

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Monday 11 December 2023
1:30 p.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

Attending at the Discretion of the Chairperson:

James Rolfe	University Representative
-------------	---------------------------

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Lisa Bloomer	Project Manager (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that Helen Valentine had announced her resignation, and he paid tribute to her work supporting the GCP since its inception. He noted that the new university representative, subject to approval by the Executive Board, would be James Rolfe, and he had agreed for James Wolfe to attend the meeting in an unofficial capacity.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Daunton declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as the County Councillor for the Fulbourn division.

3. Minutes

While discussing the minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, it was proposed and agreed unanimously to amend the first bullet point to the Joint Assembly's discussion on agenda item 10 (Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project); as follows (additions in bold, removals in strikethrough):

- 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~~ **A14/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~~ **Cambridge Airport area** 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.

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 7 September 2023 February 2023, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment, and were signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that eight 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 four questions related to agenda Item 7 (Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout), and four questions related to agenda item 8 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways).

5. Petitions

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly that no petitions had been submitted.

6. 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, including an update on the programme-wide work on biodiversity net gain.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the level of growth experienced over the last couple of years in the Greater Cambridge region and suggested that references to 'knowledge intensive' should be written in this manner, rather than being abbreviated to 'KI'.
- Queried when the results of the Gateway Review's Mid-term Review, along with its impact on future decisions about funding and choices, would become available. Members were informed that the only information that had currently been provided was that a response from the government was expected for spring 2025.
- Requested an update on the search for alternative funding for the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (CSETS) and whether there were any contingency plans for the Cambridge South interchange if CSET could not be progressed. Positive and constructive discussions had been held with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) in relation to Cambridge 2040, although no funding had been included in the autumn budget. However, given the support for the project demonstrated by DLUHC, it was hoped that continued discussions could result in funding being provided in the 2025 spring budget. Discussions were continuing with the statutory authorities and rail industry to ensure that the Cambridge South interchange was as effective as possible, although a final design had not yet been agreed.
- Requested an update on how discussions with Network Rail about the Chisholm Trail Phase Two had progressed. Members were informed that a formal application had been made to Network Rail, who had subsequently sought the views of operating companies, with a response expected in early 2024.
- Paid tribute to the work achieved on sustainability in the skills sector and drew attention to the work of other organisations in the region, such as the Combined Authority, in filling some skills gaps. It was suggested that the skills working group could consider the GCP programme and where funding should be allocated as it

moves into the next phase. Members highlighted the need for apprenticeships in the construction industry and paid tribute to the work of Cambridge Regional College in this sector. It was clarified that the contract with Form the Future required it to provide certain data to the GCP, including on the number of new apprenticeships, while the contracts with providers also included specific targets for them to achieve.

- Clarified that monitoring had been carried out throughout the trial of smart signals to assess its impact, and it was agreed that a report on the performance of the signals would be shared with members.
- Requested an update on the manufacturing and vehicle sourcing issues affecting the automated mobility project. Members were informed that Innovate UK had terminated the involvement of the original provider and was in the process of obtaining a new one. It was also clarified that the vehicles had to be sourced from the UK as part of the Innovate UK conditions.
- Queried whether there was any information about potential expansion of the automated vehicles scheme and what kinds of network they could run on. The GCP had discussed some possible routes with Stagecoach, with a potential route along the original pilot route, but also a possible route from Babraham to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. It was also planned to investigate whether the service could provide support to areas without standard out-of-hours provision, as a reduced operational cost could make such services more financially viable.
- Requested further information on the current provider of real time bus data and how the data was monitored for accuracy. It was emphasised that the contract for real time bus data was overseen by the Combined Authority, while the audit would consider a wide range of areas, including ticket machines, communication networks, the provider and the operating system itself. It would consult the bus companies that provide data on cancellations and would assess the accuracy of real time information provided to bus users.
- Sought clarification on what kind of service the GCP envisioned for Mobility as a Service, who would provide it and how it would be funded. Members were informed that officers were currently investigating the possibility of implementing an app that would bring together the different layers of the transport system in to one place so people were aware of potential multimodal journeys and could understand disruptions and alternative options. There was potential for integrated ticketing and paying for multiple legs in one app, although funding for such a project had yet to be fully explored.
- Drew attention to positive feedback that had been received about the increasing number of electric buses in the Greater Cambridge region.
- Established that due to the uncertainty about the level of expected population growth in the region over the next two decades, it was currently not possible to assess whether the ongoing reinforcements to the electricity grid supply would provide sufficient capacity for future demand. The GCP nonetheless also continued to support the statutory agencies in their work to overcome water constraint issues.

