



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board

Thursday 4 January 2024

4:00 p.m. – 5:20 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Elisa Meschini (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Mike Davey	Cambridge City Council
Andy Williams	Business Representative
Andy Neely	University Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in attendance:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
-----------------------------	------------------------

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (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 Mayor Dr Nik Johnson.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Davey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 8 (Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout), as a Cambridge City Councillor for the Petersfield ward.

Councillor Davey declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest, as a member of Camcycle.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 28 September 2023, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Membership

The Executive Board received a report from the Chief Executive which contained a nomination from the University of Cambridge for Joint Assembly membership, and a nomination from the Business Board for Executive Board membership.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Confirm the appointment of James Rolfe as a co-opted member of the GCP Joint Assembly, representing Anglia Ruskin University as one of the nominations from the University of Cambridge; and
- (b) Confirm the appointment of Al Kingsley as the Business Board's substitute representative on the GCP Executive Board.

5. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that 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 one question related to agenda item 8 (Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout), and one question related to agenda item 9 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways).

6. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 11 December 2023.

7. Quarterly Progress Report

The Chief Executive presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, including a summary of programme-wide work on biodiversity net gain.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had been informed alternative funding for Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme (CSETS) had not been obtained yet, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted the importance of ensuring the work sponsored by the GCP in the skills sector continued after the City Deal expired.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Established that stakeholder engagement had recently taken place as part of the Gateway Review's mid-term report. It was confirmed that no significant concerns had been raised and that the programme was progressing well.
- Welcomed that corporate employment growth in the Greater Cambridge region had increased over the previous year, particularly in Knowledge Intensive sectors. Noting how important high value jobs were for the economy and region members highlighted the GCP's role with schemes that would continue to support this growth in the future. It was also emphasised that the economic opportunities that arose as a result of this growth should be available to young people, for example through apprenticeships, and older people, through reskilling to bring them back into the workforce.
- Observed that construction of the Cambridge South West Travel Hub had been delayed and would commence in 2025, and queried whether it was still expected to be completed in 2025. It was confirmed that technical consultants had been appointed and that construction was still expected to be completed in 2025.
- Welcomed ongoing discussions with representatives of the government regarding its Cambridge 2040 plans, noting that the GCP continued to seek additional funding for CSETS, while continuing to also convey local concerns with the plans. It was emphasised that the construction of hundreds of thousands of houses would require significant investment in transport and other local infrastructure.
- Highlighted the inflationary impact of construction and engineering costs on the GCP's budget and expressed concern that the original City Deal resources were no longer sufficient.

- Clarified that the delay to the completion of the Full Business Case for Waterbeach station was due to the rail industry requiring additional surveys and preliminary design work to be undertaken in advance.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the progress across the GCP Programme; and
- (b) Note the update on the Programme wide work on Biodiversity Net-Gain.

8. Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout

One public question was received from Edward Leigh (on behalf of South Petersfield Residents Association, and read out by Frank Gawthrop). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Executive Board which included proposals for Cycling Plus improvements on both Hills Road and the Addenbrooke's roundabout at the A1307 / Fendon Road intersection. Public consultations had been held for both projects, with the responses and outcomes set out in the report, which had resulted in a preferred concept design and Strategic Outline Business Case for Hills Road and a detailed design for the Addenbrooke's roundabout. Further changes to the design of the Hills Road section would be subject to further public consultation.

