



# GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
15 November 2018 at 2pm

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairperson)
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridgeshire City Council (Vice Chairperson)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Nicky Massey	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Peter Topping	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jo Sainsbury	iMET
Christopher Walkinshaw	Cambridge Ahead
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute
Andy Williams	Astrazeneca
Heather Richards	Transversal

### Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network

### Officers/Advisors:

Peter Blake	Transport Director, GCP
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme, GCP
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive, GCP
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Alison Norrish and Joanna Rowell	Arup
Jo Baker	Mott MacDonald

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Helen Valentine and Councillor John Williams.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Baigent and Kavanagh each declared a non-pecuniary interest as members of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Apologies for absence were received from Helen Valentine and Councillor John Williams.

**4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

10 public questions had been received. These related to agenda items 6 and 8 and would be taken at the relevant agenda items.

**5. PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

**6. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT**

The GCP Transport Director gave a short presentation setting the Cambourne to Cambridge proposals in the context of the wider City Access proposals.

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum (LLF) summarised the outcomes of the LLF meeting which had taken place on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2018:

- The LLF requested that the Joint Assembly allowed two weeks between the meeting papers being published and the Joint Assembly meeting taking place, to allow more time for input to be provided by the LLF.
- The LLF noted that the GCP was taking forward a route and alignment that was most opposed in the public consultation and which the LLF had advised against.
- The LLF supported the principle of tunnels but was concerned about their deliverability.
- The LLF felt that the GCP's preferred route did not serve commuters from Cambourne and Bourn and would only benefit a small proportion of people.
- The preferred off-road route provided poor connectivity; it did not provide effective links to the Biomedical Campus or the Science Park. A northern route would provide better connectivity.
- The LLF technical group expressed concern that the benefit cost ratio (BCR) was one tenth of what was normally expected of public transport schemes.

- It was felt that journey times were not significantly better than on-road alternatives.
- There was concern about Mott MacDonald's environmental assessment which the LLF felt was based on a poor understanding of the importance of the wider landscape setting of the city and heritage implications within the city. The LLF asked for an independent assessment of each to be completed before the full EIA and HIA at Planning stage.
- The LLF requested to see the full Arup report that had looked at and dismissed an alternative northern route.
- The LLF requested that a panel of experts independent from the GCP, assess the economic, environmental and transport implications of the scheme.
- The LLF had:
  1. Recommended that no decision be taken on a preferred route until greater clarity on the CAM was provided; the proposed network, connectivity and funding. It was felt that the off-road bus route due to its poor connectivity to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), Science park and the city centre, its poor transport benefits and low BCR, did not stand up to scrutiny.
  2. Noted that there was only one route that was compliant with CAM. It asked that a northern off-road option be developed. It was felt that there could be major advantages to this; it could better connect with the Oxford Cambridge Expressway and developments at the Girton Interchange in the longer term, and could link with the Science Park, CBC and the North West Cambridge site.
  3. Recommended that, given the lengthy timescale involved in building an off-road scheme, an in-bound bus lane be designed on Madingley Road immediately. This would provide significant public transport benefit to the residents west of Cambridge.

Dr Marylin Treacy, Allan Treacy, James Littlewood, Roger Tomlinson, Alistair Burford and Dr Gabriel Fox were invited to ask their public questions. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which provided an update on progress with developing the business case for the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge (C2C) Better Public Transport project. Attention was drawn to the timescale of the project. An Executive Board decision on the outline business case would be sought in Autumn 2019, following a formal public consultation. There was a clear alignment between the preferred scheme and the CAM. It was recognised that an on-road scheme had less impact on the greenbelt than the off-road scheme. It was highlighted that the specific route alignment was still under development.

Councillor Topping queried whether there would be sufficient time for the outline business case for this route, to take account of the Combined Authority's strategic business case. The route needed to be consistent with the longer term aspiration for the CAM. Given the immediate need, he suggested that an on-road solution would be deliverable more quickly, cost significantly less and would allow more time for a longer term CAM system to be developed. The GCP Transport Director pointed out that the GCP recognised the challenge of delivering very large projects and that the phasing of delivery was important.

This would be addressed in the strategic business case. Officers would look at options for potential interim short term solutions and report back on this.