- Expressed concern about the effects of increased use of artificial technology due to the high levels of water and energy required, noting that it was not referred to in either the current or the emerging local plan, and suggesting that companies using the services of large data centres should consider the impacts.
- Requested further information from the Greater Cambridge Sectoral Employment Analysis on changing working patterns, such as flexibility and working from home.

7. Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout

Four public questions were received from David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge, and read out by Linda Jones), Frank Gawthrop, Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle), and Sarah Huges (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Immy Blackburn-Horgan, Cambridge City Councillor for the Queen Edith's ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the frustration of local residents in Queen Edith's with delays and traffic issues caused by ongoing work to gas and electricity supplies to Addenbrooke's, Councillor Blackburn-Horgan queried how the Cycling Plus proposals would be managed and staggered alongside the ongoing works, to mitigate additional serious impacts on travel in and out of the area. It was clarified that street works were a responsibility for the County Council, although the Joint Assembly was reassured that the GCP worked closely with them to accommodate timelines if it was of benefit to the local community, as was the case with the ongoing upgrades to Milton Road.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly 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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Acknowledged the need for improvements along Hills Road for all modes of transport and suggested that emphasising the Cycling Plus nature of the project could assist with that. Members considered whether the proposals would have sufficient effect to improve the wider situation in Cambridge, with cars potentially displaced to other roads. One member argued that banning cars from turning at certain junctions may not be popular, while other members suggested that the proposals should be as radical as possible, such as banning cyclists from junctions or diverting them down side streets.
- Expressed concern that the proposed changes to the design that had been made as a result of the public consultation had not themselves been consulted on and argued that an additional public consultation should be carried out given the

concerns that had been raised, particularly in relation to the impact on surrounding roads, such as Brooklands Avenue and Park Terrace. Members also emphasised that an additional consultation should be as open-minded as the initial consultation. It was confirmed that once the two alternatives had been considered, the proposals would be presented for a further public consultation in 2024.

- Welcomed the high level of consultation between the GCP and local members throughout the development of the projects' designs, as well as the willingness to respond to the consultation with new proposals and then reconsult on them. Notwithstanding, it was suggested that it would be beneficial for construction to commence on the sections of the route that were not subject to a further consultation, to avoid further delay and subsequent cost increases, although it was acknowledged that the scheme's design needed to be improved and agreed before that could occur.
- Highlighted the narrow width of the pavements on Brooklands Avenue and suggested that additional measures to support active travel could be beneficial, along with additional lighting. Members also drew attention to Regent Terrace as the main safe route for cyclists alongside Hills Road and expressed concern about the level of conflict with other vehicles. It was agreed to consider whether any changes would be appropriate, such as additional parking controls, but the Joint Assembly was cautioned about mission creep.
- Suggested that consideration may need to be given to Station Road and its vicinity if the planned East West Rail brings more people to the area, although it was clarified that this could not be taken into consideration at this stage, as it was not yet a committed scheme. If it were to proceed, part of the project would be to identify any local pedestrian and cycling links that would be required as a result of the East West Rail works.
- Emphasised the importance of monitoring on junctions and their surrounding areas once any works had been carried out, in order to minimise rat-running, and improve cycling and walking. Baseline monitoring had already been carried out and would continue as the proposals were further developed, and it was confirmed that the emergency services had been consulted to assess how the proposals could impact them.
- Drew attention to the problems caused by HGVs loading and unloading goods at businesses along Hills Road, although it was acknowledged there were also residents living on the road who needed to access their properties. It had not yet been established how many parking spaces would be lost as a result of the proposals, as they were still being developed, although members were assured that the GCP always endeavoured to find solutions with low or no reduction in parking, unless consciously doing otherwise.
- Expressed concern about the safety of wands separating bicycles from vehicular traffic, although it was acknowledged that they were only used when they were considered the best option for a particular design.