Noting that the Joint Assembly was satisfied with the outcomes of the consultation that favoured Option B for the Hills Road improvements, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted the issues that had been identified during the consultation and emphasised the importance of holding a further consultation on the subsequently revised proposals, given the significance of the proposed changes. He expressed concern that the recommendations to the Executive Board did not explicitly state that a further public consultation would take place, and they did not appear to allow for consideration of the impacts of the proposed changes. With regards the Addenbrooke's Roundabout, he reported that the Joint Assembly had emphasised the need for further improvements to address wider issues once the initial works had been completed.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Emphasised that the Hills Road improvements were designed to benefit all road users, including cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. There would be impacts on the surrounding streets, and it was suggested that these needed to be analysed and consulted on, engaging with those who lived in the area or travelled through it.
- Acknowledged and supported the concerns raised by the Joint Assembly about the need for a further public consultation on the Hills Road proposals. It was recognised that there had already been in place an intention to hold a further consultation, but members suggested that it would be clearer to refer to it in the recommendation. It was clarified that a further consultation would be likely to take place in Autumn 2024.

- Drew attention to the difficulty in achieving behavioural change, demonstrated by increasing levels of car ownership across Greater Cambridge, and expressed concern that the problems were worsening in the region.

The following amendment to recommendations (b) and (c) was proposed by the Chairperson and agreed unanimously (removals in strikethrough, additions in bold):

- (b) Approve the preferred concept design **and Strategic Outline Case** for Hills Road, which reflects and builds upon the consultation and stakeholder response; ~~The design includes a further sub-option for the Hills Road/Lensfield Road junction.~~
- (c) ~~Approve the Strategic Outline Case for Cycling Plus Hills Road.~~ **Agree that a further sub-option for the Hills Road/Lensfield Road junction, which came out of the consultation, will be developed, subject to** the planned technical work outlined in the report and a further public consultation.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

Cycling Plus Scheme Hills Road

- (a) Note the response from the recent consultation of the Hills Road Cycling Plus scheme between Gonville Place and Purbeck Road;
- (b) Approve the preferred concept design and Strategic Outline Case for Hills Road, which reflects and builds upon the consultation and stakeholder response; and
- (c) Agree that a further sub-option for the Hills Road/Lensfield Road junction, which came out of the consultation, will be developed, subject to the planned technical work outlined in the report and a further public consultation.

Addenbrookes Roundabout Scheme

- (a) Note the response from the recent consultation that presented a concept design for Addenbrookes Roundabout;
- (b) Approve the final detailed design of Addenbrookes Roundabout that has been further developed following the consultation response and working with the County Council and key stakeholders; and
- (c) Approve the proposed construction timeline and budget.

9. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways

Two public questions were received from Councillor Lesley Sherratt (on behalf of Grantchester Parish Council) and Peter Scrase. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out the Outline Business Cases for the Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways, as well as a proposed programme of delivery. Following public engagements, various changes were proposed for the schemes, as set out in Sections 4.1 to 4.29 of the report.

Acknowledging public representations that had been received on this item at the Joint Assembly meeting, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly informed the Executive Board that members had supported a route for the Haslingfield Greenway that was practical and attractive to cyclists. He emphasised that ongoing concerns about the design and impact of the Waterbeach section of the Haslingfield Greenway still needed to be resolved. The Chairperson also highlighted concerns about the fact that building developments north of Cherry Hinton would not be served by the Fulbourn Greenway until Phase 2 was completed.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Suggested that a route through the village of Grantchester was shorter and faster than alternative proposals and would therefore be beneficial to those using the Haslingfield Greenway. It was clarified that the alternative route was also not supported by an affected landowner.
- Argued that people would cycle through the village of Grantchester regardless of whether the Greenway was there, which would affect safety and result in needless expenditure on a largely unused route. Members noted that Camcycle supported the proposals for the Greenways.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the results from the Fulbourn Public Engagement exercise, conducted in Summer of 2023 and agree any changes to scheme design resulting from the engagement;
- (b) Agree the Outline Business Case for Fulbourn;
- (c) Note the results from the Grantchester Public Consultation exercise and agree to progress the Haslingfield Greenway (Grantchester section) including changes to scheme design resulting from the consultation;
- (d) Agree to the submission of the required Planning Applications, Permitted Development Applications, Section 25 and 26 Rights of Way creation Orders and Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), working with the County Council as necessary;

- (e) Agree to the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers for land where Section 26 Highways Act 1980 powers cannot be used;
- (f) Agree the programme of delivery for Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways; and
- (g) Agree to finalise schemes for construction and complete Full Business Cases for the Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways.

10. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Programme Update

The Programme Manager presented a report to the Executive Board, which included the Full Business Case for the Greenways programme, along with its delivery plan. Two TROs related to the Comberton Greenway had been advertised, and it was proposed to implement the one in Comberton Village and withdraw the one on Sidgwick Avenue.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had supported the TRO proposals and the Full Business Case, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted a request from members for a greater number of rural train stations to be connected to the Greenways network.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the progress of the Greenways programme and paid tribute to its scope and ambition, noting how it would help with wider challenges.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring appropriate surface materials were used for the Greenways to maximise their appeal.
- Noted that there were various gates, both in Cambridge and in its surrounding area, that could not be passed by bicycles, which were forced to take longer routes instead, and it was suggested that such gates be avoided when possible.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Approve the Greenways Programme Full Business Case;
- (b) Approve the implementation of the Comberton Village TROs following the statutory consultation;
- (c) Agree the next steps for the TRO relating to Sidgwick Avenue on the Comberton Greenway;
- (d) Note the Outline Delivery Plan; and
- (e) Note the Stakeholder Engagement carried out across the Greenways network including Public Engagement held in 2022 and 2023.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chairperson noted that it was Andy Neely's last meeting and paid tribute to his work as a member of the Executive Board.

The Executive Board noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 7 March 2024.

Chairperson
7 March 2024

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 4 January 2024
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation

From	Question	Response
<p>Edward Leigh Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>South Petersfield Residents Association (SoPRA) notes that a new proposal for the Hills Road Catholic church junction has emerged post-consultation, which will have significant impacts on traffic flows on Brooklands Avenue and through South Petersfield (between Hills Road and Mill Road). As part of developing the "final preliminary designs" (paragraph 10.2), we ask GCP to engage directly with local residents' associations, including SoPRA, New Town RA, Accordia RA and any others that are active in the vicinity of Hills Rd and Brooklands Avenue to explore the trade-offs, potential alternatives and mitigations. Will the Board support this request?</p> <p>We draw Board members' attention to the fact that the draft New Road Classification for Cambridge omitted Station Road and Tenison Road, even though these are heavily used routes for travel to/from Cambridge station. They are also used, along with other roads in South Petersfield, as 'rat runs' between Hills Road and Mill Road. These traffic flows need to be taken into account when considering banning turns at the Catholic Church junction.</p>	<p>With regard to the addition option for the Hills Road Catholic Church junction that has been put forward, the GCP acknowledges that in order to progress such a design, the project team will need to undertake further traffic modelling in the next project stage in order to assess the wider impacts of such a design. While it is anticipated that the impacts will be largely positive for all travel modes using the junction, such a design would undoubtedly lead to re-routing of some traffic, and therefore the project team need to be assured that this does not cause more problems that it looks to solve before coming back with a preferred option design for future public consultation.</p> <p>The GCP project team will engage directly with the residents' associations mentioned, in order to explore ideas and potential alternatives and mitigations.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Lesley Sherratt Chair, Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>We, Grantchester Parish Council (GPC), ask the Executive Board not to move forward with the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway (the ‘Through Village Route’) due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Its detrimental aesthetic impact on a heritage village; (ii) The low projected use, especially coming from Haslingfield into Grantchester; (iii) The existence of an alternative route, the “Baulk path” on the Barton Greenway; (iv) The high additional cost of the Through Village Route (v) The democratic deficit in distinguishing the local response from the overall response, then discounting that (very negative) response; (vi) Misleading answers having been given to the Joint Assembly, making its recommendation to the Executive Board flawed. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The poor benefit:cost ratio of 0.4:1 of this section was buried by claiming a cross network benefit. (This benefit is unaffected if using the Baulk instead.) (ii) The question: ‘How much longer would it take a twelve year old child to cycle the Baulk path?’ was answered by giving the approximate distance, not time taken. After accounting for the reduced speeds on the Through Village Route, there is no obvious time advantage. (iii) A specific commitment given to GPC by Councillor Smith (not the project team) that the Grantchester vote would be accepted, resulting in a mutual agreement, was described simply as GPC’s misunderstanding and overridden. It is not appropriate for GPC to decide what was agreed between Councillor Smith and GPC. If our factual account of this 	<p>Thank you for the work that the Parish Council has done alongside officers to bring forward proposals to consultation. However, we strongly refute that the proposals are unlawful, all due process has been followed and the officer recommendation is based on overall support in a consultation. In answer to the specific queries.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The GCP is working closely with landscape officers and specialist consultants to ensure the whole of the Greenways network is sympathetic to the environment it runs through, including specific protected areas such as Grantchester. 2. As per the request from the Joint Assembly we have been tasked with trying to significantly increase the targets for the Greenways network. The sensitivity test with these increased targets shows the Haslingfield Greenway with a BCR of 1.7, based on reaching higher levels of cycling. This is set out in the Programme Case. 3. The cost of the route through Grantchester is included within the Future Investment Strategy budget that was presented to the Board in September 2023. As the most direct route, it is seen as an important part of the network and offers value for money. The Full Business Case for Haslingfield with an updated cost will be provided later this year for final approval.
---	---	---

