



**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 29 June 2023

2:00 p.m. – 4:45 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
-----------------------------	------------------------

### Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson

Deputy Mayor Anna Smith	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
-------------------------	---

### Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Daniel Clarke	Strategy and Partnerships Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Lynne Miles	Director of City Access (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Election of Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Milnes, seconded by Andy Neely and resolved unanimously that Councillor Meschini be elected Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the 2023/24 municipal year.

## 2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Davey, seconded by Andy Williams and resolved unanimously that Councillor Milnes be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the 2023/24 municipal year.

## 3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Mayor Dr Nik Johnson (substituted by Deputy Mayor Anna Smith). The Chairperson reported that, with the agreement of the other voting members of the Board, they had decided to exercise discretion available to them to interpret Standing Orders and suspend them if necessary to allow the Deputy Mayor to attend as substitute for The Mayor when he was unable to attend.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillors Davey and Milnes to the Executive Board, and expressed thanks to former Executive Board members Councillors Dave Baigent and Bridget Smith. She also noted that Councillor Alex Beckett had replaced Councillor Neil Gough as the County Council's substitute member.

## 4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Davey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 9 (Greater Cambridge Greenways: Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives), as a resident of Riverside.

Councillor Davey declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Camcycle).

## 5. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 9 March 2023, were agreed as a correct record, and were signed by the Chairperson.

## 6. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that nine 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 9 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives), and eight questions related to agenda item 10 (Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy).

## 7. 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 8 June 2023, and the extraordinary joint meeting of the Executive Board and Joint Assembly held on 26 June 2023.

## 8. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, and which included details of a proposal to undertake a procurement exercise to provide the GCP with specific legal support for the programme.

Highlighting the Joint Assembly's endorsement of the procurement proposal, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly drew attention to a member's request for an update on the Chisholm Trail and a suggestion for greater prominence to be given to the GCP's work on skills. He also noted that members of the Joint Assembly had suggested additional strategic risks should be considered for inclusion in the risk register published in Quarterly Progress Reports.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council had a shared legal service and queried whether the GCP had considered using the same service. It was clarified that the GCP was required to follow the procurement process of its accountable body, the County Council, although it was emphasised that there were regular discussions with officers of the constituent authorities to identify and learn from their experiences and practices.
- Welcomed the data collated by the Centre for Business Research, which had identified a strong recovery of employment growth, particularly in the knowledge intensive sector.
- Welcomed the GCP's work with Cambridge City Council to build upon and expand the work of the City Portrait to demonstrate the economic impact of the Greater Cambridge region on the rest of the UK. It was noted that the University of Cambridge and various businesses had been working to identify their wider, non-economic contributions to the UK and rest of the world, particularly in health

outcomes, and it was suggested that such additional impacts could also be captured alongside the economic impacts.

- Observed an £8.411m underspend for the 2022/23 transport finance budget, as set out in Section 8.1 of the report, and requested an analysis of the variance.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the progress across the programme; and
- (b) Approve the proposal to undertake a procurement exercise to provide GCP specific legal support to the programme.

## 9. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives

One public question was received from Roxanne De Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out the Outline Business Cases for the Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives Greenways, as well as a proposed programme of delivery. Following a public engagement, various changes were proposed for the schemes, as set out in Sections 4.4 to 4.9 of the report.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised that the Joint Assembly's endorsement of the Outline Business Case acknowledged that further improvements would be made to the details of the individual schemes. Officers had been asked to consider how future reports could be improved to afford better scrutiny of the schemes on a granular level, and he drew attention to another request for a report to be presented at the next meeting on the issue of maintenance of the Greenways once they had been completed.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the difficulty in finding solutions to some issues that would satisfy everyone and emphasised the widespread eagerness for the Greenways to be completed as soon as possible.
- Clarified that a Full Business Case would continue to be developed alongside engagement with local members, resident associations and other interest groups, which would then be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for final approval. Notwithstanding, early works would begin on some sections of the routes where that was possible.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the results from the Public Engagement exercises, conducted during Q1 of 2023 and approve changes to scheme design resulting from the engagement, as set out in the report;
- (b) Agree the Outline Business Cases for the Bottisham, Swaffhams and St Ives Greenways;
- (c) Agree to the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers for land where section 26 Highways Act 1980 powers cannot be used;
- (d) Agree the programme of delivery for Bottisham, Swaffhams and St Ives Greenways;
- (e) Agree to finalise schemes for construction and complete Full Business Cases for the Bottisham, Swaffhams and St Ives Greenways; and
- (f) Agree the Wayfinding concept design following the completed public poll.