- Drew attention to the significant increase in street works being carried out, particularly by utilities companies, and highlighted the value in encouraging them to both coordinate their works and share ducting. It was clarified that street works were a responsibility for the County Council, although it was unable to have a significant impact on the scheduling or coordination of such works. It was also observed that street works had an impact on modelling.
- Expressed concern about the proposed location for bikes to be held at traffic lights on the Addenbrookes roundabout, given the prevalence of ambulances and heavy traffic during peak hours. Members noted there was a lot of space on the roundabout itself and suggested that it could be better used. It was clarified that the proposals including removing cyclists from the road on the Babraham Road arm of the roundabout, with a larger island and wider crossing point at that section.
- Suggested that it would be helpful to have an indication of what future phases of the Cycling Plus A1134 project could potentially look like, to understand the wider picture of the current proposals. The Joint Assembly was informed that future phases of the scheme had not reached the stage of a detailed concept design or modelling analysis, although they were assured the proposals for Phase 1 were in keeping with the general plans. It was clarified that this stage sought to resolve a specific safety issue, as opposed to make wider improvements to the cycling infrastructure in the area.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly acknowledged the responses to the Hills Road consultation and supported evaluating further considerations that were raised during it, including assessments of the impact of affected streets, such as Station Road, Brookland Avenue and Regent Terrace, as well as the wider area. Members also supported the proposal for an additional public consultation on those changes. The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposals for the Addenbrookes roundabout.

8. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways

Four public questions were received from Councillor Lesley Sherratt (on behalf of Grantchester Parish Council), Peter Scrase, Hugh Clough, and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Michael Atkins, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Hardwick division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Expressing concern about the significant level of local opposition to the proposals for the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway, Councillor Atkins argued that historic villages struggled to accommodate additional car or bike movements. He suggested it would be helpful for the GCP to present proposals for how the Haslingfield and Barton Greenways could be connected, and to investigate whether the step free access over the M11 could be combined with connections to the Baulk Path. Councillor Atkins also indicated his support for the Comberton Greenway. It was emphasised that the nature of historic

villages had been taken into consideration throughout the design of the Greenways to ensure they were appropriate.

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 2.1 to 2.29 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Acknowledged the local opposition to specific sections of the route and expressed concern about the issues raised by Grantchester Parish Council), although it was recognised that consultation and engagement was not limited to particular groups or individuals. While there were differences in opinion, it was emphasised that 64% of respondents supported the proposed route of the Greenway through Grantchester.
- Emphasised the underlying principles of the Greenways network that the routes should be as direct and accessible as possible, in order to attract as many people as possible to use them. Nonetheless, one member argued that given the GCP's situation of overprogramming, it could be worth considering the less expensive option, which was also the longer and more popular option locally, in order to maximise its ability to support people in more rural areas to access jobs and education in Cambridge. At the same time, it was suggested that cyclists could simply leave the Greenway to pass directly through Grantchester and rejoin it on the other side if it did not pass through the centre of the village.
- Expressed concern about the safety of cyclists along the narrow section of Broadway entering Grantchester and queried whether alternative routes had been considered for that section of the Haslingfield Greenway. Members were informed that two options were considered in 2022, with the currently proposed on-road route preferred by local residents, as opposed to a path in the field on the opposite side of Broadway to the houses.
- Clarified that the Baulk Path in Grantchester was a permissible path, and it was noted the GCP was trying to convert permissible paths into bridleways, where it was possible.
- Argued that the Greenways could help reduce traffic levels in smaller villages by making them less appealing to cars, particularly in villages such as Grantchester that suffered from narrow roads and high levels of on-street parking.
- Queried whether businesses, including pubs and restaurants, in the villages that were benefitting from increased connectivity through the Greenways network had been provided with information about options or grants to improve cycle parking at their venues.
- Argued that the M11 crossing of the Haslingfield Greenway should be step free.