Councillor Sollom raised concerns about the off-road route. He queried:

- The Red Amber Green [RAG] scoring of the public acceptability in the Mott MacDonald report, which did not reflect that the off-road option was not favoured by the public.
- The significant difference of the wider economic benefits between the schemes and asked how these calculations had been reached. He suggested that more detail be provided about this.
- Why the northern route had been rejected when the Arup report suggested that it had been competitive. He felt this route had greater potential to link to the wider network, fit better with wider project objectives, had far greater local support and should therefore be looked at again.
- He asked about national strategic infrastructure projects, including East/West Rail.

Councillor Sollom requested:

- Further consideration and detail of the wider heritage aspects across the whole of the off-road option, not just focussing on the SSSI.
- That extensive landscaping be included in the mitigations.
- An explanation of why the on-road route did not open up the sites in the Local Plan to the same extent as the off-road route.
- That two CAM compliant schemes be compared.
- An interim on-road solution be worked on.

Councillor Sollom commented that residents in the area understood the need for a segregated route and to develop a scheme that connected communities such as Cambourne and Bourn, with employment centres in the city. However they did not think the solution presented was the best option and there was no evidence of other options being presented. He felt that trust had broken down between the GCP and stakeholders.

Councillor Bick expressed support for the proposals and hoped the Executive Board would move forward with them. He stressed the importance of the GCP providing a first class public transport system to enable residents of existing and future new developments outside the city, to access Cambridge city. The recommended route was not predicated on the CAM and it was likely the GCP would still be looking at this option without this.

Andy Williams commented that travel routes that were reliable, regular and offered a journey time of 30 minutes or less from Cambourne to Cambridge city centre, CBC and the Science Park, was the step change businesses were seeking. The current public transport journey time of 90 minutes from Cambourne to CBC, was not acceptable to businesses or employees. The GCP needed to aim for an aspirational scheme. He commented that the 30 minute journey times outlined in the report via the preferred route, were not reliant on the CAM or tunnelling. He suggested that the aspirations of each scheme needed to be made clear in future reports.

Heather Richards suggested Madingley Road cycling improvements could be a quick win and should be focussed on.

Councillor Baigent supported the proposals. He pointed out that the arguments for a

northern route had already been listened to, the route had been discounted and he felt that this should not be revisited. Madingley Road could not be expanded to the extent that was needed to accommodate the commuting traffic from existing and future new developments outside the city.

Jo Sainsbury suggested a need for transparency and summary of the discussions that had already taken place on this scheme. Access to past reports should be ensured. Old ground should not be revisited. She commented that from a business perspective, journey time was paramount to transport solutions and reducing these was the only way to get people out of their cars. The GCP had a unique opportunity to do something different in the longer term; an on-road solution was short term and a long term ambitious solution was needed.

The GCP Transport Director, Arup and Mott MacDonald representatives responded to the points raised:

- Arup had been providing technical advice to the Combined Authority around the buildability and technical aspects of the CAM. The Joint Assembly was informed that an underground system could be built.
- The strategic outline business case would follow the Green Book Treasury principles and would be available in the public domain in January/February 2019.
- Officers would look at an interim on-road solution and would inform members of a timescale for this work.
- The evidence around the northern route would be pulled together into a single document.
- Work was ongoing on the East/West rail and a consultation was expected in early 2019. The GCP was in regular discussions with constituent authorities.
- There was much more work to be done on mitigation and nothing had been ruled out.
- The off-road option had performed significantly better than the on-road scheme at public consultation.
- Assurance was provided that the heritage and environmental aspects along the route had been considered. More detailed surveys had been undertaken and local wildlife sites had been included in this. The two most significant sites in terms of heritage and the environment at a national level, were along the on-road route. Further surveys were ongoing.
- The assessment of patronage was based on work that had been carried out on the benefit cost ratio and was based on committed development. Wider economic benefit considered the potential development that could result if the scheme was in place. A fully segregated scheme that was future proofed and could operate without congestion in the long term, would enable development more successfully than an on-road alternative that would eventually fail at key points along the route, due to congestion.
- Officers clarified that not all focus was on journey time.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder offered to meet with Joint Assembly members to discuss this scheme and the issues raised at the meeting, before or after the December Executive Board meeting. The LLF Chairman was also welcome to attend this meeting.

## 7. CITY ACCESS AND BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS - UPDATE

The GCP Transport Director presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on the City Access workstreams, with a focus on developing options for securing a step-change in public transport, reducing congestion and improving air quality in Greater Cambridge. The public transport offering needed to go far beyond what already existed, with significant improvements in journey time and reliability needed.

