



Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 7 September 2023
10:30 a.m. – 4:20 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Katie Thornburrow (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Claire Daunton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Graham Wilson	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Paul Bearpark	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Annika Osborne	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Kristin-Anne Rutter	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Tom Kelly	Service Director of Finance and Procurement (CCC)
Lynne Miles	Director of City Access (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Heather Richards.

2. Declarations of Interest

Kristin-Anne Rutter declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 item (agenda item 7), as an Executive Director of CBC Ltd and a leading figure in the Cambridge Life Sciences sector.

Councillor Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 item (agenda item 7), as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project item (agenda item 10), as an employee of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Ltd.

Councillor Thornburrow declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report item (agenda item 11), as a lead member at Cambridgeshire City Council on parking issues.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 8 June 2023, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that twenty-three public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in Appendix A of the minutes.

It was noted that twelve questions related to agenda Item 6 (Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps), three questions related to agenda item 7 (Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3), two questions related to agenda item 8 (Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme), three questions related to agenda item 9 (Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway), and three questions related to agenda item 10 (Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project).

5. Petitions

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly that a 4,546-signature petition had been submitted, which related to agenda items 7 (Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3) and 8 (Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme), and James Littlewood, the Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, was invited to address the Joint Assembly as the petition organiser. Drawing attention to a possible alternative scheme to the Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme (CSETS), Mr Littlewood suggested that the alternative scheme would cost £100m less, would have fewer impacts on the environment and landscape, could be constructed in stages, and would create a wider range of benefits, particularly for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). Arguing that the CSETS design needed to be reconsidered as it was no longer required to support a previously proposed Cambridge Autonomous Metro service, he suggested that expansions to the rail network could be more effective than CSETS and that the GCP should consider allocating resources to an alternative scheme.

6. Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps

Twelve public questions were received from Sara Lightowlers (on behalf of Cambridge Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone), Jennifer Williams and Alexander Blandford (read out by Sara Lightowlers), Lilian Runblad, William Bannell, David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), Martin Lucas-Smith, Sarah Hughes (on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign), Neil Mackay (on behalf of Mackays of Cambridge Ltd.), Pam Parker (on behalf of East Cambs Climate Action Network), Richard Wood (on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users), Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle), and Sarah Hughes (on behalf of Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Elliot Tong, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Querying whether research had been carried out on the possible use of a council tax precept levied by the Combined Authority and any potential administrative cost savings it might have produced, Councillor Tong sought clarification on the figure for a band D property under £200 per annum. He expressed concern that a council tax precept had not been considered in more detail and queried whether it had been considered in conjunction with other alternative schemes, such as a workplace parking levy. It was clarified that while the Mayoral General Precept in place currently in place across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, including a cost of £12 for band D properties, was raising £3.6m per year to help fund bus services, the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ) would raise £31m for the same purpose. This net revenue would be significantly above the administrative costs, although such costs were subject to further investigation if the proposals continued to be developed. The Combined Authority was continuing to consider wider reform of the bus network, and it was acknowledged that improving public transport required increasing road space by reducing traffic levels, as well as establishing a source of ongoing revenue.

The Director of City Access presented a report to the Joint Assembly which included the Making Connections Interim Outline Business Case, setting out various alternative scenarios for the STZ. The recommended scheme, Scenario 1A, would operate with peak hour only charging and would provide users with fifty free days a year, while an expanded package of discounts and exemptions would help to mitigate the impact on a wide range of users. Despite raising less revenue and leading to less reduction in traffic than the original proposal and other scenarios, Scenario 1A was considered to be the best balance between achieving the scheme's objectives and responding to concerns expressed during the public consultation. The Joint Assembly received a presentation on the Outline Business Case and possible scenarios, which was published on the [meeting website](#) and will be attached at Appendix B of the signed minutes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Paid tribute to the professionalism and resilience of GCP officers in the complex work of developing the proposals and responding to the feedback received from the public consultation, as had been requested by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Members expressed concern that officers were required to defend the proposals instead of elected councillors, who were responsible for any decisions that were made.
- Emphasised the importance of finding a solution to reduce congestion and air pollution while improving the sustainable and public travel networks, noting that the expected levels of growth would exacerbate current challenges and inequalities across the Greater Cambridge region. It was acknowledged that opposition to the STZ did not equate to support for the status quo, and all members agreed that action was needed to achieve these underlying objectives. Members observed that the GCP had been established to resolve such issues and suggested that the lengthy process of consultations and development of the proposals that had been carried out was a testament to the democratic process. Notwithstanding, they expressed frustration at the complex decision-making process and suggested that a governance review would be beneficial.
- Suggested there was a lack of investment in public transport by the government and highlighted the continuous reduction of bus services, particularly in rural areas, which restricted educational and employment choices for people who did not have access to a car. Members expressed support for the Combined Authority's ongoing work considering bus reform and franchising, and emphasised the need to work with local, regional and national partners to develop a long-term vision and stable funding for improvements.
- Drew attention to the need for political consensus across the constituent councils in the Greater Cambridge region for the proposals to proceed and acknowledged that there was currently no such consensus, due to continued concerns about the impacts of the proposals. It was argued that the short-term nature of party politics had negatively impacted the development of the proposals and members expressed concern over levels of hostility and disrespect that had been displayed throughout the process.

- Acknowledged that Scenario 1A had sought to address many of the issues raised by the public consultation's feedback on the original proposals, with some members expressing support for it to proceed and others opposing it. Nonetheless, a majority of members concluded the Joint Assembly should not scrutinise the scenario at the meeting, based on a lack of the necessary consensus in support of the proposals. Members expressed frustration and disappointment that progress had been halted, although it was acknowledged that no decision could be made by the Joint Assembly on the proposals. Some members expressed concern that if the Executive Board decided to proceed with Scenario 1A, the Joint Assembly would not have carried out its role in pre-scrutinising the proposal.
- Expressed concern and disappointment about the Joint Assembly's failure to support the recommended proposals, with some members arguing that it demonstrated a lack of leadership that would negatively affect the Greater Cambridge region and future generations. It was suggested that a rejection of the Making Connections proposals could set the region back years, and officers were asked to provide the Executive Board with a strategic assessment of the risks and opportunities of not proceeding with the proposals, taking into account a variety of factors that could be impacted, including other GCP projects, future funding, bus reform, and the local plan. Members also expressed concern about the impact on the upcoming Gateway Review which would decide whether the GCP would receive a further £200m of funding.
- Requested that the Executive Board establish whether a political consensus could be achieved to support Scenario 1A and seek confirmation from the constituent authorities on their continued commitment to identifying and supporting solutions to reduce congestion and improve public transport and sustainable travel across the region.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly was frustrated and disappointed to have found itself unable to support the current proposals. Officers had been asked to provide the Executive Board with a strategic assessment on the threats and opportunities of not proceeding with the STZ, along with information on alternative sources of funding. The Joint Assembly had asked the Executive Board to establish whether a political consensus could be achieved on the proposals and for the constituent authorities to reaffirm their commitment to the scheme's underlying objectives. He also noted that members had requested a review of the decision-making process, and for members to relieve officers of the responsibility of being the face of the proposals.

7. Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3

Three public questions were received from Antony Carpen (read out by Sam Davies), Jim Rickard and James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chairperson noted that a written statement had been submitted by Councillor Susan van de Ven, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Melbourn and

Bassingbourn division, which had been published online and is attached at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chief Executive presented a report to the Joint Assembly which set out a second update to the GCP's Future Investment Strategy (FIS3) in response to significantly higher than expected levels of inflation since the previous update in 2020. The report also included the current forecast cost for the programme, identified opportunities for alternative funding, and assessed the level of overprogramming. Based on the findings of the report, it was proposed to carry out a reprioritisation of the programme, which would include pausing two schemes (Cambridge South East Transport Strategy Phase 2 (CSET 2) and the Foxton Travel Hub) and making changes to others.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the assessment of the GCP's overall financial viability to ensure projects were fully funded and completed to a high standard and expressed support for the prioritisation of schemes to enable this.
- Argued that the City Deal should receive additional funding because of inflationary pressures that had not been anticipated when the programme was first agreed. Members highlighted the region's importance in the science and technology sectors, and argued that recent proposals from the government for significant levels of population growth to Cambridge and its surrounding area would require additional funding to ensure the necessary infrastructure to support and facilitate such growth.
- Highlighted the importance of CSET2 for organisations along the scheme's corridor, with one member drawing particular attention to the need for improving cycle options between Babraham and Granta Park, suggesting that if CSET 2 was paused, the Babraham improvements could be extended to Granta Park. Attention was also drawn to the number of Haverhill residents who travelled along the corridor to work in the CBC, and argued that if CSET 2 was paused, consideration should be given to alternative support that could be provided. It was agreed to provide an update to the Joint Assembly at its next meeting on progress seeking alternative funding for the project.
- Expressed concern about the impact that pausing CSET 2 could have on transport issues that already existed at the CBC, particularly in relation to Cambridge South train station. Members were reassured that a pause would not impact the development of the train station and that conversations were ongoing with the County Council and the Combined Authority.
- Suggested that alternative route alignments or various smaller, separate alternatives could be considered during any time that CSET 2 was paused to increase the scheme's value for money, although members were informed that such changes to the scheme would involve further rounds of consultation and a repeat of the business case process to align with the requirements of the Department for Transport. Notwithstanding, it was acknowledged that if funding issues could not be resolved in the future, modifications to the scheme may need to be considered.

- Confirmed that the section of the CSET 2 scheme's route that passed through a retirement village would be safeguarded against other development if the scheme was paused.
- Noted that if projects did not progress, they could lose any Section 106 funding they had been awarded, although it was acknowledged that the CSET 2 project had attracted only a relatively small amount of such funding and that through close working with local planning authorities, it would not be lost from wider public infrastructure.
- Clarified that the £66m increase in forecast income for the programme was in relation to the forecast income that had been included in the previous update to the Future Investment Strategy in 2020. Members were informed that the increase was greater certainty over levels of Section 106 funding, although it was emphasised that there would continue to be a level of volatility to the projections.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the recommendations were supported. Notwithstanding, members had highlighted the importance of CSET2 locally and nationally and the subsequent need to urgently seek alternative funding for the scheme. He also noted requests for the Executive Board to consider pursuing some of the active travel components of the scheme during any pause that it agreed to.

8. Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme

Two public questions were received from Stephen Partridge-Hicks, and John Latham (on behalf of Hobson's Conduit Trust, and read out by James Littlewood). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Sam Davies, Cambridge City Councillor for the Queen Edith's ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Drawing attention to the CBC Transport Needs Review published in 2019, which investigated how the projected growth of the CBC to 2031 could be achieved while maintaining or even reducing vehicle trips to the site, Councillor Davies highlighted the importance of CSET 2 and other major transport infrastructure schemes in achieving this objective. She queried when the forecasts of the number of trips to the campus in the period to 2031 had last been revised, and what implications such revised forecasts should have on the continued growth of the CBC, while also questioning whether the forecasts reflected a possibility for the increased level of exemptions for trips to hospital that had been included in the revised STZ proposals being considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. It was confirmed that the forecasts had not been revised.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly, which provided a response to the Stapleford consultation that had been carried out as part of the work to resolve the impact of the Stapleford Retirement Village planning application on the CSETS route. A minor route variation would be recommended to the Executive Board, which would also be asked to submit a formal request to the County Council to

prepare and submit a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application, although it was noted that if the Executive Board agreed to pause the CSET scheme as part of the Future Investment Strategy, the request to submit a TWAO application would also be paused.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Sought clarification on why the forecasts of the number of trips to the CBC in the period to 2031 had not been revised. Members were informed that the GCP had carried out a piece of work, on the request of the Joint Assembly, to update in broad terms what the requirements would be for the planned growth of the CBC and then to consider all the transport schemes, which included CSET. The resulting report provided a strategic narrative around the CBC, while an updated Transport Needs Review had been carried out by the GCP in 2022 which included slight revisions to growth predictions of the CBC. It was suggested that an update to the forecasts, given the recent and planned developments on the CBC site, as well as the completion of Cambridge South train station, could help bolster the case for additional funding from the government.
- Expressed support for the route variation. Notwithstanding, one member argued that it could be prudent to develop an alternative option for the whole route, to ensure a scheme could still be implemented if funding for the current proposals could not be obtained. Members were informed that the process for developing a scheme to be submitted for a TWAO had been carried out in an open and transparent manner with extensive consultation, and the development of an alternative scheme would require a lengthy process and could potentially detract from the arguments for the proposed scheme.
- Sought clarification on the length of time the CSET scheme would be likely to be paused for, if agreed by the Executive Board, noting the impact that a pause would have for organisations on sites along the corridor, particularly the CBC. Members were informed that a clear plan would be developed for managing and determining the length of any pause, and if it exceeded 18 months, the data and consultations underpinning the scheme would potentially need to be reconsidered.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson indicated that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations to the Executive Board.

9. Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway

Three public questions were received from James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), Sarah Hughes (on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign, and read out by Josh Grantham) and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly which included the outcomes of the consultation on two possible route alignments for a busway from Waterbeach to Cambridge and on three potential locations for a new park and ride facility close to the new town at Waterbeach. A revised central option for the busway was recommended for progressing to the preliminary design stage, along with the Park and Ride site Option C. As a further aspect of the GCP's work in the corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge, the report included a proposal for a public consultation on a new alignment of the Waterbeach Greenway to provide better connectivity between GCP schemes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the ongoing joint working between the GCP, County Council and the Combined Authority on the various transport infrastructure schemes in the Waterbeach to Cambridge A10 corridor, noting the urgent need for progress given the imminent first occupations of Waterbeach new town. However, it was suggested that there could be better coordination of route alignments with the various projects in the Waterbeach to Cambridge corridor.
- Expressed concern that the development of the busway could risk the removal of current bus services in villages such as Landbeach, Waterbeach and Milton, with residents instead required to walk further due to a reduced number of bus stops, and requested that such a risk be assessed as part of the scheme's development.
- Highlighted the importance of future-proofing the busway for new or alternative forms of technology and transport. Members were reassured that the GCP was exploring updating the guidance technology for the busway to ensure future modes of transport would be able to use the infrastructure once it was in place, and it was noted that guidance technology and national regulations had both developed since the previous busways had been built.
- Noted that the number of planned homes for the new town in Waterbeach had increased from 8,000-9,000 homes to 11,000 homes and requested further information on the number of planned homes in Waterbeach village itself. Members were also informed that the high number of homes being built would lead to a significant amount of Section 106 funding be available towards the revised scheme budget of £109.4m.
- Noted the importance of archaeological considerations when selecting the location of the proposed park and ride site.
- Clarified that the park and ride site would be a travel hub with appropriate facilities to encourage and support active and multi-modal travel.
- Expressed support for the proposed location of the park and ride site, and sought clarification on its capacity to be expanded in the future if required by the level of demand. Members also observed that there was already a park and ride site within a few miles of the proposed new location, and queried whether the two would complement each other rather than reduce their effects and usage. Members were reassured that the impact of having two park and ride sites within close proximity

had been considered, and that it was considered beneficial. It would also reduce the likelihood of needing to expand either of them, although it was acknowledged that further growth could lead to this becoming necessary.

- Noted that a bridge being built by the developers of the new town would help provide access, although it was suggested that a path alongside Denny End Road to connect to the bridge would provide additional connectivity to the park and ride, as well as the new cycleway along the A10.
- Sought clarification on whether the current Waterbeach train station would close when the new station opened, suggesting that it would need additional connections to active travel networks if it continued to be used. Members were informed that the current station would close, although it was acknowledged that closing a train station was a complex process overseen by the rail authority, and it was agreed to seek confirmation on the closure.
- Suggested that it would be beneficial to extend the Waterbeach Greenway to the new town and Cambridge Research Park if additional funding was available.

Summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board, noting that he would convey the issues that had been raised.

10. Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project

Two public questions were received from James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future) and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). A further question had been submitted by Mark Rison. As he was not present to ask his question, he would receive a written response. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Naomi Bennett, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Acknowledging the overall negative response to the proposed modifications to the A1134/A1303 roundabout, which she highlighted as an accident blackspot, Councillor Bennett suggested that there were polarised views between local residents and people who only travelled through the area and highlighted the need for safety improvements. Noting that she had submitted a response summarising residents' feedback, she requested a written response from the GCP in advance of the Executive Board meeting.

The Chairperson noted that a written statement had been submitted by Councillor Alex Bulat, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Abbey division, which had been published online and is attached at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly on the Cambridge Eastern Access Project, which proposed a location for the new park and ride site based on the outcomes of the recent consultation, and which proposed progressing various aspects of the scheme to the detailed design stage. It was also suggested that pausing the scheme around the Elizabeth Way / Newmarket Road roundabout would

allow for the development of a wider strategy for the area, reflecting the emerging Grafton and Beehive developments.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concerns about the proposed location for the Park and Ride, noting that it was within the Greenbelt and arguing that it would not sufficiently resolve congestion issues caused by traffic approaching Cambridge from the A14 or the B1102. It was suggested that a location closer to the A10/B1102 roundabout could provide a better long-term solution, reduce congestion further, and allow for a bus lane to be installed along the A1303. Members also drew attention to nearby planning proposals, including a major development in Stow cum Quy and the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant. However, it was acknowledged that all the potential sites had positive and negative aspects, and that moving the location too far from the city centre could risk reducing its appeal as a hub for active travel, which could be increased by including connections to nearby Greenways.
- Noted the lack of a road bridge crossing the River Cam between Elizabeth Way and the A14, and suggested that connection services from the Park and Ride could travel towards Cambridge along Newmarket Road and also Milton Road, via the A14, to minimise the impact of an increased number of buses.
- Suggested it was unfortunate to be required to relocate a Park and Ride, and emphasised that the selection of a location for the new site should ensure that it was future proofed to avoid a similar situation reoccurring in the future.
- Suggested that water gardens and on-site trees could help minimise the impact of the relocated Park and Ride.
- Clarified that the proposals did not include the removal of any mature trees on Meadowlands Road. While some trees would need to be removed alongside Newmarket Road to the west of Meadowlands Road due to space constraints, members were informed that they were not classified as mature trees, and that they would all be replaced.
- Acknowledged the underlying issues of the Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Way roundabout and supported a pause in that section of the scheme to ensure it aligned with the wider strategy in the area. Notwithstanding, members highlighted the importance of resolving the issues and ensuring that the scheme maintained its objective of reducing the level of traffic using the corridor, rather than simply creating space for more vehicles.
- Suggested that the report to the Executive Board could differentiate between the consultation responses from local residents and people travelling through the area, in order to prioritise local feedback.

Summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations in the report, except for the proposed location of the Park and Ride, with various concerns raised that would be conveyed to the Executive Board.

11. Quarterly Progress Report

The Chief Executive presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. The report also included a proposal for an £80k contribution to funding of the City Council's secure cycle parking scheme at Queen Anne Terrace car park, a proposal to fast track the detailed design for the Addenbrooke's Roundabout section from the A1134 Cycling Plus scheme, an update on the future maintenance of the GCP Active Travel infrastructure, and an update to the GCP Assurance Framework.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the update on future maintenance of active travel infrastructure but suggested that it would be useful to include more information on the scope and scale of the forecast maintenance costs. Members drew attention to the County Council's reluctance to implement measures to resolve ongoing health and safety issues that would require costly maintenance, although they acknowledged the difficulty for the County Council in obtaining additional funding specifically for maintenance of active travel infrastructure. It was also noted that maintenance costs were not considered as part of the City Deal, and that such costs had been exacerbated by additional schemes such as the Greenways and busways. Members were informed that although future maintenance costs were a consideration during the design of schemes, it would be unreasonable to base designs on such potential costs. It was noted that bus service operators contributed to maintenance costs of fully segregated routes because of the significant operational benefits derived from the infrastructure.
- Suggested that the installation of benches alongside active travel routes such as the Chisholm Trail would provide additional support to potential users of the routes and emphasised that relatively small additional costs could provide disproportionately large benefits. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged that small costs multiplied across the extensive network often resulted overall in a large cost.
- Expressed support for the proposal to contribute funding to a secure cycle parking scheme but sought clarification on why funding had been proposed for this particular scheme when there were many other organisations that would also benefit from increased secure cycle parking. Members also suggested that the scheme could include a higher proportion of stands for non-standard bikes and established that there were no plans to redevelop the car park in the future. It was agreed to provide members with the City Council's Business Case for the scheme and information on previous work carried out by the GCP to fund secure cycle parking in the region.