- Confirmed that the Outline Business Case for the Haslingfield Greenway included data on current cycling to and from Grantchester, with further analysis to be included in the Full Business Case. Further design work would be undertaken the route in the Grantchester area had been established.
- Requested additional detailed maps of the Greenways routes to identify areas of concern, such as the congested commencement of the Fulbourn Greenway, and also to see how the Greenways connected to the wider, integrated active travel network.
- Drew attention to concerns that had been raised during consultations about maintenance of the Greenways and requested an update on the issue of short-term and long-term maintenance of the network, including sections of routes that were currently unusable because of their state. It was confirmed that the GCP currently held the responsibility for maintenance and that it would eventually be handed over to the County Council.
- Noted that the building developments north of Cherry Hinton had received planning consent on the basis there would be improvements to the active travel network in the area, and queried when the second phase of the Fulbourn Greenway would be presented. Members were informed that the GCP hoped to engage with Network Rail in spring 2024, following which a report would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. It was clarified that the Outline Business Case included both phases of the project, while a Full Business Case was expected in the second half of 2024, following which construction could shortly commence.
- Expressed concern about the construction stage of the Fulbourn Greenway coinciding with other nearby works on Teversham Road and Fulbourn Drift, and it was acknowledged that the impact on local communities could affect the timeline. Notwithstanding, one member argued that people had already been waiting so long for the Greenways to be constructed that further delays should be avoided.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson acknowledged that a balance had to be made between the wishes of the local community and the practicalities of a piece of infrastructure, although he recognised the local knowledge that communities always had. The Joint Assembly supported continuing to develop the Haslingfield Greenway route to pass through Grantchester, but requested the GCP try to address practical issues that arose and could be reasonably dealt with. The Chairperson also indicated the Joint Assembly supported the next steps for the Fulbourn Greenway.

9. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Programme Update

The Programme Manager presented a report to the Joint Assembly, which included the Full Business Case for the Greenways programme, along with its delivery plan. Two Traffic Regulations Order 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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that the GCP could develop a broad strategy for connecting the Greenways network to rural train stations that were not currently scheduled to be connected, such as the Horningsea Greenway and the Waterbeach train station. Members also noted that there were a large number of villages in the Greater Cambridge that were not connected to a Greenway. It was noted that various train stations would be connected to the Greenways network, including Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton, but members were also informed that there were not sufficient resources to support connections to all the villages or train stations in the region.
- Queried whether the timeline set out in the report was realistic, given the land acquisition difficulties that had been encountered. While it was acknowledged that land acquisition issues were to a certain extent beyond the GCP's control, the Joint Assembly was assured that the timeline in the report was a reasonable and realistic programme based on the assumptions made by the various project managers involved in the network.
- Requested further information on the clearance of vegetation overlooking the Greenways, and whether there was any enforcement or guidance on the clearance of waste cuttings. It was confirmed that vegetation clearance was a land owner responsibility.
- Established that neither the Combined Authority's recently approved Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, nor the County Council's adoption the Active Travel Strategy, had any impact on the Greenways programme.
- Expressed concern that the Waterbeach Greenway did not connect to the west of the new town and suggested that Phase 2 should therefore commence as soon as possible.
- Clarified that the different Greenways had not been prioritised in any way. They were being delivered as quickly as was possible, but some were complex and therefore took longer at different stages of the design and planning process. It was requested that local members and parish councils continued to receive updates on Greenways in their area.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 15 February 2024.