Councillor Wilson commented that the diagram of proposed routes excluded many villages; it was important that the residents of these villages knew that they would not be overlooked. As the local member for Cottenham, one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire, Councillor Wilson pointed out that the bus from Cottenham to Cambridge took one hour and as such, was not a viable option for people commuting to work. Furthermore she pointed out that neither the stations nor Addenbrooke's could be reached from Cottenham without changing buses. The Oakington Rural Travel Hub would link to the guided busway however there was no bus service that linked Cottenham to Oakington and the busway. For people who would have to drive from Cottenham to the travel hub, only 41 parking spaces were proposed. Cottenham was a community of over 6000 residents, which would increase to 8000 with future development, and a good public transport solution was needed.

Councillor Massey commented that it was vital that the city access project also focussed on villages outside the city. She suggested the reintroduction of the bus and bike service may be an option for rural communities to access their rural travel hubs. Faster and affordable public transport was needed across the city and from the villages, which was cheaper for people to use than their cars. Extremely low public transport fares were needed. Councillor Massey and Baigent wanted to see something worked up on free bus transport. Councillor Massey pointed out that people living within the city had to change buses to get to the train stations and hospital, which was not acceptable. A better public transport system was needed now; she pointed out that Newmarket Road was at a standstill at peak hours and the weekends, and development in the area would make this situation worse.

Councillor Kavanagh reiterated previous comments regarding the need for cycling improvements and felt this point had not been made strongly enough in the report. He suggested the GCP should build on the alternative modes of transport people were already using, such as cycling. More people would cycle if they felt it was safer to do so, therefore segregation of cyclists from other road users should be a top priority. A network of segregated cycle routes and safe junctions for cyclists was needed across the city, expanding what had already been achieved on Hills Road and Huntingdon Road.

Christopher Walkinshaw welcomed the report, in particular the emphasis it put on capacity issues. He suggested that reference to the number of people coming from outside the area and capacity issues on orbital routes, was missing from the report.

Andy Williams commented that the city access scheme was the top priority scheme for businesses. The importance of improving city access from surrounding areas needed to be emphasised.

Councillor Topping felt there was not enough in the report to explain the attraction of the proposals for the villages of South Cambridgeshire. He pointed out that economic growth was happening in South Cambridgeshire rather than Cambridge city.

Dr Wells commented that the emphasis on journey times was key however the way in which this would be achieved needed more discussion. He echoed the need to keep in mind the South Cambridgeshire villages and where people from these villages interchanged.

Councillor Baigent suggested that in order to make public transport more attractive, disincentives may be needed to encourage its increased use. He emphasised the need to be able to move around Cambridge quickly and cheaply by public transport and pointed out that it was quicker to get around Cambridge by bicycle. He suggested the GCP should be increasing the argument to provide cheaper and free transport around the city and South Cambridgeshire, in order to get people out of their cars.

Councillor Wotherspoon expressed concern about intelligent charging, pointing out that representatives from Transport for London did not think that congestion charging would work in Cambridge, as the city did not have the critical mass nor the universal access to public transport that was needed to make such a charge fair and equitable. A way of funding a public transport network without penalising drivers for having to use their cars to get into central Cambridge, was needed.

Councillor Bick welcomed the report, pointing out that more car free roads would make cycling safer.

The wording of questions being asked of the public and the information that accompanied the questions, was vital. Councillor Sollom expressed support for the idea of a citizens' assembly.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder was keen to ensure that rail was progressed. He highlighted the need to include residents who lived just outside the South Cambridgeshire border in public consultation, as many of these residents commuted to Cambridge.

## **8. HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS - FINAL DESIGN**

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the final design for Histon Road. He explained that following the public consultation, changes had been made to the scheme to ensure that all aspects of it conformed with regulations, were considered safe and provided a good balance of functionality for all road users. The Joint Assembly was informed that given the contentious issues that remained regarding the Histon Road/Gilbert Road/Warwick Road junction, a further Histon Road LLF meeting would be held on 26 November 2018.

Public questions from Anna Williams, the Windsor Road Residents' Association and Lilian Rundblad were invited. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Joint Assembly acknowledged written representations received from Nick Flynn, Roxanne de Beaux and Daniel Thomas, which had been circulated to members before the meeting.

