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Welcome

• First Local Liaison Forum (LLF) for any City Deal project
• **Joint** forum due to close proximity and relationship between 2 projects
• LLF’s have been used in other CCC projects e.g. Chesterton Station – but as planning conditions
• Scope and scale of A428/WO different – so early start LLF deemed necessary
• Lesson learnt from A428 consultation in late 2015 – need to ensure effective and ongoing engagement – not just during formal consultation periods
• **Local** – is focused on the direct area of influence of projects
• **Liaison** – is a conduit for information exchange between local representatives and the project
• **Forum** – is a focused meeting with structured topics
• A ‘learning process’ which can develop other the course of the project
First Meeting

• More about process

• Future Meetings – focusing on the developing options/schemes
### Today’s Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title (lead)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attendance and apologies (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LLF Terms of Reference (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conducting the Business of the LLF (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Election of Chair and Vice Chair (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Introduction to Major Scheme development approach (Alan Brett, WS Aitkins Ltd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The A428-A1303 Project – Next Steps (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Western Orbital Project – Next Steps (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Any other Business (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Date of Next Meeting (CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs Agenda Meeting – (6 weeks prior to DNM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terms of Reference

1. Membership

1.1 The following representatives will be invited to join the LLF:

- All local authority Members from wards directly affected by the proposals within the geographical scope of the scheme options
- Representative of local Parish Councils within the geographic scope of the scheme options

1.2 The LLF may co-opt additional members from other organisations or interest groups, as considered appropriate, to facilitate the function of the LLF in support of the delivery of a project.
2. Functions

2.1 The LLF will act as a conduit through which local issues, opportunities and concerns relevant to the project* will be taken into account during its development and delivery.

2.2 To this end, the LLF may offer advice to the Project Board and put forward suggestions, as considered appropriate, to influence and inform the delivery of the project within the scope of the Project Inception Document (PID).

2.3 Upon completion of the construction phase, the LLF will participate in a review of a project’s delivery, in accordance with the Greater Cambridge City Deal Project Review Protocol, making recommendations, as considered appropriate, to inform future programme delivery.
Meeting Conduct

3. Term of office
3.1 The LLF will function for the duration of the project which will include its design, delivery and review stages.

4. Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman
4.1 The LLF will appoint a Chairman and Vice-Chairman at its first meeting for the duration of the term of office or as otherwise agreed

5. Meeting frequency, administration and attendance
5.1 The LLF will set its own timetable for meetings. Administration of the LLF will be the responsibility of the Project Manager.

5.2 LLF meetings will be open to the public but members of the public will not have the right to speak or participate in the meeting unless invited to by the Chair.
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6. Agenda and Minutes

6.1 The agenda for the LLF will be agreed by the Chair of the LLF in liaison with the Project Manager. The Project Manager may require that items are put on the agenda as required by project exigencies.

6.2 The Chairman will sign the minutes of the proceedings at the next suitable meeting. The Chairman will move that the minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record. The only part of the minutes that can be discussed is their accuracy.

6.3 The LLF is not able to make decisions. The minutes can however include ‘Proposals’ which are recorded as such.

6.4 Once signed, LLF meeting minutes will be made publicly available via the City Deal website.

6.5 The minutes of the LLF are taken as an agenda item at the next Project Board
Understanding ‘scope’

• What is scope?
• Scope in effect is what the project is about –
  Time: how long
• Cost: how much
• Quality: where/what
How is scope defined

• 2 key sets of document(s) that define scope
• A) The ‘key decisions’ of the City Deal Board
  • This sets the overall framework of the project
• B) The Project Inception Document (PID)
  • Key Decisions > PID
PID

- Key Decisions are dealt with City Deal Board and Assembly by means of report
- *Between* Key Decisions the PID is the fundamental governing document of the Project
PID contents

• Purpose of this document
• Project Rationale
• Benefits and Objectives
• Key Outputs
• Scope
• Programme
• Links with strategy, policy and development
• Project Process & Resources
• Project Board
• Local Liaison Forum
• Review
• Issues & Assumptions
• Appendix A Project Board Terms of Reference
• Appendix B Project Liaison Forum Terms of Reference
A428/1303 Key PID sections