## 10. Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy

Eight public questions were received from William Bannell, David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), Richard Wood (on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users), Ian Black, Sarah Hughes (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance), Miranda Fyfe (on behalf of Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone), Dr Mike More, and Roxanne De Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Director of City Access presented the report, which detailed the methodology and process of the second Making Connections consultation, which ran from 17 October 2022 to 23 December 2022, and its headline findings, which were drawn from over 24,000 responses to a public survey, demographically representative opinion polling, written submissions from organisations in the Cambridge travel-to-work-area, targeted meetings with representative and seldom-heard groups, and a series of in-person and virtual engagement events. These findings, summarised in Section 6 of the report and set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report, had led to the identification of a range of themes and concerns to be addressed, including whether to change any of the core parameters of the scheme, whether to change any of the rules about who was required to pay and under what circumstances, and whether to change any of the benefits that the scheme would deliver.

The Joint Assembly considered these potential changes to the Making Connections proposals on 8 June 2023, but felt it had insufficient information on the likely impacts of any changes and asked for additional information to be provided to the Board. Alongside this information, set out in Section 8 of the report, three illustrative scenarios were developed to demonstrate the potential impact of various proposed

changes, which were considered at an extraordinary joint meeting of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on 26 June 2023. The Executive Board received a presentation on the consultation, potential changes to the proposals, and the illustrative scenarios, which was published on the [meeting website](#) and attached at Appendix B of the signed minutes.

Noting the Joint Assembly's extensive discussions about the Making Connections consultation and proposals at both meetings, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised that members agreed the process of multiple consultations and engagements over the years had culminated in the development of a set of proposals that sought to address the City Deal's underlying objectives and the needs of Greater Cambridge. However, the Joint Assembly had been concerned about issues raised during the consultation and asked officers to consider how the proposals could be amended to attract wider support, and what impact such changes would have on the proposed improvements to the public transport and active travel networks. While members had not settled on a defined final set of proposals, they agreed that doing nothing was not an option.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Paid tribute to the people who participated in the consultation that amassed a valuable data set, noting that over 24,000 people and over 100 organisations had provided feedback. While members expressed concern about the polarising effect of the proposals, they welcomed the varied opinions that had been received and argued that there was a large middle-ground that could be expanded if the proposals were suitably changed. It was noted that various parameters, such as the age and location of respondents, demonstrated differing levels of support between certain demographics.
- Drew attention to the consultation's alignment with the Gunning Principles and emphasised the extensive consideration that had been given by both officers and members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board to the feedback from the consultation. Members welcomed the positive, independent review of the consultation that had been carried out by the Constitution Institute.
- Observed that while only 34% of respondents had indicated support for the STZ as proposed, 70% of respondents had supported the proposed improvements to bus services. It was therefore important to find a way to modify the overall package of measures in a way that did not undermine the proposed bus improvements that were so widely supported. Members also noted larger businesses were generally more supportive of the proposals than smaller businesses, and emphasised the need to mitigate the impacts of expected levels of growth across the region.
- Welcomed the extensive discussions that had been held by the Joint Assembly about the consultation's outcomes and the possible changes to the Making Connections proposals. Members noted that they had also received a significant level of correspondence from people on various issues related to the proposals.