Councillor Massey expressed concern at the number of public representations that had been received by Joint Assembly members, which expressed a feeling of betrayal by the GCP. She highlighted the need for cyclists to feel safe and pointed out that Hills Road had demonstrated that segregated cycle routes worked as an increase in cyclists had been seen here.

Councillor Wilson was pleased that the GCP was going back to the LLF to discuss the changes to the proposals. She was concerned that local people had taken a lot of time contributing to the public consultation and did not feel included in the subsequent changes to the scheme. The safety of cyclists was a concern and if they did not feel safe in a shared environment with pedestrians, they would cycle on the road which led to conflict between cyclists and drivers.

Members expressed concern at the changes to the proposals, which it was felt disadvantaged cyclists. It was pointed out that if cyclists did not feel safe and were discouraged from cycling, congestion would get worse. Members were disappointed that following the changes, the scheme would deliver little change for cyclists and pedestrians. Members felt that segregation at the Gilbert Road junction was needed. Heather Richards pointed out that in order to achieve mode-shift to cycling, Histon Road needed to be looked at as a whole as a cyclist's entire journey needed to be safe in order to achieve mode-shift from bicycles to cars.

Some members considered that doing nothing about the junction at Kings Hedges Road, was a major safety concern for cyclists and pedestrians. There was significant concern that there had been a complete failure in the public consultation process regarding this project.

Councillor Topping commented that in comparison, the A1307 public consultation had gone exceptionally well.

Some members felt that this issue should come back to the Joint Assembly following the LLF meeting, before proposals went to the Executive Board. A vote was taken on this with six members voting in favour of this. As the majority of members did not consider this necessary, it was agreed that the proposals would go straight to the Executive Board following the LLF meeting. Feedback from the LLF meeting would be presented to the Executive Board and the Joint Assembly Chairman would report the Joint Assembly's concerns.

In response to the concerns raised regarding the public consultation, the GCP Transport Director made the following points:

- The GCP recognised the concern about the Gilbert Road junction and pointed out that the proposals balanced a number of key priorities. The key concern was the safety of all road users. Officers would look at what could be done to resolve the issue and would discuss this with the LLF.
- All junctions in all schemes would be looked at in their own right.
- He explained that there was a safety concern on Histon Road due to the conflict between walkers and cyclists. Safety Officers considered that a segregated cycle system potentially allowed cyclists to come into conflict with pedestrians too quickly, whereas shared space would continue to slow cyclists down. Officers would continue to look at this to find a mutually agreeable solution.

Officers clarified that no changes were proposed to the Kings Hedges Road junction. This had been looked at in detail however it had been decided that the junction was out of scope of the scheme. Officers considered it prudent to leave this junction until it was known how the Darwin Green junction would look and how the area would function. Councillor Bick requested the GCP look at this junction when the appropriate time came.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder asked the GCP Transport Director to liaise with County Council officers regarding Darwin Green. He also requested that the County

Council's Safety Officers be asked to attend the Histon Road LLF meeting.

## 9. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on progress across the GCP programme. In addition to the routine budget and performance monitoring information, the report contained an overview of cycling projects and an update on the recent skills procurement exercise. In relation to the latter, Members were informed that tender returns for the provision of a skills service had not been of sufficient quality to award a contract. The GCP hoped to go back out to market in the new year and would in the meantime work with procurement experts to try and improve the quality of future bids. The GCP would also work with companies who may be interested in bidding, to help them understand the procurement process.

Referring to the Smart Places progress report, it was noted that phase 2 status was shown as 'green' although detailed actions had yet to be agreed. It was suggested that this be reviewed at the next Working Group. The same report referred to a bid for 'C-CAV4', the next round of funding for development of autonomous vehicles. It was noted that if successful, this would potentially extend the scope outside the city into surrounding villages, including the potential development of autonomous vehicle hubs. Consideration would need to be given to how to engage these communities in a wider debate on this.

## 10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would take place at 2pm on Wednesday 27 February 2018, at the Guildhall in Cambridge.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.40pm**

---

This page is left blank intentionally.