Outputs within scope

• Measures such as Park & Ride/ Cycle on A428/A1303 and Madingley Road
• A shared, dedicated or partially segregated bus facility running either on or broadly parallel to the A428/A1303 from Caxton Gibbet to Cambridge City Centre or other options on a similar alignment
• Additional bus priority infrastructure to improve journey times or the customer experience on public transport along the corridor
• Bus waiting and passenger information enhancements
• Improved and safer cycle and pedestrian infrastructure
• Measures to ensure the protection of the environment of the corridors;
• Measures to mitigate the impact of proposals on local road network
• Measures to physically integrate into other City Deal proposals e.g. Western Orbital and City Access studies and
• Any other transport related infrastructure measures to promote growth in key housing and employment centres along the corridor including ticketing and marketing initiatives
• Measures to ensure ongoing maintainability of new infrastructure
Outside of the Scope

- Operation of bus services
- Non transport related infrastructure except for mitigation
- New Park and Ride except those that are integral to the preferred options
- Rail, tram or other non-bus based solutions as these are not deliverable within the City Deal funding and time constraints
- Any measures west of Caxton Gibbet or east of Northampton Street
- Any measures significantly north or south of the linear corridor between Caxton Gibbet and Northampton Street which do not directly support the corridor proposals
- Any measures that do not meet the broad City Deal objectives or the policy objectives of the City Deal partners
Western Orbital – Key PID sections

Within the scope

- Measures such as Park & Ride/ Cycle on the M11, A603, B1046 and A10(S)
- A shared, dedicated or partially segregated bus facility running either on or broadly parallel to the M11 between junctions 11 & 13
- New or enhanced junctions at J11, 12 and/or 13 of the M11
- Bus and or car only slip road for priority access from J11 to Trumpington Park & Ride/
- Bus priority infrastructure between Cambridge North West/West Cambridge university site (Madingley Road) (J13 of M11) and Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Hauxton Road / Trumpington Park & Ride) so that buses can compete with private car on journey times
- Other non motorway junction improvement measures to facilitate public transport priority through key pinch points
Western Orbital – Key PID sections

Within the scope

• Improved orbital cycle and pedestrian infrastructure including links across and alongside the M11
• Measures to ensure the protection of the character and environment of the corridors;
• Potential traffic management solutions such as High Occupancy Vehicle lanes
• Cycle and pedestrian links including both strategic and local options
• Measures to physically integrate into other City Deal proposals such as the A428 corridor proposal and
• Measures to promote growth in key housing and employment centres
• Measures to mitigate the impact of new developments on local road network
• Landscaping
• Signage, waiting facilities and bus passenger information enhancements
Outside of the Scope (things that the project will definitely not deliver)

- Rail, tram or other non-bus based solutions as these are not deliverable within the City Deal funding and time constraints
- All non transport related measures except for mitigation
- Any measures north of Junction 13 or south of Junction 11 except where these are integral to the within scope scheme
- Any measures that do not meet the broad City Deal objectives or the policy objectives of the City Deal partners
- Bus operational issues except where such issues are directly relevant to the establishment of a business case for infrastructure interventions
Managing the project between ‘key decisions’

**PID** - the project objectives

**Project Plan** – how the project is progressing

- Project Board - monitors progress & makes non key decisions
- Project Manager – day to day management
- Local Liaison Forum
  - Views/Opinion
  - Information

**Project Team** – Consultant
- Other CCC officers
- Other partner officers
Conducting the Business of LLF

• TOR set “minimum standard”

• Beyond that members of LLF can determine approach that they feel reflects local circumstances

• Key considerations should be how to ensure the LLF performs its function best
Possible models

Public Meeting

Presentations and questions

+ Allows widest possible participation

- Unstructured – not going to capture ‘resolutions to Project Board

Scrutiny Committee

Only Members – highly formal

+ Formality may add to influence

- May not offer sufficient scope for wider public engagement
Balanced approach?

• Membership of LLF..........
• Other stakeholders?
• Focus on general or specific issues?
• Questions from the floor versus prepared presentations?
Example of conventional approach

• “Update” role of meeting
• General wide ranging agenda
• Content of meeting led by officers
• Only questions from floor – can become confrontational
• Difficult to ‘capture’ views in coherent way
• Therefore difficult to directly impact project development
Example of constructive input

- “Quality assurance” role
- Identify key local issues e.g. landscaping, design, screening etc......
- Focus on limited number at each meeting
- Allow presentations/questions notified in advance plus ad hoc questions
- Obtain views of LLF – concerns/agreement
- Feed back to Project Board
Meeting Frequencies?