- Acknowledged that too many concerns had been raised with the original proposals during the consultation for them to be progressed unchanged, and it was noted that the Joint Assembly had reached the same conclusion. Members suggested that a combination of some of the changes proposed in scenarios 1 and 2 were the most attractive options for making changes to the proposals and could increase the level of support. However, it was emphasised that the impacts on the proposed bus improvements of any changes to the proposals would have to be calculated to ensure they did not outweigh the benefits.
- Argued that a scheme without an Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ) had to remain an option while changes to the proposals were still being considered, noting that excluding the STZ would not equate to doing nothing as there were alternative funding mechanisms that could be investigated, although it was argued that such alternative funding or smaller scale of changes would be insufficient to resolve the current problems.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring the proposals did not disproportionately affect people on lower incomes or key workers and argued that consideration of inequalities should be the driving factor when deciding how to change the proposals. It was suggested that greater clarity was needed on how low-income exemptions would operate and who would be eligible.
- Acknowledged interest in workplace parking levies as a potential inclusion to the proposals, although it was suggested that they attracted less support than the proposed STZ, with significant costs usually being passed on to employees. It was also argued that workplace parking levies would fail to raise sufficient revenue to make the desired improvements to the public transport and active travel networks, while also failing to create space and reduce congestion on the roads.
- Highlighted the additional financial costs to driving that were often overlooked, such as spending time and petrol while searching for somewhere to park, as well as parking fees themselves. It was argued that small vans should not be charged a higher rate than large cars, as they both occupied the same amount of space on the road and contributed equally to congestion.
- Argued that outbound traffic had an impact on congestion as well as traffic heading into Cambridge and suggested that a free period per day or several free days per year could help overcome many of the issues raised in the consultation.
- Emphasised the need for improvements to the bus network, particularly for young people, who suffered restrictions to accessing education and employment and were often underrepresented in decision-making processes. Members highlighted the importance of providing clarity and detail of how the bus network would be improved, noting that building people's confidence in the GCP's ability to implement such changes was fundamental to increasing support for the wider package of measures, particularly given the unsatisfactory service offered by the current bus providers. It was emphasised that the changes would be implemented a few years before any charge was implemented, to allow people to become accustomed to the improved service and experiment with behavioural change.

- Argued that franchising and the subsequent public control of the routes, fares, frequencies, operating hours and other aspects of the service, would be fundamental for the proposals' success, and members emphasised the importance of ensuring people understood the benefits. It was noted that franchising, along with other aspects of bus reform, were a priority for the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, with an Outline Business Case for these reforms being developed to demonstrate how it could be funded and how it would operate. The Executive Board acknowledged the Mayor's vision of a fair and sustainable public transport and active travel network across the region and expressed support for the Combined Authority's ongoing network review. It was clarified that the aim was for proposals to be considered by the Combined Authority Board in November so that additional services could potentially be procured and operating in 2024.
- Observed that recommendation (d), unlike the other recommendations, did not include a timeline, and it was suggested that such an inclusion could strengthen the commitment to work with the Combined Authority and emphasise the urgency.

The following amendment to recommendation (d) was moved by the Chairperson and agreed unanimously (addition in bold):

- (d) Agree to work with the CPCA, as the Transport Authority, including the provision of resource, to input findings from the Making Connections consultation and technical work into the CPCA's work on bus reform and review of the bus network **by the Autumn**; and

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the feedback from the 2022 Making Connections consultation, including the public survey, the accompanying opinion polling, organizational submissions, and stakeholder meetings;
- (b) Informed by the feedback from the consultation, and the comments of the GCP Joint Assembly, note and comment on the range of scenarios for modifying the proposed scheme, set out in this paper in section 9;
- (c) Request that GCP officers work with Cambridgeshire County Council officers to develop the technical assessment needed to present an Outline Business Case for further consideration by the GCP Executive Board, and by Cambridgeshire County Council, in Autumn 2023.
- (d) Agree to work with the CPCA, as the Transport Authority, including the provision of resource, to input findings from the Making Connections consultation and technical work into the CPCA's work on bus reform and review of the bus network by the Autumn; and
- (e) Request that GCP officers develop proposals for the early introduction of a bus and sustainable travel package (as set out in section 11) based on the £50m of city deal funding provisionally allocated for this purpose, for decision at the GCP Executive Board meeting in December 2023.

