

# **Residents' Association Forum Meeting Notes**

**Forum held 17.01.2017**

## **1. Background**

The Greater Cambridge City Deal is a unique opportunity to secure the future of Greater Cambridge as a leading UK and global hub for research and technology, support economic growth and enhance quality of life for people in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The GC City Deal partnership aims to invest £1 billion in the infrastructure we need to connect new homes and jobs, so our city region can grow in a sustainable way, benefitting those who live, work, study and visit it. It aims to: bring about a step change in sustainable transport infrastructure and networks; ensure employers have access to the skills they need and people in Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire benefit from the employment opportunities growth affords; and accelerate delivery of 33 500 new homes, so that there is more housing people can afford, closer to new jobs – 44 000 additional jobs are planned by 2031. These changes will enable us to secure and share our city region's future prosperity.

The Greater Cambridge City Deal team and the Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations (FeCRA) organised a question and answer session for Residents' Associations on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017. The first part of the session was a general City Deal question and answer session: this note summarises questions asked and answers given. Residents' Association chairs' questions were answered by Graham Hughes, Executive Director for Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council and Tanya Sheridan, Greater Cambridge City Deal Programme Director.

The Annex sets out questions the FeCRA committee supplied ahead of the meeting and the answers. Note that many of the points raised were covered in the introductory briefing at the meeting also.

## **2. Overview of the Greater Cambridge City Deal**

Tanya Sheridan gave an overview of the City Deal, covering:

- Greater Cambridge City Deal purpose and rationale;
- The GCCD partners: Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership and Cambridge University.
- GCCD governance: the City Deal Executive Board takes decisions and the Joint Assembly provides advice, pre-scrutinises decisions and represents a range of stakeholder views. The Terms of Reference of both are decided by the 3 Local Authorities. This covers size and who nominates members.
- GCCD funding - up to £1 billion. This comprises up to £500 million Government funding, dependent on investment decisions and up to £500 million of local funding. The local funding covers a range of infrastructure for sustainable growth, including new schools.
- Relationship with and impact of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

She also explained how the City Deal listens to comments from members of the public. This meeting was one in a series of 6-monthly Question and Answer sessions. City Deal has just reviewed communications and channels and once that feedback had been considered, would be keen to discuss with the FeCRA committee planned engagement and information going forward.

### **3. Summary of Questions and Responses in the meeting**

*Q. Why did the Programme Director commission the independent review by Mouchel (Wendy Blythe, Chair FeCRA)?*

A. An external assurance review of the City Deal's transport work stream was commissioned as good practice for a programme of this size and complexity in order to test current progress and identify future risks and opportunities.

It was commissioned in response to a change in scale and pace of work in the transport work stream throughout 2016 and looking ahead to changes from 2017 and to get an external assessment of delivery confidence.

*Q. Growth without Congestion Growth – what is your transport objective? I thought it was reduce to congestion by 15%?*

A. The City Deal Board is keen to reduce car traffic into Cambridge by 10-15% as that's the reduction we see in the least busy periods (school and university holidays) which would have a huge impact on the road network for all transport users, reducing delays and improving reliability for people travelling by bus and car.

*Q. Will the new City Deal Core Team include a landscape architect? Milton Road Residents are worried that the new City Deal team will not have enough money for planting trees?*

A. We recognise the importance of thinking holistically about transport, movement and place in delivering City Deal Projects. The City Deal Board is keen that landscape is a key part of the process and that resource is in place to achieve this. This could be from an external consultant or internal staff. The City Deal core team is currently being formed.

*Q. We are concerned that Phase 2 of the Hills Road cycle scheme doesn't include landscaping?*

A. There was a public exhibition on the plans on 17<sup>th</sup> January – comments have been fed back to officers who will work to get the landscaping right.

*Q. Does maintaining green space mean stopping Stagecoach from taking the Bowling Green on Christ's Piece?*

A. There are no proposals for taking spaces for buses in the city like this.

*Q. To whom is the new Interim City Deal Chief Executive accountable to? Who reports to her?*

A. The Chief Executive is accountable to the City Deal Executive Board. The new Transport Director and the programme Director will report to her.

*Q. South Area Committee – The Councillors were not aware that the Hills Road would be closed for five months. An officer said that the local councillors were informed. The exhibition at Addenbrooke's had a couple of maps in the concourse and only a couple of councillors – how is that an exhibition?*

A. We aim to keep Councillors informed about City Deal activities in their wards and divisions. We aim to make the consultation as accessible as possible and for continuous improvement, so we are grateful for your feedback which will inform future exhibitions.