Chairperson
15 February 2023

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 11 December 2023
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">David Stoughton Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Living Streets welcomes the revised proposals for Hills Road, which include important improvements for pedestrians, both walking and wheeling. The reframing of the proposals to spell out the aim of creating a ‘healthier, more pedestrian friendly environment’, rather than just ‘Cycling+’ with pedestrians as more of an afterthought, is a significant step forward.</p> <p>We note that current pedestrian, cycling and bus use of Hills Road exceeds motor vehicle movements, despite conditions in some parts of the road being unpleasant, unsafe and a deterrent to walking and cycling. We expect active travel numbers to grow appreciably once improvements are in place.</p> <p>We do have remaining concerns about the safety of floating bus stops for access for those in wheelchairs or pushing buggies. We also regret the rather cumbersome pedestrian crossing arrangements eg. at Hills Rd/Lensfield Rd/Gonville Place, where pedestrians could still have to walk or wheel quite long distances to cross. We urge GCP to support diagonal road markings to signal the all red phase pedestrian movement here and at the Downing Street crossing. Cambridge residents might learn that all-red enables diagonal crossing, but visitors and overseas tourists need more clarity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your overall support for the proposals. We note your concerns about floating bus stops and will continue to work with stakeholders on this issue.</p> <p>In terms of diagonal crossings, the GCP does support the exploration of such solutions, providing they work well within the overall design, and pass the requirements of the Road Safety Audit process.</p> <p>At Brooklands Avenue, the scope of the GCP’s Cycling Plus scheme covers only the junction with Hills Road. The proposals look to remove the shared use on the approach to the junction in response to concerns that were raised during the consultation process.</p> <p>The GCP is aware that there are further concerns about the rest of Brooklands Avenue as you have raised, and that these concerns fall outside of the current scope of any identified projects. We will raise with partners CPCA / CCC to explore potential solutions.</p>

	<p>Our question focuses on the negative impact of the Brooklands Avenue-Hills Rd changes for pedestrians on Brooklands Avenue. Traffic levels and pollution are likely to grow on Brooklands Avenue as the Hills Rd scheme squeezes motor traffic. The wholly inadequate shared footways will become even more attractive for cyclists – but more risky for pedestrians. Will GCP Assembly agree that investment is urgently needed in Brooklands Avenue to increase pedestrian safety and reduce health risks especially for children who need to get to local schools and for older people to be able to stay active?</p>	
<p>Frank Gawthrop</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Are Councillors aware that some 6 years ago the Catholic church junction was extensively changed to introduce a cycle lane on Hills Road leading to the junction with Lensfield Road and a forward box with a cycles only green light that allows cyclists to cross this junction before general traffic is allowed and that this works well.</p> <p>Would Councillors agree that not everyone is capable of using a cycle and also for many people who have to travel longer distances using a car is the only viable option. As such any changes here must take account of all road users.</p> <p>Are Councillor concerned that the report has introduced this major unilateral change to the scheme without prior warning.? Advertised as a consultation on Hills Road there was no mention of a major change to the A603 which is a</p>	<p>The recent GCP consultation on design options for Hills Road proposed minimal changes to the junction in question. However, this consultation and engagement process highlighted that many people are not happy with the current junction arrangements and felt that more could be done to make the junction work better for all travel modes that use it.</p> <p>The additional design option aims to address the key issues that were raised during the consultation, and would bring a number of positive benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly improved pedestrian crossing facilities, especially in north/south directions where pedestrian flows are highest. • removal of left hook risks to cyclists north and southbound through the junction. • potentially reduced vehicle flows along the northern section of Hills Road.