- Meetings should be held around 1-2 months in advance of Project Boards
- Project Boards currently scheduled for 26\textsuperscript{th} April, 20\textsuperscript{th} July, 22\textsuperscript{nd} September, 24\textsuperscript{th} November
- Agenda meeting to be held with Chair around 1 month in advance of these meetings
- Next LLF June – Agenda meeting early May?
Resolutions?

- Not “compulsory”
- What are they?
  1. A collective view of the LLF
  2. Provide a formal and auditable manner of putting local views into the project development process
  3. Not decisions
  4. Are recorded and will be reported to Project Board
  5. Project Board will be asked to “note”
  6. However they can also agree and instruct further work to reflect/investigate resolution
  7. Resolutions cannot be out of scope
  8. Of course the normal other means of influence and engagement still exist! e.g. consultation, City Deal questions etc.
Election of Chair and Vice Chair

• Any Member of the LLF can be Chair / Vice Chair
• Initially proposed to rotate Chair / Vice Chair after 3 meetings of LLF (not including this one)
• Main responsibility is to set agenda of LLF, chair meetings
• Pre Agenda meeting to be held with officers
• Vice Chair is invited to agenda setting meeting and can deputise for Chair
• Full support to be provided by officers of CCC as required
• If no Chair/ Vice Chair appointed today Officers will continue to chair meeting until appointment
A428-A1303 Next Steps
A428 Corridor

Early Options 2014
Refine Options 2015
Consult on options 2016
Recommend Preferred Option 2017/18
Business Case 2018
Consult on Scheme 2018
Statutory Approvals 2018-20
Construct

We are here
• **Modelling** – use of Cambridgeshire Strategic Regional Model to assess likely journey time impacts, patronage, general congestion impacts

• **COBALT (COst and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch)** is a computer program developed by the DfT to undertake the analysis of the impact on accidents as part of economic appraisal for a road scheme

• **TUBA: Transport Users Benefit Appraisal** - The purpose of TUBA is to carry out transport scheme economic appraisal in accordance with the DfT’s published guidance. It implements a ‘willingness to pay’ approach to economic appraisal for multi-modal schemes with fixed or variable demand.

• **DI = Distributional Impact** = consider the variance of transport intervention impacts across different social groups
Western Orbital Next Steps
## Programme

### Western Orbital: Phase 2 Stage 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Workshop</td>
<td>07-Mar</td>
<td>14-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop</td>
<td>21-Mar</td>
<td>28-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Evidence Review</td>
<td>04-Apr</td>
<td>11-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Principles assessment of Bus Operations</td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
<td>25-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Design - Line proposals only (S)</td>
<td>02-May</td>
<td>09-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Design - design to 1,100 (S)</td>
<td>16-May</td>
<td>23-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Costings (S&amp;A)</td>
<td>30-May</td>
<td>06-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costings</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level Environmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Modelling (non CSRM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Consultation Responses (if available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Report (draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Report (final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Western Orbital: Phase 2 Stage 2 (indicative only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecast Modelling</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Highway Interventions</td>
<td>27-Jun</td>
<td>04-Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess impacts</td>
<td>11-Jul</td>
<td>18-Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline Business Case</td>
<td>25-Jul</td>
<td>01-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Option Costing</td>
<td>08-Aug</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Phase 2 Report (draft)</td>
<td>22-Aug</td>
<td>29-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Comments</td>
<td>05-Sep</td>
<td>12-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Phase 2 Report (final)</td>
<td>19-Sep</td>
<td>26-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology for Phase 3</td>
<td>03-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Orbital

- Early Options: 2015
- Refine Options
- Consult on options: 2016
- Recommend Preferred Option
- Business Case: 2017
- Consult on Scheme
- Statutory Approvals: 2018
- Detail Design & Construct: 2020 / 2022
## Summary Tables

**Approval Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary of Key Impacts</th>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Socio-economic Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Not assessed - social</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Accounts (PA) Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL COMMUNITIES / CYCLING</th>
<th>ALL MODES</th>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>SMS and COACH</th>
<th>RAIL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET IMPACT</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC COMMUNITIES FUNDING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Non-Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Non-Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1) + (1) = 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During Construction & Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Goods Vehiles</th>
<th>Business &amp; LDV's</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Freight</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel time</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle operating costs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Business Impact**

- Goods Vehiles: 0
- Business & LDV's: 0
- Passengers: 0
- Freight: 0
- Passengers: 0

Note: Benefits appear as positive numbers, while costs appear as negative numbers. All amounts are discounted present values in 2019 prices and values.
City.deal@cambridgeshire.gov.uk