives of the City Deal programme.

During discussion the Board was content with the Joint Assembly's recommendation, noting however the key role that the Local Liaison Forum would play in terms of understanding local expectations. Councillor Burkitt welcomed a design guide but said that he would be more interested in what local people had to say about proposals as they were developed, adding that he would rather be guided by them.

Councillor Herbert requested that all Members of the Executive Board and Joint Assembly, as part of the further work that would be undertaken to improve the document, be asked their views as to what elements were missing in order that they could help shape the revised version.

The Executive Board unanimously:

- a) **REQUESTED** the improvement of the City Deal Urban and Environmental Design Guidance document.
- (b) **REQUIRED** that the document is proactively used and reference by project managers during the development of relevant City Deal transport projects.
- (c) **REQUESTED** that the document is updated periodically to reflect any significant changes in highway and planning design policy.
- (d) **REQUESTED** that officers investigate the process of all future City Deal schemes being considered by the Cambridgeshire Quality Design Panel.
- (e) **REQUESTED** that officers investigate the introduction of a facility that invites members of the public to provide photographs of aspirational ideas and ideas to be avoided for a website-based montage.

15. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal progress report.

16. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

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

The Meeting ended at 6.20 p.m.