	<p>critical part of the city inner ring road. Are they satisfied this gives the public a fair consultation process?</p> <p>All traffic heading down Hills Road intending to enter the city centre car parks or use the Fen Causeway to access west Cambridge will be offered two alternative routes:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use Brooklands Ave (already heavily congested) and then Trumpington Road to the Fen Causeway roundabout 2. cut through Station Road, Tenison Road (a largely residential street), Mill Road and Gonville Place to approach the Catholic junction from the other direction <p>Both these alternatives are highly unsatisfactory, causing extra journey time and congestion. The routing of traffic down Tenison Road is particularly onerous on residents.</p> <p>I would also point out that the removal of the right turn from Lensfield Road will have the reverse effect on the above roads. Do Councillors consider it acceptable to propose such a change without a proper analysis of the effect on the road network as a whole?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potentially improved bus journey times as vehicles turning left from Hills Road into Lensfield Road at peak times are often blocked by vehicle queuing on the Lensfield Road exit, resulting in queues building up along Hills Road due to the restricted junction exit capacity, further delaying buses. • providing a substantial increase in public realm space, with an additional 400m2 footway space. <p>It is important we listen to the feedback from consultations, hence we explore this option further, alongside the original minimal change option for this junction that was originally presented.</p> <p>At the next stage the options would be fully modelled as the impacts of the designs need to be fully understood before being presented back to the public for further consultation on the preferred scheme design.</p>
Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7: Cycling Plus – Hills Road And Addenbrooke's Roundabout</p> <p>Hills Road is a bustling street of shops, restaurants and local services connecting the city centre to many of Cambridge's largest educational and employment sites. It sees a large number of transport journeys and includes some of Cambridge's most dangerous junctions including both the Addenbrooke's roundabout and Catholic Church junction.</p>	<p>Thank you for your overall support for the GCPs proposals.</p> <p>Regarding Addenbrookes Roundabout, at this stage the funding and scope requires that the GCP looks to fast track a smaller scheme on the Fendon Road arms of the Roundabout in order to resolve a specific safety issue that has been identified.</p> <p>This aim is achieved with the current design proposals, however, the GCP note and agree that in the longer term, a project is</p>

<p>Neither of these junctions can be considered alone: any new designs must be part of a wider vision for both the sustainable transport network and city priorities as a whole. Due to the limited scope of the Addenbrooke's scheme and funding, here this opportunity has been missed.</p> <p>However, Camcycle does welcome the new option provided for the Hills Road/Lensfield Road junction, a place where far too many cyclists have been seriously hurt in collisions. The proposed changes to this junction will rebalance road space, allocating half the area to walking and cycling and half to motor vehicle movements. Currently people walking make 40% of the daily journeys on Hills Road, but are only given 26% of the roadspace at this junction, leading to squeezed pavements and congested crossings.</p> <p>The proposed design would increase walking areas to 34% of the space, and cycling areas from 6% to 17%. This will vastly improve safety and comfort for active travel users and encourage more people to choose these modes of transport. Restricting some of the vehicular movements will also improve traffic flow across the junction for cars and buses.</p> <p>The design of this scheme would need to be carefully planned and adjusted to ensure a solution that works well for all road users in surrounding areas. It should also be considered in line with the city council's vision for the core of the city and its future vision for Cambridge.</p> <p>Is the GCP working closely with Cambridge City Council on its plans?</p>	<p>required to look at options to improve the wider roundabout for all travel modes.</p> <p>The GCP welcomes your support for the alternative Hills/Lensfield road junction design and will work with all key stakeholders to ensure that any eventual outcome is considered in line with the City Council's vision for the core of the city and its future vision for Cambridge.</p> <p>We continue to work closely with our key partners in our rich-governance environment.</p>
---	--