*Q. Has the City Deal taken up the challenge of looking at a light rail option?*

A. We are co-investing in work that Professor John Miles at Cambridge University is leading, which is looking at rapid transit systems – this will provide further information on costs/ feasibility of light rail and alternatives. Light rail is an expensive system, requiring significant investment.

*Q. What's happening with the proposed Park & Ride on top of Madingley Hill?*

A. A decision on this is scheduled for July 2017. Options are being assessed.

*Q. Richard Price: A recent piece in the BMJ states that air pollution from diesel engines is a huge problem for young people. If we have more diesel buses, the air quality will worsen. How big a priority is air quality?*

A. Air quality is a very important issue for Cambridge. Reducing vehicle traffic, reducing congestion and encouraging cycling, which are part of the city centre access strategy, can help to achieve this, as well as climate change objectives. We work with operators to encourage cleaner buses and are looking at infrastructure to take buses around the city, so they don't all go through the centre. Subsequent to the 17<sup>th</sup> January meeting, the greater Cambridge City Deal Board agreed work to assess the feasibility of a Clean Air Zone, which may also help.

*Q. David Plant (Trumpington Residents Association) Will buses remain a priority in the City Deal Scheme? We support demand management measures to reduce car use and increase bus use.*

A. The City Deal's transport strategy includes significant measures to improve public transport, particularly buses. Bus priority and bus rapid transit are important to achieve this. Buses will always play an important role in providing good public transport in a city the size of Cambridge.

*Q. Air pollution is a huge priority for me – what is being done to monitor it? How frequently?*

A. Air Pollution is monitored by Cambridge City Council. We undertook to provide more information on Cambridge City Council's air pollution monitoring – there is a good summary at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/content/monitoring-air-pollution> , including links to data and monitoring reports.

*Q. What will happen in place of the PCCPs? The report (recommending next steps on City Centre Access) states we will still achieve the same without the PCCPS.*

A. We are currently accessing an alternative package, and haven't created a fully formed package yet. A paper suggesting further work to develop this has now been agreed by the City Deal Executive Board. .

*Q. How did you choose the housing provider for the Housing Development Agency?*

A. Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) was set up between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships. Cambridge City Council chose Hill City Council but the Housing Development Agency facilitated the arrangement. Following legal advice it was concluded that this form of joint venture is not a procurement of works and services. Therefore we did not need to follow OJEU procurement rules ie the Council could have chosen anyone to be its partner without the need for a selection or 'tender' process. However, naturally the Council was keen to ensure we selected the 'right' partner and therefore the H DA developed a selection process which had three parts. A – we asked three property consultants to independently draw up a list of prospective partners. B – we invited the top three to submit an 'expression of interest' that was evaluated by a panel of Council officers. C- we undertook due diligence checks on the preferred organisation. On other projects we have and would undertake a OJEU procurement process to select a construction/house-builder/developer partner.

## Annex - CITY DEAL FORUM – 17/01/2017

Topics and questions from FeCRA submitted in advance

**First of all FeCRA thanks Tanya Sheridan and Greater Cambridge City Deal for the opportunity they have given to residents to meet face-to-face to share their views. FeCRA's questions try to summarise the concerns expressed by residents over the last year.**

- a) *Is GCCD aware that many experienced members of the public and city residents are devoting free of charge all their spare time to developing less invasive and more effective transport solutions? Why are not these well-researched and plausible solutions not automatically **tested by GCCD's appointed consultants**? If they are being tested, why are we not told about their assessment? Such volunteers would not spend their time in this manner were it not for the fact that the transport options chosen by the City Deal officers have little logical basis and make residents deeply unhappy as they take little account of their needs.*
- We are aware and very grateful for everyone's input and interest in the future of transport for Cambridge. It is fantastic that this has captured the imagination and investment of so many.
  - GCCD does consider new ideas and thinking. Plans have to be developed and delivered within the parameters of the City Deal agreement, its strategic objectives, frameworks we have agreed to follow and within the framework set for us by the elected councillors who take decisions, including agreed budgets.
  - The City Deal transport strategy and plans are derived from and seek to deliver the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, which was developed with the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans and works in tandem with those. The City Deal local authorities consulted extensively on the Local Plans and transport strategy and are grateful to all who responded and helped to shape those strategies.
  - Research is being undertaken to future proof plans and provide an evidence base for longer term solutions to complement the initial set of transport improvements we are developing and delivering.
- b) *GCCD invited these volunteers, along with experts with a track record, including from Transport London and Nottingham City Council, to share their vision and experience at the Call for Evidence in November 2015. We heard, too, about tunnelling from Professor Marcial Echenique. Is any of this going to be used? Was this just window dressing, too?*
- The information collected during this process was extremely useful and we are taking some of these ideas forward, including improvements to the cycle network, parking management and looking at integrated ticketing. In particular, we have been working closely with Nottingham City Council to learn about their Workplace Parking Levy scheme, which could be adapted for Cambridge's needs through further dialogue with businesses in the city.
- c) *How much money has been spent on all public consultations including the Call for Evidence? Were these public consultations carried out merely to meet*