	<p>agreement is correct, there is a breach of a legitimate expectation.</p> <p>- and instead investigate shortening the Barton Greenway connection</p> <p>Accordingly, we ask whether the Executive Board will decline to approve the proposed Through Village Route on grounds of (i) – (vi) above and the fact that to do so may be unlawful; but to investigate shortening the Barton Greenway connection instead.</p>	<p>4. The paper makes clear the opposition from the Grantchester area, as well as the overall support for the proposals from the wider area.</p> <p>5. Officers confirmed that the distance would be approximately 50% longer, increasing from approx. 2.4km to approx. 3.6km. The Greenways are to be used for walking and cycling and therefore it was felt a distance was a more suitable answer. However the distance is over a Km longer, which is significant for a child. The view of Councilor Smith has not been factually changed and was reported at the Joint Assembly.</p> <p>The shortened connection for the Barton Greenway has already been discussed with landowners and is not supported. In addition, the alignment for the Barton Greenway has already been agreed by the Executive Board.</p> <p>The route via the Baulk is not as direct or attractive for this scheme and therefore the alignment through Grantchester (as supported in the consultation) is recommended.</p>
<p>Peter Scrase Grantchester resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>The Executive Board is being asked to ratify the recommendation of the Joint Assembly to continue to develop the proposed route through Grantchester village rather than the route via the Baulk. No comparison of the relative cost of these two alternatives was made in the report to the Assembly nor was any mention of this made in the recommendation to the Executive Board.</p>	<p>The Baulk route forms part of the Barton Greenway and the route and preliminary designs for that scheme have been approved by the Executive Board. It is not a case of one scheme or the other, the proposal is to have both. This would provide a</p>

	<p>Given that the Baulk route is going to be built in any event as part of the Barton Greenway, almost the entire cost of the proposed route through the village would be saved if it is abandoned in favour of the Baulk route. An estimate from documents which I have seen would indicate a saving well in excess of £2m if the Baulk route is chosen.</p> <p>My question to the Board is whether it accepts that expense is a serious relevant factor in deciding which route to select and that no decision should be taken until the figures for each alternative are made known.</p>	<p>significant improvement in the network for active travel in this area.</p> <p>The route via the Baulk is not as direct or attractive for this Greenway and therefore the alignment through Grantchester (as supported in the consultation) is recommended.</p>
--	---	---