- Established that, if approved by the Executive Board, the detailed design of the proposed modifications to the Addenbrookes roundabout would be presented at a future meeting once funding had been obtained and agreement reached with the County Council. Members were informed that a design for the whole scheme would be presented within the next year, and it was emphasised that care would be taken to ensure any earlier interventions, such as those at the Addenbrookes roundabout, did not undermine the plans for the rest of the route.
- Sought clarification on the GCP's future role around the electricity grid's reinforcement, noting its importance and that concerns had previously been raised about capacity in west Cambridge. Members were informed that UK Power networks was now responsible for the delivery of two new substations, and it was agreed to provide an update on the situation in west Cambridge.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 23 November 2023.

Chairperson
23 November 2023

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 7 September 2023
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Response
<p>Sara Lightowlers on behalf of Cambs Parents for Sustainable Travel</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>Many residents are concerned regarding the impact of the proposed sustainable travel zone on those who have disabilities. Disabled people are not necessarily car users: in fact, only 55% of disabled people in England aged 17-64 hold a full driving licence, compared with 83% of non-disabled people (though disabled people are much more likely to travel as passengers in a car or taxi). But research from the Motability Foundation has found that 30% of disabled people say that difficulties with public transport has reduced their independence. In the UK those with disabilities (as defined under the Equality Act) take 28% fewer trips than those without. While this ‘transport accessibility gap’ is driven by many factors, a significant proportion is due to the current provision of transport, both public and private, not adequately catering for the needs of disabled people. This in turn contributes to wide ranging socio-economic disadvantage: for example, disabled people are almost twice as likely to be unemployed as those without disability. Obviously, this is a complex area, so my question is: what assessment has been made of the impact of sustainable travel for disabled people and those with long term health conditions compared to the status quo?</p>	<p>The GCP is committed to making sure that the proposal does not disadvantage those with disabilities. You correctly point out that that includes those who are reliant on car but also those who do not have access to a car and are therefore isolated by the current situation.</p> <p>We have developed a Social Distributional Impact Assessment, a Health Impact Assessment and an Equality Impact Assessment to make sure that we are continually reviewing such considerations. These are living documents and are updated to reflect any scheme changes. The EqIA considers the protected characteristic groups covered by the Equality Act 2010, and we have also added care leavers, carers and armed forces veterans to our considerations.</p> <p>Overall, we anticipate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moderate beneficial impacts across the core elements of the assessment including increased physical activity, improved journey quality and improved accessibility arising largely from better investment in sustainable travel options which support those disabled people without access to a car. - Larger capacity buses and more frequent services could make travel easier/more comfortable for wheelchair users and people with other disabilities, who are more likely to rely on public transport to make independent journeys. - For those disabled people who are reliant on a car, those who qualify for a Blue Badge would receive a full discount for up to two vehicles. We have also expanded this measure in the latest proposals to cover those in receipt of the mobility component of Personal Independence Payments.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Those who may still not be eligible but have mobility issues, as well as those who help care for them, may qualify for the 50% Low Income Discount, which would provisionally be based on receipt of Universal Credit, Pension Credit, and Carer's Allowance. - The longer 'inter-peak' period and earlier close of charging at 6pm, included in response to feedback in the consultation, would also give more flexibility for trips by people with disabilities or those making caring visits during midday and evening periods.
<p>Jennifer Williams and Alexander Blandford</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>We're a car-less family who cycle and walk with our pre-schooler across Cambridge and the surrounding villages. We don't have a car for a variety of reasons: firstly, due to Type 1 diabetes and the extra difficulties this creates for getting and keeping a license, my husband has never learnt to drive. Secondly, our last car broke down 2 and a half years ago and we couldn't easily afford to replace it, so we decided to see how long we could live without it.</p> <p>We recognise there are lots of benefits to our active travel, including increasing our daily exercise and exploring the outside world with our daughter. However, it also means dealing with walkways that are too thin for our stroller and too thin to walk holding hands with our child; pavement parking that forces us into the busy roads; as well as poor driving and aggressive attitudes from drivers desperate to get through congestion as quickly as possible. This can all make active travel with kids extremely nerve wracking. Additionally, the poor and potholed state of our city's roads and walkways has caused damage to our bike and tripped up our daughter numerous times.</p>	<p>Making Connections forms part of the wider City Access programme which also includes work to develop a new road classification for Cambridge which would change the way that traffic and people use roads and streets to move around the city, and one of its aims is to improve health and wellbeing through providing a nicer environment for physical activity.</p> <p>We have set out our illustrative package of sustainable transport measures and, subject to the agreement to proceed to the next stage, will explore these in more detail and finalise them as part of the Full Business Case. The intention is overall to generate around £5m annually to invest in the types of sustainable travel improvements that you ask about. We have published indicative suggestions for what this might cover. In the shorter term this could include better provision of apps and integrated travel ticketing and info; enhanced maintenance of the existing travel network; swipe card cycle parking, and enhanced cycle parking for example.</p> <p>In the medium term, in the early stages of the STZ we anticipate that the investment will extend to the provision of many operational and behavioural initiatives and also infrastructure improvements to improve the approach to specific junctions and segregated facilities, as well as in the maintenance of sustainable travel infrastructure.</p>

	<p>Less traffic on the roads is welcome, however, what further physical improvements to encourage and support active travel does the GCP intend as part of the Making Connections proposals?'</p>	<p>Other GCP projects have already invested over £115m in active travel, including the Chisholm Trail, Cross-City Cycling, and the Greenways. Future works will include implementation of Cycling Plus schemes - with an indicative budget of £20m to spend on further improvements to the active travel network.</p>
<p>Lilian Runblad</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>The Histon Road Corridor Project, part of the City Deal, focusing on Walking, Cycling and Public transport, was finished about 2 years ago with new bus lane and “floating” bus stops accommodating the Guided Buses and promised improved public service. Especially the Guided Bus A direct service to the Station and Addenbrookes was of great importance. Schoolchildren travelling to the Long Road Area and personnel to the Biomedic campus, Addenbrookes, Papworth etc. have had a direct bus facility. This is in line with the 1.6, 1.29, 1.33 points.</p> <p>The new services should be delivered before any STZ charges, see e.g. 6.6,6.7, 6.10. In point 8.2 the GCP corridor schemes e.g. Histon Road, is included.</p> <p>But does GCP and partners really have the will and capability to enforce the necessary obligations from the bus service companies?</p> <p>On September 3, Stagecoach suddenly declared that it will no longer stop at the special bus stops by Brownlow Road and Carisbrooke Road, nor at Blackhall Road which is serving the new Franklin Garden/ Darwin Green area. There have been no discussions or consultation with the residents along the road.</p>	<p>Your points reflect many local users' experiences over the last year under the current system of private operators who must make decisions on their services based on profitability and the ability of routes to pay for themselves. This can lead to increased cutbacks which make it harder for our residents to get to school, work, and make other independent journeys. This is strongly echoed by the Making Connections consultation feedback. This slow decline of privatised public transport underlines the importance of this scheme as an opportunity to establish a securely funded, long-term, locally-controlled solution for bus services.</p> <p>As you reference, the scheme proposes to make improvements to bus service provision in advance of the implementation of road user charging, and we are setting aside £50m to invest in a suite of ramp-up interventions, although this could only be allocated if there were a guaranteed source of future funding. Under the Making Connections proposals, delivery of improved bus services will come under the responsibility of the CPCA, who we are working with closely. The CPCA is currently considering bus reform proposals which would see greater local government control over public transport, with the potential to set routes, timetables, fares, and other aspects of service either through enhanced partnership or franchising. This would also prevent private companies suddenly withdrawing services in the future, as we have seen over the last year.</p>

	<p>The residents suddenly face changes in the city centre or Histon Village Station and almost twice the cost.</p> <p>What action will GCP and Partners take to reinstate the A Bus service at above bus stops?</p> <p>Depending on actions taken on the above question, which is challenging the trust we should have in the coming STZ projects' reliability and the GCP and partners.</p> <p>Can we trust that we will really have the bus service as outlined in 6.10 – 6.13 before the STZ?</p> <p>And will the service remain for the future and not suddenly stop on a whim of the bus company?</p>	<p>This greater level of control to get buses where they are needed, combined with the Making Connections funding to make it all happen, would be a once-in-a-generation opportunity for Greater Cambridge to safeguard our public transport system and make it work better for everyone now and in years to come.</p>
<p>William Bannell</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>Given the universal unpopularity of the proposed STZ, and the continued unworkableness of the adaptations that have been put forward, providing less income and limited effect, while still managing to inflict unprecedented hardship on the people of Cambridge and surrounding region, why is the GCP so seemingly reluctant to listen to reason and observe reality, when there are viable alternatives available which would avoid all this angst and fear and pain, what is the reason that the GCP is still refusing to explore alternate funding models for transport?"</p>	<p>The GCP and its partners have explored a number of alternatives to road user charging, with consultations in 2017, 2019, and 2021, and a Citizens' Assembly in 2019. We used these as opportunities to get public feedback on how best to address the issues of congestion and funding for public transport, and a range of options were explored, including pollution-based charging, a Workplace Parking Levy, increased parking charges, and physical measures such as experimental road closures.</p> <p>These alternatives were generally less popular than road user charging, with some form of vehicle charging being strongly preferred to increased parking charges. It is important to note that improving public transport requires not just funding, but also reduced traffic and increased roadspace otherwise service reliability and improved journey times cannot be delivered.</p> <p>Technical work found that other means of generating funding were less</p>