<p>Sarah Hughes Campaign Officer Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7: Cycling Plus – Hills Road And Addenbrooke’s Roundabout</p> <p>The CSTA is delighted to see the new design option under consideration for the Lensfield Road/Gonville Place junction on Hills Road. The movement report shows that the majority using the road are travelling by sustainable means: 22,000 pedestrians, 6,250 cycles, and 27,250 vehicles including 760 buses (note that 760 double decker buses can transport up to 57,000 people). The improved design option should greatly improve safety for active users by providing additional footway space, and by preventing left-turning motor traffic coming into conflict with cycles passing through the junction from Hills Rd and Regent Street. It also enhances bus priority.</p> <p>We believe that this design will also bring benefits to those driving. Removing right-turning motor traffic from Lensfield Rd to Hills Rd will improve flow through the junction. Currently right-turning traffic often blocks traffic going straight on and takes up significant time in the phasing, reducing overall capacity. Removing left-turning traffic from Hills Rd to Lensfield Rd will also improve flow on Lensfield Road and through the Trumpington Road mini-roundabout.</p> <p>We also support the new design option as it prioritises sustainable transport through a major gateway junction into the heart of the city. One of the aims of the 2014 Greater Cambridge City Deal, as stated in the founding document, was to “allow significant increases in bus and cycle use, particularly within Cambridge, that will maximise the capacity for movement, particularly within the historic core”. The centre of Cambridge currently experiences high</p>	<p>Thank you for setting out your support for the Hills/Lensfield road alternative design option and for highlighting the potential benefits.</p> <p>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 likely 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>motor traffic levels, especially at weekends. By prioritising journeys into the centre by active and public transport and lowering motor traffic levels, the city centre will become a more pleasant and safe area to work, shop, eat out and spend time.</p> <p>What will the GCP do to progress this design option?</p>	
<p>Councillor Lesley Sherratt on behalf of Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>Grantchester Parish Council (GPC) wishes to ask members of the Joint Assembly if, in the light of the strong local majority against the routing of the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway, it wishes to progress with this section.</p> <p>In a poll conducted by the Parish Council during the previous consultation on this Greenway, its route was opposed by 80% of local Grantchester residents. As a result of this, the Parish Council met with Cllr Smith and Peter Blake, and Cllr Smith proposed that if the Parish Council would work with the Greenways team to try to improve the proposals so as to answer as many local objections as possible, a second consultation would then be held that asked both the wider consultation group and Grantchester residents specifically, if they now approved the amended proposals. If a local majority was still opposed to the route through the centre of the village, Cllr Smith stated that it would not then be imposed upon Grantchester against its residents' will.</p> <p>The Parish Council has participated in the second consultation in good faith, but the results are that 75% of</p>	<p>As detailed in the Joint Assembly Paper, the route through Grantchester would provide the most direct connection between Haslingfield, Grantchester and Cambridge, and would also allow the M11 bridge to become step-free, therefore greatly improving accessibility for all users.</p> <p>The paper acknowledges that a majority of Grantchester resident respondents opposed this section of the route, but the overall results from the consultation exercise show strong support (64%) for the route through Grantchester.</p>

	<p>Grantchester residents still oppose the route through the centre of the village and indeed most oppose most of the smaller changes as well (Appendix B makes clear that the local, Grantchester, response to these changes is in inverse proportion to that of the wider group, and is strongly majority opposed to them).</p> <p>GPC is not opposed to the Haslingfield Greenway, which if the Grantchester section is not approved, can proceed over the 'Baulk' route. GPC therefore asks the Joint Assembly if it will decline to progress the Haslingfield Greenway (Grantchester section), respecting the village's repeated opposition to this section, Cllr Smith's commitment to the Parish Council, and the principle of local democracy.</p>	
Peter Scrase	<p>Agenda Item 8 Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>The Joint Assembly has to make a recommendation to the Executive Board as to whether the route for the Haslingfield Greenway should pass through the village of Grantchester or whether it should bypass the village and proceed via the Baulk. The Director of Transport has recommended the village route, but in doing so has not advised the Assembly on the relative cost of the two routes.</p> <p>The village route involves substantial expense in street furniture and in modifying the footbridge over the M11. The Nigel Brigham & Associates report of October 2016 filed on the GCP website says " One of the significant problems with this route is the cost and difficulty of modifying the existing bridge, which has steps. The</p>	<p>The Baulk Path route is not proposed by GCP as an alternative to the Grantchester route, it is proposed separately as part of the wider Greenways Network.</p> <p>The decision has already been taken by the Executive Board, following the engagement on the Barton Greenway to take forward the Baulk route.</p> <p>Today's paper focuses on the Grantchester section.</p>