*legal requirements or because GCCD is seriously interested in using following up some of the ideas? Surely all those alternative ideas cannot be excluded on the grounds of expense? How much money has been spent on consultants retained by GCCD?*

- The City Deal does not consider public consultation to be a “tick box exercise” and goes above and beyond standard requirements to ensure people are able to have their say and make their feelings known. The Executive Board have shown that they are listening carefully to the views of the public, for example making a commitment to mature trees in Milton Road and deciding to rethink the peak-time congestion closure points.
- d) *To give an example, residents working on the Milton Rd CD scheme have been told by officers that their alternative scheme is unaffordable. How much money has been spent on consultants, officers and councillors for attending all the LLF workshops? Residents gave their time freely in the belief that their views would be taken seriously. They are wondering if this was all a done deal to get a scheme through.*
- Residents’ views are taken very seriously and the workshops were created as a way for residents to influence the design and to establish a set of design principles that could be considered in the detailed design process. We have listened to the comments with great interest and very much value the time people have put into this process.
  - The alternative scheme produced by residents would need to meet the scheme brief and agreed scheme objectives, including bus priority on Milton Road.
  - The outputs from the workshops have been collated and these are being considered by the Local Liaison Forum. The LLF have the opportunity to agree resolutions on design principles. These will be used in a paper scheduled to be put to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in March, along with recommendations to agree the design constraints for the scheme.
  - Unfortunately it is not possible to work out exactly how much has been spent on consultants, officers and councillors for attending the workshops
- e) *At the Local Liaison Forums Workshops, why do the City Deal officers consistently present residents with the ‘Do Maximum’ diagrams, when ‘Do Minimum’ or ‘Do Nothing’ options were given as alternatives to respond to in the public consultation documents? Should LLF participants not be given a carte blanche to design their own schemes?*
- It was decided at the Executive Board meeting of June last year that the principles of the “Do something” for Milton Road and the “Do maximum” for Histon Road would be used to develop a design. The plans produced were created to stimulate discussion.
  - As the workshop process was utilised to establish design principles which will not be agreed until March it was not practical to update the plans during this process.
  - The City Deal investment is to meet the aims and objectives agreed in the City Deal document, including sustainable economic, jobs and housing growth

and significant improvements in public transport. Schemes have been prioritised on this basis and scheme objectives agreed. The views and opinions of the LLF participants must therefore be balanced against these aims and objectives.

- f) *GCCD must be aware that there are several private schemes, including one from David Cleavelly for an underground system. Why don't GCCD put the £100m of Tranche 1 into a general pot with private enterprise towards implementing collaborative schemes for light rail/tunnelling? Why insist on busways? Why not be more far-sighted?*
- The transport and other investments we are delivering in the first 5 years of the City Deal programme were selected because they are important to support the planned growth in our City Region. They will ensure that new homes and jobs in the Cambourne area, at Northstowe and Waterbeach new towns, in and around Cambridge and between Cambridge and Haverhill are connected and tackle key routes where people using public transport experience significant delays.
  - At the same time, we are future-proofing our thinking by co-investing in work that Cambridge University is leading, which is looking at rapid transit systems – this will provide further information on costs/ feasibility of light rail and alternatives. The GC City Deal appreciates there is potential for private sector investment in the transport network in the future and is keen to engage further with this thinking.
- g) *We are aware that City Deal intends to supplement the government's £500m with private funding. How much private funding will City Deal require to implement their schemes? Is this forthcoming?*
- The City Deal document refers to the up to £500 million of Government funding complementing a similar amount of local investment into supporting growth. This local contribution covers a range of infrastructure in Greater Cambridge to support sustainable growth, covering schools, transport and other community infrastructure.
  - Developer contributions are included within the scope of that funding, both in terms of contributions towards City Deal schemes (which are coming forward) and other developer contributions to support housing and employment growth.
- h) *Specifically regarding Cambourne-Cambridge: what happens if we spend the £59m of Tranche 1 on the portion from Madingley Mulch to Grange Road, and the government does not give us the remaining £83m for Tranche 2? We have half a busway, which does not even serve Cambourne.*
- Funding for this project will come from a combination of Government Grant, developer contributions and likely Growth Deal funding. If approved, the aim would be to build the bus link all together and therefore it is being developed as single project. That said, we are prioritising the section east of Madingley Mulch, as this section would tackle the significant public transport delays.
  - The City Deal Board has given instructions to officers to provide information on the range and feasibility of different options, for the Executive Board to decide how to progress with the scheme, rather than a decision to build.