## 11. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 28 September 2023, and noted the programme of meeting dates up to the end of 2024.

Chairperson  
28 September 2023

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 29 June 2023  
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation

From	Question	Answer
<p>William Bannell</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>I have read through the document pack for this meeting and would like to draw everyone's attention to and highlight section 9.8 on page 113 : "Doing nothing remains an option", and to put forward that this would be by far the most beneficial option for Cambridge moving forward, given all the reasons which have been made plain by businesses large and small, charities, employers and residents during the past 6 months or so.</p> <p>I am asking the GCP board to seriously consider using this option and to re-open the examination of alternate funding models, of which there are many, and I have written a short report detailing the various hypothetical means of raising revenue for the transport network which are simple, logical and fair, and would be preferable for everyone involved, including all of you on the GCP.</p> <p>The STZ is an unworkable, impossible prospect. Will you please drop the idea and allow me to submit my paper onto the public record for yours and everyone's consideration?</p>	<p>GCP Officers have been and continue to work on analysing the feedback we have received through last year's consultation, which alongside technical work is being used to inform Members' decisions as to how best to respond to the wishes and concerns of our communities.</p> <p>It is correct that "no STZ" remains an option, it is important to be clear that it is not a neutral option and, in itself, it has economic, business, environmental and equalities impacts to consider as set out in the paper</p> <p>Choosing not to progress the STZ would mean either doing nothing – the cost of which would be failure to deliver the changes and improvements to regional public transport and active travel which were strongly supported in the consultation, and which previous technical work has established the growing need for in our geography, or going back to previous ways and means of both raising money and delivering road space which have been sifted out in previous rounds of technical work, and proved less popular at previous consultations.</p>

		<p>It is now for the GCP Executive Board to consider the numerous options for scheme adaptation available to them and decide which, if any, to take forwards to the next stage of detailed analysis and design work.</p>
<p>David Stoughton on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>As politicians you will be aware of the concerns of young people about climate change. Many feel fearful about the future and it's a major source of stress that they don't feel enough is being done about it. So you are perhaps not surprised that approaching two-thirds of UNDER 24 year olds (61%) who responded to the GCP Making Connections consultation supported the introduction of a Sustainable Travel Zone and over three-quarters supported bus improvements and measures to support walking and cycling.</p> <p>What does this signify in political and environmental terms?</p> <p>First, the level of support for change among young people is very high, even though they were under-represented in the GCP consultation and the voices of most under 18 year olds were not heard at all.</p> <p>Second, young people voted decisively for a greener transport future, limiting the congestion and pollution that car use creates and expanding more sustainable forms of transport. Since they are your future workforce and council tax payers to ignore them seems unwise.</p>	<p>Mr Stoughton is correct that young people were much more likely to support the proposals put forward than average, and that the way forward will require balancing the opinions expressed by all ages and demographics, though of course the particular needs of young people warrant their own consideration.</p> <p>Young people and those in education have been and continue to be particularly affected by deteriorating public transport options in our locality, and we know that the quality and availability of public transport and active travel has a major role to play in young people's access to opportunities. Without financial intervention we can expect more services to be withdrawn in coming months and years as the commercial network struggles for financial viability.</p> <p>Many older residents, too, as well as those less able to afford private car travel, have a greater dependence on public transport and independent modes such as walking and cycling, which was reflected in the consultation responses.</p> <p>The status quo of increasing congestion, more car-</p>