**Appendix A to the minutes of the 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018 meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions and Responses**

6		Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project	
	Questioner	Question	Response
6a	Dr Marilyn Treacy	<p>The GCP and Combined Authority’s preferred SRA for the off road route does not link with future plans for the Oxford-Cambridge expressway, nor the A14/M11 junction, nor take account of the Comberton to Cambridge Greenway. Neither does it link the majority of commuters to their places of work. It relies on the possibility of as yet unfunded tunnelling.</p> <p>Would the J.A. therefore request that the Board take the recommended Specific Route Alignment off the table until the GCP proposes a scheme that takes account of these other developments?</p> <p>In the meantime, recognising the lack of need for a cycleway and walkway down the A1303 once the parallel Greenway is completed, the GCP could trial a dedicated busway down Madingley Hill which could, in future, be developed into a fully segregated CAM route if approval is given for tunnelling from the West Cambridge site.</p>	<p>The GCP Transport Director’s presentation set the context and urgent and pressing need faced to deliver to public transport services.</p> <p>The C2C project was consistent with the local plan and other transport documents that existed. The GCP was seeking to develop a scheme on this basis. He pointed out that it was important to recognise that the report did not present a final decision on the project, with more work and further public consultation to be done before this decision was taken. The scheme was on a pathway to development, with more work still to be done and the final decision on the scheme was still some time away.</p> <p>Work had previously been carried out on a northern route alignment. The Transport Director had undertaken at the LLF meeting to dust this work down and show what had been done. The work had indicated that the route to Girton was much less direct. It had reliance on the Girton Interchange and there was no assurance that Highways England would be taking the Girton Interchange work forward in the short term.</p>
6b	Allan Treacy	<p>With reference to the Arup report (appendix 2, page 10, section 4.9), there is a wholly superficial assessment of the alternative proposal put forward by CPPF and others for a Northern route that links with the Girton Interchange which is summarily dismissed by Arup. The detailed basis of their rejection is not included in their report.</p>	<p>Information from Natural and Historic England would be released as requested.</p> <p>The GCP’s development of the C2C schemes was in line</p>

		<p>Given the wide support that an improved Girton Interchange has amongst many of the area's residents and interested organisations, will you please instruct Arup to publish, in detail, the basis for their rejection of this proposal. In the interests of openness will the Assembly ask that this information is made available to both the public and the Board before they make a decision to discount this option?</p>	<p>with Government guidance on transport scheme assessment. This had a number of considerations including transport, environmental, commercial and engineering aspects, and public consultation. The GCP undertook both early non-statutory public consultation and statutory public consultation, which it would be continuing to undertake, and was required to demonstrate that this process had been followed. The GCP had tried to be clear on its website of the responses to public consultation that had been received on the various options. The GCP would continue to use the approved processes.</p>
6c	James Littlewood (Cambridge Past Present and Future)	<p>The Arup and officers reports refer to avoiding adverse impacts in the "West Fields" and Coton village. However the greatest impact of significance would actually be on Madingley Hill (ie the section between Madingley Mulch and the M11). This does not seem to be reflected in the summary assessment of Route Options, which scores Route A as "positive" in this respect. Nor is it reflected in the proposed mitigation options – for which it appears that only the section next to the village would be mitigated.</p> <p>Please can the Assembly ask why the length of route with potentially the greatest landscape impact, which is covenanted by the National Trust, does not appear to register in the constraints or mitigation?</p>	<p>The objective was to arrive at a scheme option to present to decision makers, to enable them to make a balanced decision informed by both technical advice and public opinion.</p> <p>The off-road route is consistent with Highways England's plans for the A14 and M11 and would complements the Comberton to Cambridge Greenway. The progress of the Oxford-Cambridge expressway has been noted but the timescale of the scheme was a considerable time away and would not enable the GCP to deliver improved public transport for 10-15 years and as such, does not address the issues which City Deal funds were allocated to resolve.</p>
6d	Roger Tomlinson – Coton Parish Councillor	<p>GCP consults and engages the public, though the development of route options for Cambourne to Cambridge went through a series of five iterations, reducing 34 options to four, then six, BEFORE public consultation started in 2015. The public said the County Transport Officers chose the wrong routes but have championed their choice ever since.</p>	