- i) *Does the City Access statement say where the buses will all go? Will they all fit into the bus station? If so what about the pollution and inconvenience to residents in the area?*
- As part of the current work, we are looking at on road routes into the City Centre, relating to the A428 scheme. The City Centre Access project is looking at a package of measures for the city centre, which would complement the strategic goals of the A428 scheme. We are looking at specific options available on the road, and looking at where the buses will go and how they will plug into City Access. We are also looking at orbital capacity and infrastructure for buses, to provide alternative routes to the City Centre.
- j) *The centre of Cambridge is already full and there must be little opportunity for job growth there. Since the principle areas of job growth are on the periphery of Cambridge, should not the new bus connections be predominantly along the Western Orbital and following the trajectory of the A14?*
- The historic core of the city centre does not have considerable capacity for additional job growth, beyond densification of jobs in existing buildings and changes of use. However, outside the historic core there are likely to be increases in activity that lead to job growth, for example around Cambridge Station, along Hills Road and around the Grafton.
  - The city centre will remain a vibrant place, visited every day by thousands of people working, shopping or visiting Cambridge. Improved bus services to the centre continue to be an important part of the transport strategy for Greater Cambridge.
  - We have and are looking at bus connections around the periphery of Cambridge as well as access for the city centre.
  - The Guided Busway already follows the trajectory of the A14 providing an orbital route around the northern side of Cambridge, and together with links already secured through the North West Cambridge and Darwin Green developments provides excellent bus links for the Vision Park in Histon, Cambridge Regional College and the Science Park as well as linking to the new Rail station, Cambridge North.
  - The Western Orbital scheme envisages a bus priority route on or near the M11. It would link up with the Busway at Trumpington and provide a southern orbital route around Cambridge connecting with growth areas such as the Biomedical Campus, and will also connect with the northern route starting at the North West Cambridge Site. It would have the opportunity to link with the proposed busway in the A428 corridor, providing even more strategic links to housing growths in areas such as Cambourne to employment centres.
- k) *Will not the new axis of rail travel between North Cambridge – Central Cambridge – and South Cambridge stations not provide a preferable mode of transport to busways through the centre of town? Will there not be competition?*
- Rail and bus both have an important place within the transport mix and within the transport plan. The public transport network needs to be able to cater for many different journeys. Buses are flexible and can cater for east to west travel as well as north to south – new bus infrastructure provides more

flexibility in a geography such as Greater Cambridge and can be delivered more quickly and at lower cost.

*l) Is GCCD following any of the suggestions put forward by members of the Assembly such as Andy Williams of AZ, who supports a slip road at J11? Or don't you even listen to him?*

- Joint Assembly ideas and suggestions are considered by officers and the Board. The Executive Board decided in December 2016 to integrate the J11 slip road into the wider Western Orbital. Officers will be investigating this along with the whole Western Orbital scheme.

*m) Does GCCD undertake to implement residents' preferred schemes for green landscaping & tree retention across all the schemes? Lewis Herbert has guaranteed an avenue of mature trees in Milton Rd. Will there be public realm and landscaping design on all the CD schemes? If so will this be put out to tender? The landscaping & PR element of the Chisholm Trail was not put out to tender.*

- We recognise the importance of thinking holistically about transport, movement and place in delivering City Deal Projects. The City Deal Board is keen that landscape is a key part of the process and that resource is in place to achieve this. This could be from an external consultant or internal staff. There are likely to be landscaping requirements for all schemes though these will of course differ. As schemes develop we will be looking at how to involve local people in the landscaping through mechanisms such as Local Liaison Forums, workshops and further consultation.