		<p>effective at fulfilling the objectives of reducing traffic and of generating sufficient revenue to make meaningful investments in our transport network. In particular, while alternatives such as a Workplace Parking Levy may raise revenue, they would have little impact on the increasing volume of traffic we are experiencing and would therefore do little to improve the effectiveness of public transport or the safety of walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <p>A pollution-based charge would also have some issues, such as becoming ineffective over time as more and more people adopt electric vehicles, as well as potentially having a disproportionate impact on those on low incomes who would be less able to afford new compliant cars.</p> <p>Making Connections offers the potential to establish a stable, long-term funding source for public and sustainable transport in Greater Cambridge, while addressing congestion and promoting modal shift.</p> <p>The CPCA, through their bus reform work, will consider the wider funding mix for buses which would include but not be limited to STZ revenues.</p>
<p>David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>Young people are calling for change. They want independent travel: more walking and cycling, fewer cars on the road. They want a cleaner, greener environment.</p> <p>Research by Imperial College, London found much higher levels of concern among 16-24 year olds about climate change than about COVID, even though COVID had more immediate, disruptive impact. Young people reported “anger, disgust, guilt</p>	<p>You are correct to point out that younger respondents to the 2022 consultation were more likely to support the proposals, with a majority of under-25s supporting the proposed STZ. It is also true that despite our consultation achieving a record proportion of respondents under 25, they were still underrepresented relative to their proportion of the population. Younger people are also more likely to rely on public transport and active travel to make independent journeys rather than driving, and the proposed improvements in these modes are therefore particularly urgent for them.</p>

and shame” about inaction on the risky environmental future they will inherit

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/issue/vol6no9/PIIS2542-5196\(22\)X0009-0](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/issue/vol6no9/PIIS2542-5196(22)X0009-0) .

For young people, carbon reduction and active travel options are closely linked. Over 70% of under-24s who responded to the 2022 GCP consultation wanted better buses and improvements for walking and cycling. 61% of 16-24 year olds supported the creation of a sustainable travel zone for Cambridge along with 55% of under-15s.

Living Streets asks the Assembly to reflect on these numbers. If young people had been as fully represented in the consultation as older people, it’s possible that the sustainable travel zone would have got majority support. Instead older people – who were significantly over-represented in the GCP consultation responses –might be allowed to continue polluting and congesting our streets.

It is young people who will have to grapple with congestion, pollution and global warming. Surely, as floods and firestorms engulf the planet, it is time to ‘think globally and act locally’? 33.4% of carbon emissions across Cambridgeshire come from motor traffic. Will the Assembly now take a strong and principled stance that supports our young people in building a better future?

The Making Connections proposals were conceived with the long-term needs of Greater Cambridge in mind and attempt to address the long-term costs in carbon emissions, pollution, public health, and the resilience and effectiveness of our transport network of failing to take the necessary actions now. The feedback from young people is hugely important to us and Making Connections offers a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to invest a substantial sum of money in Greater Cambridge on an annual basis without being reliant on central government funding (which we know is under continued pressure).

<p>Martin Lucas-Smith Petersfield Resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>The STZ compromise proposals remove a number of the elements of the scheme on which many people have been most critical. But in doing so, this has naturally reduced projected income significantly, from £60m to £33m per year.</p> <p>The report for the February 2020 Exec Board meeting stated that a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) based on £400/year (lower than was consulted on subsequently) and a £5 increase in parking rates would raise ~£23m annually.</p> <p>At the previous meeting, I asked why a WPL was not being pursued. The answer given was that 'WPLs can raise revenue and reduce traffic but on a smaller scale than the proposed STZ'.</p> <p>That answer is now totally irrelevant. The proposed STZ income has been chopped in half. The income that would be raised is now in the same ballpark. So you now have a congestion charge proposal which would raise £33m but be subject to multiple difficulties in political deliverability and risk, vs a WPL scheme that both sides seem to agree on raising £23m public transport subsidy and which could be implemented in 2025.</p> <p>While it is true a WPL would require a further statutory consultation, this seems a poor reason to reject it. Wouldn't a massively modified STZ also need further consultation? A WPL has already seen surprisingly high levels of support, from both sides, including the South Cambs Tory MP. It would be a much simpler scheme and has no significant regressive effects. It would be one of the few ways of taxing the growth industries exacerbating the congestion problem.</p>	<p>The GCP and its partners have explored a Workplace Parking Levy as one of a number of alternatives to road user charging, with consultations in 2017, 2019, and 2021, and a Citizens' Assembly in 2019. Technical work was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of a WPL against a range of criteria.</p> <p>A WPL was less preferred as an option in public feedback and was found to be ineffective at fulfilling other necessary objectives besides revenue generation. In particular, although a WPL would raise revenue, it would raise less than an STZ and would achieve negligible traffic reduction, with any gains being more than outweighed by the anticipated increase in journeys over time. as Cambridge continues to grow.</p> <p>Without this reduction in congestion and the ability to limit further traffic growth, our transport network would become less and less effective for all users, and more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Investments in public transport and active travel that the revenue raised could pay for would yield fewer results without the road space and smooth circulation to let them work. Our city as a whole would become less healthy, and less attractive to spend time and money in.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>I ask that the WPL be put back on the agenda. Not to do so would undermine your own argument given at the last meeting.</p>	
<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>In the absence of a national road pricing scheme Milton Cycling Campaign remains convinced that the sustainable travel zone is the right way of pricing the road danger, pollution and congestion motor traffic generates, but we are concerned that the new proposals will reduce the amount of money available to active travel schemes specifically.</p> <p>In order to encourage more and more people to walk and cycle more infrastructure is needed, but with limited income streams is hard to see how this is going to happen.</p> <p>What additional funding streams are there available for walking and cycling schemes?</p>	<p>In addressing the feedback from the consultation we have adjusted the parameters of the scheme, which has reduced the amount of revenue which will be generated. At this stage of the proposals (Outline Business Case) there is, following the correct process set out by the DfT, a generous allowance of risk profiled into the Business Case. We are anticipating that as the technical work progresses that we will be able to reduce this allocation for risk and increase the total pot of funding available.</p> <p>Besides this, there are further improvements to active travel being funded through the Greater Cambridge City Deal, which include other elements of the City Access Programme such as the upcoming Road Network Hierarchy Review, as well as £80m of investment allocated to the Greater Cambridge Greenways, over £20m allocated for the Chisholm Trail, and £11m invested into Cross-City Cycling schemes, among other projects.</p> <p>There are additional funding streams for walking and cycling including - national government funding set out until 2025 in The Second Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, S106 and CIL funding; funding through the County Council for Local Highway Improvements; and any future Active Travel Fund and City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (through the Combined Authority).</p> <p>In addition to these, the DfT also funds a range of capital programmes which deliver walking and cycling infrastructure, beyond dedicated funding for active travel, which includes the CRSTS which was already mentioned, but also the National Highways designated fund, Integrated</p>

		<p>Transport Block and Highways Maintenance Block funding. There are a range of other government funding programmes that will also deliver active travel infrastructure schemes and some behaviour change programmes including the Levelling Up Fund, Future High Streets Fund and Towns Fund. There is also the opportunity to fund an improvement independently via the County Council's Privately Funding Highway Improvements (PFHI) initiative.</p>
<p>Neil Mackay Managing director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>I invited the GCP Executive Board to visit Mackays of Cambridge to address concerns about the 'Making Connections' proposals as consulted on at the end of 2022. We held a 90-minute meeting, which included two members of the Cambridgeshire Residents Group, and discussed a public-generated document containing ideas and suggestions harvested from comments made on social media platforms that were not endorsed by Cambridgeshire Residents Group. I request the removal of any suggestion in the meeting agenda pack attributing the congestion charge idea to CRG. For the record, we view such a charge as unfeasible and urge the government to fund required infrastructure improvements needed to support the growth of the area, instead of taxing the less affluent. Please confirm the agenda pack will be corrected, and will you now scrap Congestion Charging as the funding mechanism for Cambridge's much needed improvements to its transport system?</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership met with many stakeholders as part of the Making Connections consultation process, and the recently published proposals show revisions were made to the original plans following the feedback we heard. What we tried to do was strike the right balance based on what community groups, businesses and the people of Greater Cambridge have told us was important.</p> <p>Reducing the charge to peak times only was one of several ideas the GCP received from organisations. We did receive it from CRG although it certainly wasn't only from CRG. In this instance, following a meeting at your business in February, we received an email from Tom Davison on 22 February 2023 which contained:</p> <p>“ ... a (not exhaustive) list of some suggestions collated from the 10,000 or so social media members and the CRG committee brain storming sessions. Below.</p> <p>Carefully considered on a number of levels." These suggestions were shared to encourage "a positive and collaborative approach with the CRG.”</p> <p>The second suggestion on that list in the email was a "Peak Commute Time Charge" which would be "Active between 07.00 and 09.00 and 16.00 and 18.00 each weekday", so that "All goods and HGVs engaged in deliveries and collections are free to access the city off peak, but only</p>