	<p>The report claims that “gathering and then reflecting public and stakeholder support and views are a key factor in option selection. As such the robust public consultation has informed and shaped the scheme and optioneering process which has led to the strategic option.”</p> <p>That is quite simply not true.</p> <p>The County Council ‘s lawyer told Coton Parish Councillors that consultations were not statutory and the Council had the power to ignore the responses. Attenders at the LLF, “workshops”, “focus groups” confirm these have been ‘contentious’ between participants and the officers and their consultants. The route options not chosen by the officers have never been fully evaluated.</p> <p>There is a table purporting to show the actions taken in response to public input, but no reference to the public and their elected representatives proposing alternative routes since 2015.</p> <p>This table under-represents the public supporting an on-road route; independent analysis of the data shows that over 64% rejected the off-road route options. The pattern of ignoring the public input has recurred throughout the progress of this scheme.</p> <p>As the Greater Cambridge Partnership is not the County Council, can we have an explanation of the GCP consultation policy, and how the views of the public are actually taken into account, and how the internal decisions are taken, and under what authority</p>	
--	---	--

		public input, including from local elected representatives and councillors, is ignored?	
6e	Alistair Burford	<p>Given that the Mayor and GCP have agreed that the transport system is a CAM rather than a Guided Busway, should the GCP be looking at an alternative route.</p> <p>The Arup report made a recommendation that the route must align with the CAM system. However there is no evidence in the report that the Officers preferred route will.</p> <p>Should the GCP now identify an alternative route that would better fit CAM ie: if the goal is to get to the Cambridge West Site and then on to the wider employment centres eg. BioCampus, Is a route north of the A428 and 1303 not a more direct and less environmentally damaging alternative?</p>	
6f	Dr Gabriel Fox	<p>We have heard a lot lately about the idea of a city-wide metro system including tunnels under the historic centre. There may be benefits to such a scheme and it will be interesting to see some practical details. But the fact is that such systems are extremely difficult to bring to life. That may explain why there are only 3 metros in the UK, two of them (London and Glasgow) developed in the 19th century and the other (Tyne and Wear) dating back 40 years. These systems can take decades to work out, well beyond one or even two terms of a local authority or Mayor. And they come with a frightening price tag. The Mayor has already suggested £3 billion – and we can expect that to double when lifetime maintenance, inflation, optimism bias and other costs are taken into account. And then probably double again, as is generally the way with these schemes.</p>	<p>The GCP accepted the challenges that were faced in delivering the projects and was continuing to work closely with colleagues at the Combined Authority on these.</p>

	<p>Now consider that the London Underground, serving a population well over ten million, generates just 5% operating profit on more than £2 billion a year of fares and clocks up a net annual loss of more than £600 million when depreciation, amortisation and the like are taken into account. If the Mayor is looking for private investment, it could be a very long wait indeed for them to get a return. And if he is looking to us, the ever-giving public, to provide the funds, consider that the final cost could add up to the entire expenditure of the City, County and South Cambridgeshire District Councils for more than a decade. That's a staggering amount of money to find.</p> <p>So it may be an interesting idea but it's still a long, long way from being a credible solution, especially as we move into an era when people will expect their transport to be on-demand, rather than at a bus stop.</p> <p>With that in mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Why is there any need now to specify a preferred route for the Cambourne to Grange Road section of the metro, rather than waiting until we know if the metro as a whole can be funded and delivered?</li><li>b) What is proposed to improve public transport for people west of Cambridge during the 10 or 20 years until a metro might be up and running?</li><li>c) What will happen to this supposedly "preferred" off-road route if the metro doesn't go ahead?</li></ul>	
--	---	--

8	Histon Road: Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements		
	Questioner	Question	Response
8a	Anna Williams – Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p>I am speaking today on behalf of Camcycle's 1,300 members, but also my own family. After too many scary experiences on Histon Road, I no longer cycle there with my children.</p> <p>Many people wrote in our Cambridge Cycling Survey that they avoid Histon Road under current conditions. If existing cyclists already steer clear of Histon Road, and if the proposals are only a slight improvement, then how can we expect new people to take up cycling here?</p> <p>We believe that the current designs for this scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fail sufficiently to improve safety for cyclists. Research consistently proves that the main barrier to cycling is feeling unsafe on the roads. This is even more true for women and older people.</li> <li>• Fail to improve conditions for pedestrians. Lost trees, interruptions at minor side roads and being forced to share narrow pavements with cyclists around busy junctions will not achieve the goal of a safe and pleasant community and won't help people with visual impairments</li> <li>• Betray the community process, by jettisoning years' worth of input from Local Liaison Forums, workshops and consultations. For example, the popular Gilbert Road segregated junction design vanished last week, even</li> </ul>	<p>The GCP Transport Director responded to the concerns raised. He provided assurance that the GCP was trying to bring all stakeholders with it. He pointed out that this scheme involved an element of compromise and the priority was the safety of all road users.</p> <p>A fully segregated cycle system across the city would require fewer other things on the roads and less traffic. A balance of priority was needed and there was not the physical space on the road to satisfy all users, whose safety was a priority.</p> <p>Changes had been discussed and most of these were broadly supported. There were outstanding issues regarding Gilbert Road and as such, a further meeting with the LLF would be taking place.</p>