	<p>existing ramp could be filled and regraded and extended but that might cause structural concerns. The bridge is also narrow and the bridge parapets would need raising, so this is not an easy option”.</p> <p>The Baulk route would involve very little additional expense, as it would be over a route already planned as a spur to the Haslingfield Greenway alongside the M11 and the Baulk itself, which is part of the Barton Greenway which has already been approved.</p> <p>My question is whether the Assembly is aware of the disparity in cost between the two alternatives and if so whether it agrees that this is a factor to be taken into account when considering which of the two routes is to be preferred.</p>	
Hugh Clough	<p>Agenda Item 8 Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>It is disturbing that the officers are proposing to ignore the rejection of the current behind-the-hedge-scheme by Grantchester residents (87 of 119 against). The officers also have not provided any postcode analysis of the 297 (416-119) non Grantchester respondees to know if they would ever use the Greenway.</p> <p>Similarly the proposal to rush ahead with Grantchester Road-Barton Road junction modification and bus stop relocation which has widespread opposition in South Newnham shows another community being overridden by GCP planners.</p> <p>Surely the proposal to make Grantchester Road a 20 or 15mph “Quiet Lane” should have been considered? The</p>	<p>The paper does not ignore local communities – a majority of respondents support the proposals.</p> <p>The paper outlines the clear benefits of the Grantchester route.</p> <p>Postcode analysis has been carried out as part of the consultation, as set out in Table 4-3 and Figure 4-6 of the Consultation Report (Appendix 2 of the Joint Assembly Paper).</p> <p>The works to the Grantchester Road/Barton Road junction have not yet commenced and have already been modified in line with community feedback - including a number of meetings with residents groups and local members to inform this.</p>

	<p>proposal to use and ruin the Baulk Path remains on the table in spite of a resident's survey analysis from 2018 that proved it would never be used.</p> <p>The movement counts data for the Haslingfield Greenway (paragraphs 2.2.13 and 2.2.14 pages 42 and 43 of the Haslingfield Outline Business Case Nov22) shows that only 2 (4/2 out & return journey commuters) might come from Haslingfield itself. So if Grantchester will not use the behind-the-hedge-route and many Newnham residents prefer the safer route along Selwyn Road to using the Barton Road junction, who will actually use this Greenway? There is no business case for this huge financial expenditure.</p> <p>Question: What justification does the GCP now put forward for continuing to ignore the communities it is supposed to be serving and will it now commit to rethinking this scheme with the local residents who actually know and cycle these routes?</p>	<p>GCP has undertaken extensive consultation and engagement on this scheme to date, including a site walkover and meetings/input from Grantchester Parish Council which has been factored into the updated designs. Should this section proceed, GCP will continue to work with local stakeholders and the community going forward.</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8: Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn And Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>In July, Camcycle said that the proposals put forward for the Fulbourn phase 1 consultation were lacking in ambition. We believed they would bring little to no improvement on the existing situation and were over-reliant on speed cushions. We called for a more comprehensive approach including public realm improvements, reduction of on-street parking, new planting and stronger land negotiations.</p>	<p>This report follows the format of previous Papers and sets out a summary of the engagement responses received, and the actions proposed in light of these – we are not selective in highlighting the comments from one group and not others</p> <p>This is penultimate Greenways report at this stage of the process, and the format has been updated following comments by the Assembly. Where a commitment is given by the project team to review and re-evaluate comments in the next stage of</p>

	<p>It was clear to us at the time that significant changes would be required if a high-quality scheme was to be delivered. Therefore, it is deeply concerning to see such a lack of detail provided in these papers on the proposed actions following the consultation. The small number of actions listed are often no more than a minor acknowledgement of comment or a promise to review them.</p> <p>There is also no mention of any specific stakeholder comments in either the agenda papers or the Engagement Summary Report. Whilst there is value in analysing the themes of responses, when you only include stakeholder responses within this, they carry no more additional weighting or consideration than a single response. For example, should Historic England not be given specific consideration in conservation areas, should the British Horse Society comments not be highlighted on a well-used equestrian route, should Camcycle and CTC Cambridge comments not be highlighted when considering cycle infrastructure?</p> <p>The GCP recommends that the Board agrees to changes to the Fulbourn Greenway scheme based on results from the public consultation and resulting amendments. However, it is very unclear from the information provided what exactly is planned to change. As an experienced Civil Engineer, if I can't identify any physical changes to this scheme, how can anyone else?</p> <p>Do assembly members believe that the responses and next steps set out by the GCP provide enough information for board members to make an informed decision?</p>	<p>design - this will be undertaken and will be reported back on at the next stage of the process.</p> <p>This will all be reported back to the Joint Assembly and Board as part of the final decision required for each Greenways scheme.</p>
--	--	--