		<p>between 10.00am and 3.00pm on weekdays.”</p> <p>Yours was just one of many responses which we took into consideration as we developed the amended proposals. We are keen to get this right for local people and that’s why we considered this idea carefully, and it became part of our revised proposals.</p> <p>We believe the latest Making Connections proposal strikes a balance and will deliver the improvements the city needs — reducing congestion, and financially supporting improved public transport we need, via the Sustainable Travel Zone.</p>
<p>Pam Parker on behalf of East Cambs CAN</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>East Cambs CAN is broadly supportive of the Making Connections proposal. It is our understanding that not proceeding with the proposal jeopardises £50m in funding towards improvements to buses, walking and cycling and that the congestion charging element is a key part of the strategy to encourage a modal shift from cars to buses or active travel. Can the GCP say what would the impact on congestion, air quality and carbon emissions from transport be if the proposals (including the congestion charge) don't go ahead? And, secondly, are local politicians willing to put aside short term party politicking and put an end to the decades of back and forth over transport policy locally by supporting the new revised plan?</p>	<p>If the STZ were not to proceed the work undertaken to date demonstrates that the future situation will worsen compared to what it would be without the STZ. There would also be a significant negative impact on people from an equalities perspective, particularly regarding the bus network. Services are likely to continue to be removed on the basis of commercial viability without some means of intervening to reverse this trend.</p> <p>The overall impact of ‘doing nothing’ is assessed within the Outline Business Case, from Section 2.6.56 onwards. The potential traffic impact of not implementing Making Connections is summarised as:</p> <p>The CSR model forecasts significant increases in network delay and journey times (with corresponding significant decreases in journey average speeds up to 2041.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey times would increase by 19% (AM peak) and 39% (PM peak) in Greater Cambridge. • Network delay would increase by 30% (AM peak) and 75% (PM peak) in Greater Cambridge.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average speeds would decrease by 9% (AM peak) and 20% (PM peak) in the STZ area. <p>Further analysis on Air Quality and Carbon Impacts are due to be published shortly, but the Strategic Case confirms that the introduction of the STZ would lead to a net reduction in harmful air pollutants and a result of the significant reduction expected in motorised traffics. The revenue raised may also contribute towards funding the delivery of a zero and lower emission bus fleets.</p> <p>Over a ten-year period not proceeding with the STZ would equate to circa £310m of lost investment in sustainable transport.</p>
<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>Have Joint Assembly members considered the risk of losing a proportion of the City Deal funding, through such procrastination?</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that the revised package of measures announced recently are the best way forward to keep our city moving by reducing congestion, and also providing a reliable, sustainable, locally controlled funding source that is so urgently needed to deliver better sustainable transport options?</p> <p>Affordable, frequent, convenient bus services cannot rely solely on farebox revenue, nor on sporadic, precarious, central government grants.</p> <p>Over many decades, a variety of proposals to improve public transport and to tackle traffic congestion in the Cambridge travel-</p>	<p>One of the most important aspects of the Making Connections programme is the potential to establish a stable, long-term funding source for public and sustainable transport for Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>It is clear from the feedback from the consultation that there is a recognition of the transport issues facing our area, and a strong desire to see improvements to public transport and active travel.</p> <p>Whilst the updated figures in the OBC are not as large as those in the original consultation proposal, they still represent a transformational annual level of investment within the sustainable transport network. It would also be a more reliable, long-term, and locally controlled source of funding compared with the ad hoc funding opportunities which become available from central government.</p> <p>There is currently £50 million of the city deal notionally set aside to invest in bus services in the ramp up to the STZ on the understanding that it would be released if there were a commitment to a longer term means of funding services once that money had been spent out in</p>

	<p>to-work area, have been considered, then suspended and, ultimately, abandoned. There should be no more delays.</p>	<p>around two years. Without such an assurance it is unlikely that funding services that cannot be sustained could be justified.</p>
<p>Roxanne De Beaux on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>The Outline Business Case celebrates the increase in cycling within Greater Cambridge in the last two decades. In 2021, 28.1 million cycle trips were made here.</p> <p>According to Sustrans these journeys, along with those which are walked, have saved 19,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions, prevented 827 serious health conditions and created £215.6 million of economic benefit each year.</p> <p>They are just the tip of the iceberg: there’s a huge opportunity for growth in active travel if councillors decide to take it.</p> <p>Every additional journey that involves walking, cycling or public transport instead of driving would deliver huge benefits for our city and save the increasing costs of air pollution, carbon emissions, poor health and road danger imposed by motor vehicles. Children could be more independent, young people could have more work and educational opportunities, older people unable to drive could become less isolated.</p> <p>However, for that we need consistent, continuous investment in active travel infrastructure and we need reduced levels of motor traffic on our roads to free up space for safe routes.</p> <p>The revised STZ proposals would still deliver on both, but at a significantly reduced level compared with those consulted on. If they are to be approved as is, or watered down even further,</p>	<p>There are additional mechanisms for securing investment in walking, wheeling cycling and public space, however it is unlikely that these would generate the sustained level of investment that the revenue from the STZ would. In many cases these opportunities for funding are through a competitive bidding process. Alternatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active Travel Fund (should it continue) from Department for Transport - through the Combined Authority. - Any potential funding bid through the Combined Authority for the next round of City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (should this continue into a second tranche). - Any future, and as yet unknown, competitive funding opportunities through the Department for Transport. - A scheme which is already programmed in the County Council's Capital Maintenance Programme or secured Local Highway Improvement (LHI) funding. <p>All of the competitive funding streams cannot be guaranteed and therefore the STZ represents one of the most stable opportunities to invest in and maintain sustainable transport over the medium to long term.</p>

	<p>supplementary funding and demand reduction schemes will be essential to deliver high-quality networks for public transport and active travel. Local authorities cannot meet their commitments on the reduction of traffic and carbon emissions without them.</p> <p>Point 6.18 of the report and A.3.44 in the appendix say that additional funding options for buses would be looked at by the Combined Authority as part of its work on bus reform. What about income for walking, wheeling, cycling and public space – how would the shortfall resulting from the revised proposals be met?</p>	
<p>Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>This summer, we talked to 300+ bus users in Cambridge, Ely and Huntingdon. We found that much of the public is unaware of the benefits of the Making Connections proposals, mistakenly believing the scheme is all ‘stick’ and no ‘carrot’. Only 15% of those we polled recognised that the money generated by the road charge would be spent on improving bus services. 61%, however, had heard of the proposed road charge. We think that the lack of positive communication about the benefits of the proposals is leaving a void that is being filled with anti-STZ messaging, which further entrenches poor understanding and fear. Improving public understanding of the benefits of Making Connections will increase support for the scheme.</p> <p>When asked what the best thing was about the bus, the most common theme among Cambridge bus users (excluding Park&Ride) was that the bus was affordable. Some people were taking the bus more due to the £2 fare cap. This is no surprise in a cost-of-living crisis: cars are expensive to own and run.</p>	<p>As we have already heard, there is key recognition of the transport issues facing our area, particularly regarding buses.</p> <p>We know that the commercial viability of bus networks outside of London has been in long term decline, catalysed in the last few years by patronage not having recovered post-COVID. Funding from central government cannot be guaranteed - they have highlighted this and that of 79 local transport authorities only 34 will receive central government funding to help deliver their local Bus Service Improvement Plans because the total amount needed to deliver the plans in full greatly exceeds the funding available (House of Commons Library Research Briefing). Therefore, it is important for us to be able to invest in public transport, and Making Connections is a way in which to do this in a stable manner.</p> <p>Not many areas are in a position to generate their own income to invest back in sustainable transport, so it is difficult to compare. However, Nottingham's Workplace Parking Levy is estimated to generate £9 million per year and has resulted in £6 million being invested in improved cycling routes - the STZ would have surpassed this after 18</p>

	<p>Our buses are in a poor state, however. The network in our region is 20% smaller than it was pre-pandemic, and, on average, more than 20% of bus services run late. We fear that without extra funding coupled with measures to reduce congestion, bus services will be stuck in a continuing spiral of decline.</p> <p>Our question is around the consequences of not proceeding. Please tell us how much our region - both in terms of one-off investment and annual funding - spends supporting buses and active travel currently, how much would be available to spend under Scenario 1A or what funding there would be in the future without a Sustainable Travel Zone; and explain how that compares to other English regions outside London.</p>	<p>months in operation. Within its first seven years, the cumulative revenue generated by Nottingham's WPL would be around £64m compared to £217m from the revised STZ proposal. There has also been £50m of city deal funding set aside to ramp up bus services over the next few years in advance of any charge. This would be likely to be reallocated if there is no guaranteed source of funding to sustain them beyond that initial investment. In total, after ten years, the region would have lost out on around £310 million in lost investment in bus services and sustainable travel if the decision is not to proceed with the STZ.</p>
<p>Antony Carpen.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>Over the summer I attended a number of Cambridge-based consultations on medium-large sci-tech park developments. These included Marshalls Airport, The Beehive Centre, and Capital Park Fulbourn. Developers and their consultants all told me they were willing to meet with the GCP, CPCA, and local councils to discuss co-operating on improving transport links to their sites, and making financial contributions.</p> <p>Both The Grafton Centre and The Beehive Centre have submitted planning applications that are out for formal consultation. Mindful of the request to pause CSET and Foxton due to inflation-related pressures and the inevitable impact this is having on Benefit-Cost-Ratios of the chosen and rejected projects, what conversations have GCP Officers had with</p>	<p>The GCP works closely with the planning authorities to ensure that appropriate financial contributions are sought from developers for the programme. It is the function of the planning authority to agree S106 contributions, but we ensure a proactive input to this. As set out in the paper, the amount of total income from S106 we are estimating that £187million can be reasonably assumed. This is an increase of £66million from the previous estimate of £121million. These numbers will continue to be updated within the yearly budget updates.</p>

	<p>developers of medium & large developments in/around Cambridge in seeking financial contributions towards their transport plans, and what considerations have GCP officers made of any representations to re-evaluate BCP calculations given inflation - in particular seeking S106 contributions for new transport infrastructure from developers seeking planning permission?</p>	
<p>Jim Rickard</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>If finance is not available to proceed with the GCP's preferred route for CSET, then rather than pausing all activity, will you consider implementing at least some of the improvements to the A1307 proposed in previous strategies? You will remember that in the 2018 consultation the two routes along the A1307 corridor attracted between them more votes than the GCP's preferred route, so I don't think there would be a problem with public opinion.</p> <p>One example is the bus-only spur around the south-eastern corner of the biomedical campus, which formed part of Strategy Two in the 2018 consultation. I speak as a user of the citi 7 bus service, which suffers chronic delays at peak times on the section of its route between Dame Mary Archer Way and the Addenbrooke's bus station, making a nonsense of the timetable. The same bottleneck also applies to buses on the 'A' and 'U' routes. If a new bus-only spur alleviated those delays and also allowed buses from the key Haverhill corridor to access more central parts of the biomedical campus, it would be a significant step in reducing congestion and making public transport more</p>	<p>The GCP has delivered a number of improvements along the A1307 with others still under construction, for example the new Bartlow Roundabout and the Linton Greenway.</p> <p>The GCP has demonstrated that CSETS Phase 2 is the most suitable solution to the projected growth at the Biomedical campus alongside resolving the current traffic issues. This is the reason that funding will continue to be sought to take forward the scheme should the Executive Board take the decision to pause.</p> <p>Should the Executive Board agree with the recommendations, it is important to note that the expenditure will not be paused, CSETS Phase 2 as a project is paused with no further funding been requested to develop it from existing GCP funds. Therefore, at this time, no funding would be available to take forward other measures along the A1307 other than those that form part of the agreed CSETS Phase 1 programme.</p>