*n) There is line in GCCD about the 'magic of Cambridge'. How does GCCD define this 'magic'? What is GCCD doing to ensure this magic is maintained?*

- Greater Cambridge is one of the few UK city-regions that competes on a global stage, and it is a gateway to the UK for high-tech investment – it is the innovation capital of the country, with more patents per head than the next several cities combined.
- The city-region's economic success to date is the story of a networked and connected city-region characterised by world-leading innovation.
- This success to date has been widely celebrated, but is now contributing to a shortage of housing and significant transport congestion that threaten to choke off further economic growth.
- In order to deliver more jobs and economic growth (including retaining our own success story businesses) and to unleash the next wave of the Cambridge Phenomenon, the city-region has to grow physically whilst maintaining the ease of movement between key economic hubs such as Cambridge Biomedical Campus and North West Cambridge, and the high quality of life that contributes so significantly to the area's attractiveness and success.
- What we are doing to ensure that magic is maintained is delivering a step change in infrastructure to ensure that the city-region is connected enough to continue experiencing its past tremendous success, whilst retaining the high

quality of life and supporting the building of new houses at well-connected necklace settlements rather than on the Cambridge Green Belt.

*o) There is no independent professional expertise on the Assembly or the Board to put the case either for the natural environment or for historic heritage, whereas there is ample representation by the business and university sectors. Why not? Representation on the Assembly and the Board is seen as biased by many. Should this imbalance not be rectified?*

- Representation on the Joint Assembly and Executive Board is determined by the five partner organisations, including the 3 Local Authorities (Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council). The majority of members of both bodies are elected Councillors. The Local Enterprise Partnership and Cambridge University nominate members to bring in business and academic expertise and as signatories to the City Deal agreement and of the partnership.
- Assembly and Board members bring a range of professional expertise and bring in a range of stakeholder views. Staff work with Natural England, Historic England and other bodies to ensure that a range of expertise is brought to the development of strategies and schemes.
- Natural environment and historic heritage are key considerations for City Deal schemes – take for example the officer recommendation to not take the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme on a route that would impact on the 800 Wood and Madingley American Cemetery – and these are considered in the development and delivery of schemes. .

*p) Residents are telling us that their needs tend to be cast aside in the dialogue once the public consultation is over. They are saying be constructive to have FeCRA representation on the CD Assembly as a non-political voice for residents?*

- It's unfortunate that residents feel this way, and we should emphasise that residents' input is very much valued.
- The volume of responses we receive may mean that individuals feel their voice isn't coming through, as responses have to be categorised and we cannot always debate all points of every response – we are receiving an unprecedented number of responses to consultations.
- Residents' voice should also be coming through via their elected local Councillors – they are elected by the whole local population to represent their constituents and to combine that local representation with strategic leadership.
- Decision-makers have to balance a lot of different views, all the while looking at the strategic picture and what we want the city-region to look like in the future.
- We need local views to help us deliver the programme in an effective and acceptable way, and things like RA Forums and Local Liaison Forums are

there to capture exactly that – these should be very constructive tools in informing the programme of residents' perspectives.

q) *It is important that all options be considered. Many residents are saying that since congestion charging is a tried and tested method of raising revenue, why is it not being considered as an option? We have heard that if presented to car users as a ring-fenced fund (hypothecated) to improve public transport, it will be accepted. It should be levied fairly among city car owners as well as commuters. Why not trial this at least?*

- The Executive Board considered this question at its January meeting. It was felt that congestion charging would be unfair, especially for those people who cannot afford to live in Cambridge but must travel in and out regularly for work. In London, to remain effective, the daily fee has risen from £5 to £11.50 or £57.50 per week.
- Congestion charging has been introduced in cities where good alternative travel options are in place. This is not yet the case for the Cambridge area which the City Deal is working to address.
- Trialling congestion charging would require investment in the equipment and back-office systems needed for enforcement – if the trial did not become permanent, this could be a large sunk cost.

r) *How will Mayoral devolved power affect CD decisions?*

- The Devolution Deal is acknowledged as being additional to the City Deal, and the City Deal and Combined Authority have a great opportunity to drive in very similar directions, and act as allies.
- City Deal will continue to be local representatives agreeing and delivering a programme for the benefit of the city-region. Whilst the City Deal partners are clear that decision-making for the two partnerships should stay separate, we are looking at ways to work together to increase effectiveness for our area and ensure value for money.