	<p>Third, young people want safe, independent modes of travel - walking, cycling and taking the bus or train - not being ferried around in cars or stuck at home. However, freedom to walk has deteriorated sharply over recent decades, as car travel has grown and investment in walking has all but disappeared.</p> <p>Finally, have you considered future physical and mental health costs for children and young people of continuing car dependence? Motor traffic has eaten up open space, made playing out on streets too risky and severed communities. Whereas 62% of children were allowed to walk to school and cross roads independently in 1971, twenty years later only 23% could do so[i].</p> <p>Living Streets urges politicians to support young people's independent mobility and endorse the shift to a greener travel future. (299 words)</p> <p>[i] Hillman et al, 1991</p>	<p>dominated streets and environments, and air and noise pollution in heavily-trafficked areas, make Cambridge a less liveable and walkable city and this is what these proposals were designed to address. The Board is now asked to consider whether and how they can be modified to reflect concerns but still deliver meaningful improvements.</p>
<p>Richard Wood on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>I note that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is considering (Agenda pack 4.10)</p> <p>Free Days for Account Holders – there was a lot of interest in this and members were of the opinion it should be looked at in more detail.</p> <p>Whilst this should, indeed, be looked at in more detail, and could well improve the acceptability of the Making</p>	<p>You are right to point out that responding to issues raised in the consultation will, to varying extents, affect the benefits that can be delivered and this is one of the issues to consider in deciding how to move forward.</p> <p>The paper under discussion presents members with illustrative options for adapting the Making Connections proposals. Officers have offered a</p>