	<p>attractive. In fact any improvements along the A1307 would complement those you've already achieved with Phase 1 of CSET.</p> <p>So in summary I'm asking whether you will consider using some of the paused expenditure to fund improvements which have a lower cost, which will reduce delays to public transport, and which will be valid whatever else may happen in the future.</p>	
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to A1307 and CSETS Phase 2, given the pressures on budgets, why not revert to the 2017 scheme which is £100m cheaper and would deliver similar transport benefits and a higher BCR – rather than allocating no budget at all to improve journeys on the A1307, which you are still advising is one of the most important transport corridors into Cambridge, serving the Biomedical Campus and central Cambridge? 2. In relation to the A1307, what will happen if the GCP is not able to secure £160m, given that no budget allocation is being proposed? 3. Your report refers to CSETS Phase 1 as “under construction”, however Phase 1 consists of several discreet projects and at least one of these, changes to road layout on the Gog Magog Hills, is still at the planning stage and could be halted in order to save funds. This scheme is opposed by our charity because we have an independent road safety report which identifies that the scheme will worsen road safety at Wandlebury and it will also be 	<p>Back in 2017, the LLF pushed for the scheme to better serve the villages along the route, and not just serve commuters to the three campus sites – an off-road solution. The public in a consultation agreed, as did this Joint Assembly and the Executive Board.</p> <p>The request is not about a small budget (£250k), it is a request to take the scheme back to 2017 and start again, ignoring the LLF, the views of the public, Assembly and Board with all the consequences and abortive costs that would incur.</p> <p>3. A key objective of the CSET Phase 1 projects is to reduce accidents at accident cluster sites such as the Haverhill Road and Wandlebury Junction.</p> <p>The scheme has been developed with stakeholders and is widely supported because it addresses a safety concern at the existing junction providing the safest solution for all users at this accident cluster site.</p> <p>The scheme is currently going through the planning process which is considering the relevant impacts of the scheme on environment and highway safety.</p> <p>With funding for this scheme secured, given local support for the project and the ongoing independent planning process, scrutiny of environment</p>

	<p>harmful to ecology and the landscape. Please will the Assembly consider withdrawing this scheme in order to save budget, save ecology and save the well-loved landscape of the Gog Magog Hills?</p>	<p>and ecology effects, there is every reason to continue to deliver this scheme subject to approval.</p>
<p>Stephen Partridge-Hicks Resident of Sawston</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme and agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 and</p> <p>Now that the GCP has decided to "pause" CSET, how much money will you need to spend in order to progress CSET to the stage where it is ready to submit to the government for the T&WAO? Does this represent a good use of funds for a scheme that will cost at least £160m and has no funding available for it?</p> <p>Rather than continue to progress an unaffordable £160m scheme and further delay improvements to bus services from Haverhill, why won't you allocate a small budget, say £250k, to work up the alternative, based on the GCP's scheme from 2017/2018 which involves building a spur road into the biomedical campus and associated bus lanes for £100m less?</p> <p>If any money is going to be spent on continuing to progress CSET shouldn't at least an equal amount be spent on working up the much cheaper alternative that can be delivered without a T&WAO so much more quickly, benefiting the travelling public and employers alike?</p>	<p>The pausing of CSET Phase 2 is subject to agreement by the Executive Board. However if the board agrees to this then approximately a further £300,000 will be required to ensure the scheme is 'shelf ready.' Significant money has already been spent on looking at alternatives to CSETS Phase 2 and given the overall situation of overprogramming it would not be appropriate to spend further GCP funds in looking at alternatives which the GCP does not have funding to deliver.</p> <p>As Mr Partridge-Hicks is aware, I would question his numbers and the capacity of his proposal to meet local plan growth across our geography.</p> <p>But putting that to one side, back in 2017, the LLF pushed for the scheme to better serve the villages along the route, and not just serve commuters to the three campus sites – an off-road solution. The public in a consultation agreed, as did this Joint Assembly and the Executive Board.</p> <p>The request is not about a small budget (£250k), it is a request to take the scheme back to 2017 and start again, ignoring the LLF, the views of the public, Assembly and Board with all the consequences and abortive costs that would incur.</p>
<p>John Latham Chairman Hobson's Conduit Trust</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I am the Chairman of Hobson's Conduit Trust. The Trustees remain very concerned about the range of negative impacts that</p>	<p>Officers will continue in dialogue with the Trust to explore ways of mitigating the impact on the Nature Reserve. It is not possible to create two structures for the busway and maintenance track, but we continue to explore options of design and materials.</p>

the proposed CSET scheme would have on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and on Hobson's Brook, including the 15 metre square concrete deck of the intrusive proposed bridge over the Brook, creating a sterile dark cavern. We have argued, among other things, for splitting the bridge into two and for the use of more sympathetic design and materials.

We have made various other proposals to reduce the impact on Nine Wells of the CSET scheme, but we do not yet see their inclusion. The CSET scheme threatens Water Vole and Grey Partridge habitat, and the drainage arrangement proposed is likely to bring quantities of salt from de-icing to pollute the pristine chalk stream.

I note the following. In the Papers for the Joint Assembly meeting (Agenda Item 8 page 401) I read:

' 1.19 A full statutory, Environmental Impact Assessment was completed. '

I am unable to locate this document on the GCP website, or evidence that the full EIA has been completed. I am aware of an earlier EIA consultation, which was not a full statutory EIA .

The Trustees much prefer an alternative scheme in the A1307 corridor which would deliver similar and further transport benefits, and cost £100 million less, with much less impact on the environment.

Importantly, the A1307 on-road alternative scheme would not involve building three massive concrete bridges with huge embedded CO2 over Hobson's Brook and the River Granta. In

The EIA has been completed and outcomes will be reported in an Environmental Statement which will form a key component of any future TWAO application which will be examined by a Planning Inspector.

The scheme has been developed over a number of years in accordance with DfT requirements. The on-road option was discounted, in part following interventions from the LLF and results of public consultation.

	<p>fact the alternative would not pass anywhere adjacent to Nine Wells and its surrounds, so would not impact water quality, wildlife or habitats, and would leave visitors undisturbed.</p> <p>Can you explain why your report does not refer to pursuing the alternative scheme ?</p>	
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no traffic lights or roundabouts on the section of the A10 between Waterbeach and the Milton Park & Ride, so a bus road has no real advantage compared to a bus lane, in terms of journey times and reliability. So please can you direct us to the evidence that shows that the option of providing bus lanes to bypass any queuing traffic has been considered, and a comparison of the costs and the benefits of such an option compared to that of a £110m scheme through open countryside? 2. The recommended location for the Park & Ride is on a site that has hidden archaeology. The Historic Environment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council have advised me that the area proposed for the park and ride is an area containing a significant level of cropmarks indicating Roman settlement and enclosures, as well as a clear trackway. There is no mention of this constraint in the report. Please can you say whether there would be any archaeological damage caused by building a park and ride in this location? 3. The consultation material for the route options did not include any information about the likely ecological impacts 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of bus lane alongside the A10 was investigated in the previous project phase and ruled out by the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) for reasons including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significantly negative impact on general traffic. • A10 option more expensive to deliver. 2. A heritage assessment has been undertaken for all three P&R options in discussion with CCC colleagues. Site A in particular, has constraints related to heritage and archaeology as it borders the site of Denny Abbey. The assessment showed that there was potential for impact on the historic structure and remains as a result of the Park and Ride. <p>As for Sites B and C, given the locations of the sites within the Fens and known medieval archaeological remains in proximity, the potential for archaeology as a constraint cannot be discounted. The impact will be assessed fully as part of the Environment Impact Assessment at the next stage of the project, as designs are developed.</p> 3. There is no significant difference between the two route options in terms of Ecology. We have undertaken an Environmental Constraints Assessment, Ecology Walkover Surveys and Biodiversity Baseline Assessments of both routes and no significant differences were identified. Further surveys and

	<p>of the two options and therefore any responses were made in ignorance of any ecological differences between the two. Please can you tell us if there are differences in the ecological impacts of the two route options?</p>	<p>assessment will be undertaken, as required, to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement.</p>
<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>Waterbeach Greenway - we welcome the news that a route has been chosen. We are still disappointed that it has taken the best part of six years to get there. Could you please provide more information on when the public consultation stage will open to residents and other interested parties?</p> <p>Waterbeach Busway we are pleased to hear that the central route has been chosen. It is the route which will provide the most benefits to potential active travel users.</p> <p>As part of the public consultation earlier this year there were a number of questions that were raised by Milton Cycling Campaign but we still have not a response to our comments and concerns. These questions relate, amongst others, to cycle parking security at the busway stops, LTN 1/20 junction compliance on Butt Lane, and other issues around connectivity with Milton and Impington. Could you please provide more information on when we can expect a response to the feedback provided during the consultation?</p>	<p>Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>If agreement is reached, then an 8-week public consultation could be launched in October. The consultation period will include both an on-line meeting and an in-person meeting – where members of the public and stakeholders can ask questions. Separate meetings will also be arranged with Non-Motorised User Groups.</p> <p>Busway Question</p> <p>Your comments were welcome and will be taken on board for consideration at the next project stage subject to approval of the preferred route option.</p> <p>Once a preferred option is approved, the project team will start working on the details including junction design, bus stop design (including cycle parking security) etc. The team will look to involve stakeholders including Milton Cycling Campaign in this design process so that ideas can be discussed and developed.</p>