		<p>though it was supported by the LLF and two-thirds of the public in the most recent consultation. The current plans now look very similar to the discredited 'Do Something' design of two years ago.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are no longer value for money and will fail to achieve a modal shift to sustainable transport. This plan misses a once-in-a-generation opportunity to make a true difference for walking and cycling on Histon Road.</li> </ul> <p>We would like to ask the Joint Assembly if they agree with Camcycle and local residents that the project needs to reincorporate the LLF resolutions that have been dropped?</p>	
8b	Windsor Road Residents' Association	<p>As participants at the Histon Road LLF meeting on 8 October 2018 we question why many of the proposals agreed at this latest LLF meeting have not been incorporated in the "Histon Road Final Design" to be considered at the Joint Assembly on 15 November.</p> <p>We therefore request postponement of Agenda Item 8 in order to give time for the proposals arising from the Histon Road LLFs to be given full attention?</p>	A representative was not present to ask this question at the meeting.
8c	Lilian Rundblad (Chair, Histon Road Residents' Association)	<p>Since Histon Road Final Design includes so many changes in certain designs which have not been discussed and decided at a LLF meeting and since our request to have a LLF before the Joint Assembly was denied, it is evident that a LLF is necessary before the next Executive Board on December 6<sup>th</sup>.</p>	An additional LLF meeting would take place on 26 November 2018.

		<p>Changes after the Consultation: The Gilbert Road/Warwick Road/Histon Road Junction design which is the major concern in an article by CamCycles. The approved LLF design was presented in the consultation and was supported by 68.6%, no opinion 15.8% and opposed 15.4%. This has been ignored and a new Officers' design is presented in the Final Scheme which has not been discussed in the LLF.</p> <p>The Carisbrooke Road Junction design has never been discussed in an LLF and was not included in the Consultation, only a question if we wanted it. We believe the bus-lane should not stop in the middle of the junction but well before it to allow the private car lane to join the bus-lane and not causing congestion.</p> <p>On the request of the HRARA, please can a meeting of the Histon Road LLF be organised in good time before the GCP Executive Board on 6 December 2018?</p>	
8d	Lilian Rundblad (Chair, Histon Road Residents' Association)	<p>To create a vision of an avenue of trees as an entrance into the iconic, historic centre of Cambridge.</p> <p>The very long ca 150m and more of wooden fence has been modified in the Histon Road Final Design to a steel-mesh fence with climbers. This new change has not been discussed at any LLF meeting nor with the residents living between Blackhall Road and Brownlow Road having their back-gardens bordering the intended fence. Although the steel-mesh fence with ivy and the</p>	<p>Discussions would take place with adjacent property owners, regarding the steel-mesh fence.</p> <p>The issue of planting and height would be discussed with all property owners.</p> <p>A drainage system would be in place and this was being worked on.</p> <p>The GCP was working with the County Council on the adoption process and was working on the landscape</p>

		<p>verge with species rich grass may be an improvement, the length and height of the fencing is of concern.</p> <p>To safeguard the residents' privacy the height of the steel-mesh fence must be 3m which according to the project team is available.</p> <p>The sloping verge requires a drainage construction towards the private property boundaries along the full length of the intended fencing due to the high water level surroundings. Both 1 and 2 will be maintained by the Highways</p> <p>None of the private fences will be removed.</p> <p>Most of all – to create interest in this long fence we request that a tree of 3-4m height will be placed in the verge at every other panel.</p> <p>On the request of the HRARA, please can the Joint Assembly recommend that the above points be incorporated in the Final Histon Road Design, to be discussed at the next LLF meeting and the Executive Board meeting on December 6 2018?</p>	<p>design.</p> <p>Assurance was provided that no fences would be taken away.</p>
--	--	---	--

This page is left blank intentionally.