	<p>Connections proposals, it could reduce the funding available for the envisaged radical bus service improvements, thereby undermining the opportunities for modal shift.</p> <p>However, a road charge on every day of the week (with, perhaps, shorter hours on Sunday) would allow for 'any two days in seven' exemptions and discounts, and would be more equitable in removing discrimination against people who are unable to shift their journey patterns. It would also avoid the potential for optional car journeys being shifted to weekends, with the concomitant risk of significant increases to road traffic congestion on Saturdays and Sundays.</p> <p>This has important implications for car drivers considering sampling bus travel, quite probably initially experimenting with a weekend leisure journey by bus.</p> <p>With no road charge on Saturdays and Sundays, increased road traffic congestion would be likely to give rise to delays and unreliability in the envisaged improved weekend bus services. A poor passenger experience could trigger rejection of this crucial modal shift, not only for leisure journeys but for essential weekday journeys, too.</p> <p>Will Executive Board members commit to looking at the idea of 'Free days' and discounted days in the context of 7-day road charging?</p>	<p>range of adaptations which could be implemented in various ways or in different combinations, all of which would need to be subject to further work to allow a decision. Free Days of charge-free travel is one of these potential options for consideration, and the precise manner in which this could best be introduced to the scheme would subject to further consideration and analysis.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Ian Black Burwell resident</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No.10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Given the number of warnings about the adverse effects of the proposed Cambridge Congestion Charge that were described in many of the 1,000 written responses submitted by Cambridge businesses as part of the congestion charge consultation process, and which were from esteemed organisations such as Royal Papworth, Abcam, Cambridge Consultants, John Lewis, M&amp;S and Deloitte, my question is what plans do the council have to respond to the accurate data and real concerns expressed in those submissions, i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1 Will those written submissions be responded to individually or as a group?</li><li>2 When will your response be forthcoming?</li><li>3 What data can the council provide to dispute some of the claims in those letters, which suggest many small and large businesses will be forced to leave Cambridge altogether because of the adverse effect of the congestion charge costs impacting customers, employees and goods deliveries?</li></ol>	<p>GCP is grateful to all those organizations and individuals who engaged with us during the 2022 Making Connections consultation, as your views, concerns, and suggestions will be used to improve the proposals under consideration.</p> <p>We have published a Consultation Report in May which has analysed the salient points made in these submissions, and further in-depth analysis is ongoing to understand these views more closely. We will also continue to engage with local stakeholders throughout this process as any future version of the scheme needs to be informed and guided by local knowledge.</p> <p>We acknowledged written submissions when they are received. It is not standard practice to give individual responses to consultation submissions as they are the views of the organisation to be considered as part of the consultation report. We do very much thank all of the more than 24,000 people businesses and organisations who took the time to give their views. The business views in particular are being fed into analysis of potential business impacts, to understand what effects a scheme may have, maximise opportunities, and mitigate any adverse effects. This work would continue at the next stage.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The GCP has put forward three alternative road charge scenarios as potential ways to respond to the consultation survey.</p> <p>Scenario 1 would nearly halve the funds available to spend on bus services and improvements to walking, wheeling and cycling (2031 figures) and Scenario 3 would reduce them even further. Scenario 2 maintains funding for sustainable transport, but does this because it is potentially the same as the consultation proposal in its steady state.</p> <p>The Making Connections 2022 consultation brochure stated that the project would “give people a realistic and reliable alternative to the car” and the improvements to buses, walking, wheeling and cycling set out in the consultation proposal were supported by 70% or more of consultation respondents. Many people we have spoken to would like to see even better buses (particularly in rural areas) and further investment in active travel.</p> <p>It is hard to see how the Making Connections future transport vision, which a large majority would like to see, could be achieved, however, if funding from the road charge reduces by half or more. Any new scenario must also respond to the concerns raised in the consultation; the GCP has said it will listen.</p> <p>We would like to encourage further discussion of scenarios that could produce levels of funding for public and active transport that are at, near or above those in the</p>	<p>Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 are intended to be illustrative only, as indications of what different forms of adaptations to the scheme may look like and what the implications may be for scheme impacts. There will be further work to be done to reach a preferred option if the Board ask us to do so; and these scenarios are not exhaustive.</p> <p>There is a balance to be struck in responding to concerns raised in the consultation responses about potential negative impacts of the proposals, including road charging, while at the same time responding to the strong support expressed for improvements to public transport and active travel. As the range of opinions expressed during the consultation was wide, we recognise that people will have a wide range of views as to the right balance of response.</p> <p>All adaptations will carry some consequences for the shape of the scheme which is deliverable, but our commitment remains to delivering a meaningful change to public transport and sustainable travel investment compared with the status quo if the board decide they wish to proceed to consider it.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>consultation proposal, yet also respond to the concerns raised in the consultation survey. An example scenario might be if the Sustainable Travel Zone applied 7 days a week and account holders were allocated a certain number of free days a year (for example 104) for use whenever they saw fit.</p> <p>Could the GCP commit to modelling this and other scenarios that do not reduce funding for sustainable transport but also respond to consultation feedback?</p>	
<p>Miranda Fyfe on behalf of Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Your bus improvement proposals list “fare subsidies” first, stating that £1/£2 singles would cost £16-£20 million. However, consultation responses show that frequency and reliability of services is a bigger concern than cost. Your report talks of “ensuring the bus is a more attractive financial option than the car” as being only possible when a £5 STZ charge is imposed. But for many journeys that people do right now it is already the case that existing, unsubsidised bus fares are cheaper than equivalent journeys by car.</p> <p>For example, my journey to Cambourne is a round-trip of 29 miles; using the recommended figure of 45p per mile, that’s £13 in car running costs; whereas, the DayriderPlus bus fare is only £7. Better than that, Stagecoach offer discounted Flexi tickets, sold as bundles of 5 or 10 valid for 12 months – so even infrequent bus users can benefit – costing just £4.75 each for those who will use 10 DayriderPlus tickets in a year. And if I were travelling from Haverhill, it’d be that same price on the bus, though double</p>	<p>The responses to bus improvement questions in the consultation indeed show the importance of efficient and reliable bus services as a top priority for our residents, although affordability was also emphasised.</p> <p>“Fast, high frequency services” were identified as the single most popular priority for bus improvements chosen in the questionnaire, with “cheaper fares” next. In the demographically representative poll component of the consultation, “cheaper fares” was the most popular choice, with “fast, high frequency services” in third place.</p> <p>Fare subsidies are also part of the package that could be delivered quickly to support people with the cost of living crisis in the short term, and an element in ensuring that the package is broadly progressive.</p> <p>You are right to point out that bus fares often</p>