<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>We are happy to see progress on the Waterbeach Greenway. The proposed alignment is an opportunity to correct the mistakes that were made in the A10 cycle project.</p> <p>However, the proposed route alignment presents a number of challenges that will require bold decisions if a satisfactory solution is to be achieved. We are glad to see reference to the closure of the A10 Ely Road slip in Milton; however, there is no mention of the issue of capacity on the Jane Coston Bridge, and we were concerned to read about the inclusion of Coles Road. This street is not on the desire line and its inclusion would strongly suggest that an unsatisfactory solution on the High Street in Milton is envisaged.</p> <p>We should be designing in accordance with the user hierarchy. Firstly, planning for pedestrians, then assessing the cycling demand and providing a suitable provision before finally looking at the remaining space and managing vehicular access.</p> <p>When you complete this process for the High Street in Milton, it is clear that there is simply not enough space to provide both enhanced walking and cycling facilities whilst maintaining two-way vehicular access. Therefore, the GCP should explore and consult on the option of a modal filter and a one-way vehicular loop running clockwise on the High Street and Coles Road. Of particular importance is the section between Edmund Close and Fen Road, which is the most space-constrained section of highway.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Waterbeach Greenway will present options for people to respond to.</p> <p>Proposals for the route through Milton Village would see the majority of the route widened to 3m with traffic calming measures and improved crossing facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists. It is correct that there will be some pinch-points on short lengths of the route on the northern section of Milton Village. To address this, areas of carriageway will seek to be reallocated accordingly.</p> <p>The route via Coles Road is an option presented for those who may want a quieter route from the High Street. It is important that the Greenways appeal to all people of all abilities.</p> <p>It is anticipated that if the closure of the Ely Road junction is acceptable then the numbers of vehicles travelling through Milton Village will be reduced, creating a better environment for walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Jane Coston Bridge is not included as part of this Greenway scheme, but improvements could be considered at a later date if funding is identified. For example there is a possibility that such improvements could be delivered through future developments.</p>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Choosing not to explore these options and proceeding with a non-compliant design will devalue the travel opportunities of up to 30,000 future residents of Waterbeach New Town.</p> <p>Please can the GCP ensure that the consultation includes a range of options for Milton High Street and ensure that the needs of future residents of Waterbeach New Town are given a voice?</p>	
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Cambridge Eastern Access</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roadside verges at Airport Way roundabout are of ecological value and include a rare species of plant, the Lizard Orchid which is listed on Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. There is no mention in the officer’s report of this constraint, nor the likely impact on this habitat if the scheme were to go ahead. Please can officers say what the impact on the road verges will be before a decision is made to proceed? 2. The GCP is willing to compulsory purchase land for its schemes. Given that the main reason for relocating the Newmarket Road P&R is because the owner does not wish to continue the lease, has the GCP considered compulsory purchase? The current site is closer to Cambridge and therefore much better for Park & Cycle and it would not involve concreting over the countryside. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 CPPF has previously advised GCP of the presence of the Lizard Orchid, and the area is to be surveyed in spring/summer 2024. The design team has already been briefed and detailed design will seek to avoid the Orchids. 2 The Newmarket Road site is too small and heavily constrained to accommodate future requirements of the corridor, when reflecting Local Plan growth. The proposed site enables traffic to leave Newmarket Road before it enters what will become an increasingly urbanised area.

<p>Mark Rison</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>Coldham's Lane in Romsey is a residential road that suffers from excessive traffic during the day and speeding and HGV traffic at night. It is actively hostile to active transport. It has been long neglected while all roads in the vicinity (Mill Rd, Newmarket Rd, Vinery Way, etc.) have been considerably improved by traffic moderation measures.</p> <p>As the GCP's Executive Board noted publicly in 2021, the Phase A changes to Newmarket Rd will divert 1000s of motor vehicles onto nearby unrestricted roads. A year ago, in September 2022, in response to a public question to the GCP regarding mitigation of the effects of the Eastern Access project on Coldham's Lane in Romsey, the Chair, Cllr Bick, identified GCP consensus that there was a "keenness for the problems in Coldham's Lane to be addressed as soon as possible".</p> <p>How has this "keenness" been translated into actual, specific action, now that there has been a year to work on it? The very least residents of Coldham's Lane in Romsey deserve and expect is a 20 mph limit and a night-time HGV ban, but consideration should also be given to at least a part-time modal filter at the railway bridge, and to a speed camera and/or speed cushions. This needs to be in place by the time the work on Newmarket Rd starts.</p>	<p>Since 2021, the GCP has been developing the Making Connections programme which, along with the Network Hierarchy Review, has the potential to significantly reduce traffic around the city.</p> <p>Officers will explore the 20mph, lorry ban and modal filter suggestions raised.</p>
-------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>We note with concern that in the recent consultation, Camcycle’s response was absent from the consultation analysis. Whilst we accept that mistakes do occasionally occur and responses can be missed, it is worrying that neither the GCP, nor their consultants thought to question this and simply contact us. We would like to see the public consultation analysis revised to record missing responses.</p> <p>We are also extremely disappointed to note the proposal to pause works on the section from Elizabeth Way to Coldham’s Brook. The agenda pack references the uncertainty associated with the Grafton and Beehive Centre redevelopments.</p> <p>However, as neither of these sites are directly served from Newmarket Road and both schemes will reduce vehicular demand, it is unclear why these redevelopments should stop progress on the detailed design; however, we note it is sensible to phase the Eastern Access Project as proposed.</p> <p>We would also like to draw attention to the fact the existing scheme does not include a safe crossing of the McDonald’s access of Wadloes Road, something we have raised continually through the engagement process. Extending the scheme a mere 10 metres and providing a simple continuous cycle track over the junction (making it similar to many of the junctions within the scheme), will ensure the network ties into the existing cycle infrastructure. Failing to do so will greatly devalue the new, high-quality junction with Wadloes Road and Newmarket Road.</p>	<p>We can confirm that two anonymous responses classed by the system as being from the public matched the points made by CamCycle in their submission, received by email.</p> <p>CamCycle response was not summarised as an organisational response in the report, but we can confirm the comments they made to the consultation have been reflected in the consultation analysis which informed the report accompanying the paper. To avoid any confusion, we will update the report to note CamCycle’s input.</p> <p>We remain grateful to CamCycle for their direct involvement in the development of the scheme and the salient points from their consultation response will be taken forward to inform detailed design if approved by the Executive Board.</p> <p>Newmarket Road is a major access route for the traffic generated by the Grafton Centre and Beehive Centre uses Newmarket Road. Given the current planning submissions and public feedback through the consultation, there is a rationale for a pause to ensure our detailed designs reflect any changes of use for those two sites.</p> <p>With regards to the McDonald’s access, a number of options have been considered. We have already proposed to provide an active travel path as far as the McDonalds entrance, with an existing facility continuing along Wadloes Road on the other side of the entrance.</p> <p>As things stand, driver behaviour at the entrance is observed regularly to contravene conventional highway behaviours, so while the provision of a continuous cycle path across the junction might give the impression of a safe and continuous route, it could encourage cyclists to proceed without exercising the extreme caution needed at a location where drivers are likely not to be driving correctly. Clearly safety of all road</p>
--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Please can the GCP identify why the scheme has not been extended a mere 10 metres along Wadloes Road, and why work on the detailed design cannot progress alongside the emerging Grafton Centre and Beehive plans?</p>	<p>users is paramount hence this option is felt to be unsafe and inappropriate.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Partner Council Members – representations/questions

From	Question	Response
<p>City Councillor Elliott Tong and City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</p> <p>1 Main funding method</p> <p>Please could officers confirm what work has been done on using a council tax precept levied by the Combined Authority instead of a congestion charge?</p> <p>In particular, please can you confirm the capital and revenue administrative cost savings for this funding method (as opposed to the congestion charge)?</p> <p>In addition, please can you confirm the figure previously supplied for a band D property of under £200 p.a. for a Band D property?</p> <p>Finally, please could you state whether this option was formally considered by the GCP board and why it has not been considered in more detail?</p> <p>2 Small businesses</p> <p>We are pleased to see the first attempt at designing exemptions and discounts for local small and medium sized businesses., almost exactly 6 months after the formal proposals from the Green and Independent Group. We note that the proposed discounts only cover in house vehicles and not third party delivery vehicles Small independent shops are much more likely to depend on third party delivery vehicles. What work has the GCP done to assess whether this provides adequate protection for those businesses and the jobs and services they provide?</p>	<p>1 Main funding method</p> <p>The Mayor of the CPCA has this year introduced a council tax precept specifically to fund investment in buses. At its current level of £12 on a Band D it raises £3.6m per annum which is currently being used to sustain bus services that otherwise would have been cut last year. It is for the CPCA to consider the future existence and rate of the precept within its work on the wider funding for bus reform. But for scale, it is worth noting that the STZ proposal as set out in this paper raises a total of £31m per annum - a little under 10 times the current amount generated by the precept.</p> <p>Funding the entirety of sustainable travel investment via a Mayoral precept would be fairly blunt in terms of targeting those that put the most pressure on the road network. We know that people in the top income bracket drive about 50% more than those in the lower income bracket.</p> <p>Finally, it is important to note that improving public transport requires not only raising revenue, but reducing traffic and creating additional road space, to deliver the journey time and reliability improvements that will be necessary to make bus travel competitive with car.</p> <p>2 Small Businesses</p> <p>The programme assesses the possible impacts of the STZ on the logistics sector and, given its integral nature to supply chains that affect multiple sectors, the logistics sector is assessed to be potentially more negatively impacted by the STZ charge in the short term. Potential negative</p>

	<p>3 The safety net for our vulnerable residents</p> <p>Many local residents claiming benefits have not yet transitioned to Universal Credit from the older means tested benefits. Please can GCP confirm that both legacy and Universal Credit claimants will be treated equally?</p> <p>The national living wage does not reflect the proposed congestion charge and we are aware of residents on higher salaries making heat or eat decisions or with rent arrears. What steps have you taken to establish the increase in numbers of residents unable to pay basic living costs as a result of the congestion charge?</p>	<p>impacts may arise from the sector relying heavily on road transportation in the transportation of goods in and around Cambridge, and hence incurring the charge. On the other hand, industries such as logistics with constant road use may also benefit from reduced congestion over time – especially as key interventions in the Making Connections programme progress and improve alternative transportation, ultimately improving operational efficiency and potentially increasing the number of deliveries per trip. There is also potential for consolidation centres to be considered as part of the Freight Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of third-party vehicles, it is possible that third-party vehicles from local businesses that serve as suppliers to local businesses may also qualify for the SME discount. Where this is the case, it is anticipated that the focus of the SME discount being for locally-owned businesses will incentivise local partnerships between local businesses and local suppliers. The rationale is that the benefit of the SME discount to local suppliers will increase the likelihood that a smaller proportion, if any, of the STZ charge will be passed onto local businesses.</p> <p>Peak hour operation and finishing earlier also offers a significant concession for businesses, meaning that deliveries can be made without charge off peak, and customers can also visit by car without charge during these periods too.</p> <p>3 Safety Net for Vulnerable Residents</p> <p>The government has confirmed its intention to transition claimants to Universal Credit by the end of 2024, which will be two years before the likely implementation of any STZ (on the current programme). If this transition to UC is delayed then the Charging Authority will make provision to ensure legacy claimants are afforded equal access to any discounts or exemptions for the scheme charge.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>It is important to note that the purpose of the STZ charge is to improve public transport, which will be disproportionately beneficial to those on lower incomes and those that share protected characteristics under Equalities legislation. Those in the lowest 40% by income travel 27% fewer miles overall, half as far by car and make 47% more trips by bus than those in the top 40% income bracket.</p> <p>As part of the technical work completed to support the STZ outline business case, a number of impact assessments have been undertaken. These include the Social Distributional Impact Assessment, Equalities Impact Assessment (and yet to be published) Health Impact Assessment. Although none of these documents quantitatively assess the number of residents who drive that then would be unable to afford basic living costs it does recognise that negative impacts that may be created for people on low incomes. There is a specific proposed discount for drivers on low incomes to mitigate against this impact. For those drivers who sit within the 'squeezed middle' but who do not qualify for LID, there is also the provision of 'free days' for those journeys which need to be made by car.</p> <p>However it should also be recognised that the funding from the STZ will significantly improve public transport and active travel which will include a reduction in fares on the bus network and will encourage a mode shift to using public transport and active travel. These modes are a lower cost option compared to driving due to the wider costs associated with car ownership and offer a lower cost option for travel especially for those in the least deprived quintile.</p>
<p>City Councillor Sam Davies</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme and agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p>	<p>The forecasts have not been revised. The questions are based on the supposition that the forecasts have been revised so there is no answer.</p>

In 2019, the Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review was published. This was an exhaustive investigation into how the projected growth of the Campus to 2031 could be achieved while maintaining vehicle trips to the site at levels equivalent to 2017 ('Target') or even reducing them to 10-15% below 2011 levels ('Stretch Target').

The Review quantified the reduction in trips which would be required, as shown in this extract (Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review, Part 3, Section 10.1)

<https://scamb.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s110160/Biomedical%20Campus%20Transport%20Needs%20Review%20Part%203.pdf>

To maintain traffic at 2017 levels up to 2031, a reduction of **17,925 daily person trips** to 28,475 will be required. To achieve a Stretch Target of a reduction of 10% below the 2011 traffic levels by 2031 a reduction of **24,116 daily person trips** to 22,284 daily person trips will be required. This figure is equivalent to 81% of the 2017 traffic levels accessing the Site. To achieve a reduction of 15% below the 2011 traffic levels, the more ambitious end of the Stretch Target, a reduction of **25,354 daily person trips** to 21,046 daily person trips will be required; equivalent to 85% of the existing 2017 traffic levels accessing the site.

It also quantified the contributions to achieving these targets which would be made by a variety of interventions, ranging from major infrastructure projects (Cambridge South Station, CSET busway, Cambridge Autonomous Metro) to smaller projects designed to encourage active and public transport use in a variety of ways.

	<p>The conclusions of the Review (Part 3, p54) emphasised that "It is critical that GCP schemes are kept to programme (as identified in this Report) to address short-term continued highway traffic growth, mitigating negative impacts on Campus operation and quality of life".</p> <p>On behalf of Queen Edith's residents, I would like to ask GCP officers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When they last revised their forecasts of the number of trips to the Campus in the period to 2031; 2. Whether those forecasts reflect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the increased exemptions for trips to the hospitals included in the revised STZ proposals presented today • the postponement of the CSET project presented today • the delays in completing smaller interventions identified in Appendices A and B, such as the wayfinding project started in June 2021 3. How the revised forecasts correspond to the 'Target' and 'Stretch Target' 4. What implications the revised forecasts, relative to the 'Target' and 'Stretch Target', should have for the growth of the Biomedical Campus to 2031? 	
<p>City Councillor Elliott Tong or City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport –Cambridge Eastern Access</p> <p>We welcome the decision to pause the work on Elizabeth Way roundabout and up to the Leper Chapel. It was very clear from the resident feedback that (most)local residents want to keep the underpass and don't want their bus stops moved.</p>	<p>We have paused the work on the Elizabeth Way whilst we review the options for the area and the other changes which may influence design. We note, however, that whilst a majority of respondents opposed change, a significant number recognised the problems with the existing layout as set out in the response from the Abbey Ward Green Party which noted the need to change the junction to address the challenges it poses for disabled people, users of cargo bikes and women.</p>

<p>Residents have asked if the work is to be delayed whether early attention could be paid to the left-hand filter from Newmarket Road into Coldhams Lane which puts cars turning left in conflict with buses travelling straight on.</p> <p>We also welcome the decision to support the decision to proceed with the Barnwell Road / Newmarket Road roundabout improvements. The present accident record on this busy school route speaks for itself.</p> <p>Residents have asked for further information about the type of traffic lights and whether they will adapt to different traffic flows or adhere to a fixed schedule.</p> <p>Residents tell us they are perplexed at why the Park and Ride is being moved when it is only moving such a short distance. They would like to understand what the perceived advantages are. What does this cost and can such a small move justify the disruption and cost?</p> <p>Meadowlands residents have asked you to think again about felling their mature tree avenue to make way for a cycle lane rather than using the existing side road for cycles.</p> <p>We have already raised residents' concerns about the crossings near Jack Warren Green and explained why this is so important.</p> <p>Finally, we need to talk about floating bus stops. I have no problem with floating bus stops in principle. However, any decision to install them on existing roads with space constraints can mean that the bus stops are moved from where they are most needed to where they can most easily be fitted in. This is a huge disadvantage to residents who are elderly, have a disability or just have prams and heavy shopping. If you want to discourage car use in Abbey, leave our bus stops where they are.</p>	<p>Most traffic lights, including those proposed, will have the capacity to adapt to different traffic flows, sometimes as part of a sequence of lights which are programmed to interact. When roads are congested, lights tend to revert to an optimum cycle which is not demand responsive but which maximises capacity.</p> <p>The proposed relocation of the Park and Ride reflects the fact that the land is leased, and may not be available after 2026. The current site is also space constrained and cannot be expanded to accommodate another 30 years of growth.</p> <p>We presume the Meadowlands reference is refers to the trees west of Meadowlands on the south side of Newmarket Road as we are not proposing to fell an avenue of mature trees on Meadowlands Road. The need to avoid tree loss has significantly influenced and constrained scheme design. In this location up to 8 trees may need to be removed, but replaced with approximately 11 new trees. There is no existing side road at this location so the alternative would be not to provide a high quality end to end Active Travel route.</p> <p>The concern regarding the loss of the uncontrolled crossing adjacent to Jack Warren Green has been noted and will be considered at detailed design. The emphasis for the scheme is the aim to create safer signal controlled crossing suitable for use by all residents.</p> <p>With regards to bus stops, the relocation of stops is not simply to accommodate floating bus stops, but also improved active travel infrastructure which meets the design standards and also address the needs of residents referred to in the question whilst avoiding the loss of mature trees. As such there are some stops which are relocated but it is important to remember that the current stops are often less than ideal.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Partner Body Written Statements

From	Statement
<p>County Councillor Susan van de Ven</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>I'd like to express my appreciation to GCP officers and members for listening to the case for completing the Melbourn Greenway, which the local community has been advocating for over many years. Coming out on multiple occasions to see the area for themselves has meant understanding local dynamics and the very significant opportunities that a Melbourn-Royston link stands to bring.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the GCP funded link between Melbourn and Shepreth – the first City Deal spade in the ground – has been hugely successful and is in constant use for local and longer journeys. It has changed the way people get around in their daily lives. I hope that the Joint Assembly will see fit to support this prioritization proposal for the Melbourn Greenway.</p>
<p>County Councillor Alex Bulat</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 - Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>My apologies I cannot be in person at the meeting today, but I would like to share my support for the recommendations for the Eastern Access Project discussed by the Assembly in my capacity as County Councillor for the Abbey division.</p> <p>Many Abbey residents have been involved in the various stages of consultation for this project long before I became a councillor in 2021. The busy and often dangerous Barnwell Road roundabout, the lack of intermediate crossings in key locations for residents and the state of the road and pavements on Newmarket Road have been issues constantly raised by my residents.</p> <p>It is really important the GCP delivers on this project and chooses options that are supported by Abbey residents, which would be mostly affected by the changes to Newmarket Road. While I understand there are objections to consider in the design decisions, I would like to highlight the paper's mention that within the postcodes containing Newmarket Road, including CB5 in Abbey, the level of support in the consultation was higher than the level of opposition.</p> <p>I am particularly pleased to see that Phase A will align with the development of the East Barnwell Community Centre, as it is key the different authorities involved try their best to minimise the disruption to residents during the construction phase.</p>

	<p>On the Elizabeth Way to Coldham's Brook section which is recommended to be paused, I hope that local councillors and resident groups will continue to be engaged with in future decisions and there will be no unnecessary delay to deliver a solution supported by local residents.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------