	<p>the car costs; even at 60mpg, the fuel alone would be £7. Yet your proposed, expensively subsidised £1/£2 singles fare structure would nearly double that Haverhill to Cambourne return fare from £4.75 to £8.</p> <p>Using this realistic comparison between car running costs and bus fares, existing bus services are NOT “totally unaffordable”. Within the smaller Dayrider zone Flexi10 tickets are only £3 for all-day travel. If only more people knew about them! And the all-day nature of these tickets addresses trip-chaining issues too.</p> <p>Instead of £1/£2 single fares, please will the Board prioritise in their bus package:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- widely publicising existing Flexi ticket options</li> <li>- expanding the Dayrider fare zone</li> <li>- promoting realistic comparisons between bus fares and car running costs?</li> </ul>	<p>compare favourably to the total running costs of cars, but the behavioural evidence shows that most people in their day to day decision making will not account for the fixed costs of their car (which they consider sunk), only the variable costs of fuel, parking and perhaps in future STZ charges.</p> <p>One crucial factor in encouraging the mode shift that will make transport sustainable for Greater Cambridge is presenting a public transport option which is clearly identifiable as more affordable than the private car on a day to day basis. This is why fares formed part of the original consultation proposal. The paper points out that, if revenues are decreased by amendments to the STZ then there will be choices about the appropriate balance of spend on fares vs on new or enhanced services.</p>
<p>Dr Mike More, Chair of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>We know the challenges which congestion in Cambridge causes. Many staff and patients tell me how their journeys to and from hospital are made more difficult by being stuck in traffic or not being able to rely on public transport to get them home.</p> <p>As NHS hospitals on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, we support the move to more sustainable transport options and welcome the interventions already being made to improve journeys – such as the Cambridge South station,</p>	<p>The GCP shares your view that access to Cambridge’s hospitals must be improved by the Making Connections proposals. Patients, visitors, and staff need to feel confident they can make their journeys in a reliable and timely manner, and this will become increasingly difficult in the face of increasing journey numbers and congestion, and the absence of a fully-functional public transport solution. The consultation responses identified healthcare access as a key concern to many in Greater Cambridge, and our proposals are being adapted to place even</p>

a new park and ride site, new busway and new cycleways. But these interventions alone will not be enough.

In this context, finding the right travel solution for patients, staff and visitors to NHS organisations on the Campus is critically important. For example, many patients and their visitors are unfamiliar with coming to Cambridge; staff are concerned about the impact of a potential road user charge and whether there will be reliable alternatives; and all at a time when as NHS hospitals we face significant recruitment and retention challenges. To meet these challenges, something needs to be done to reduce congestion while providing reassurance that any proposed measures improve the situation for everyone and are fair.

This leads me to my questions. We understand that the Making Connections proposals are likely to change in response to feedback. Could you please explain how the benefits outlined last year can still be delivered if the proposals are significantly reduced? How do you ensure the commitments to provide 20 hour-a-day bus services, subsidised fares, and more services to more places can still be achieved if the plans change? I ask this so I am able to reassure NHS staff and patients, who have genuine concerns about the impact of a Sustainable Travel Zone, that the scheme will help them travelling for work and treatment.

greater emphasis on finding a fair and workable solution.

As you mention, GCP and other partners are already working on a number of interventions to improve access to the site, and the Making Connections scheme will be a step-change improvement on top of this. The proposals as published ahead of the consultation emphasised new services and extended hours of operation to make workers' commutes simpler and easier, as well as discounts, exemptions, and reimbursements aimed at the most vulnerable patients.

We understand the concerns which many feel workers have regarding the current travel arrangements - we would like to assure them that investment in the bus and cycling network through Making Connections would make a profound difference to their commute. By cutting congestion, the expanded bus system would become more reliable and available for 20 hours of the day, including making P&R facilities available to those working shifts that begin or end outside the current operating hours, while improved cycling and walking infrastructure will make it easier and safer to get around.

The adaptations Officers have now presented to the Executive Board also include options which specifically address issues around the hospitals site, and would potentially extend the reimbursements to all patients and visitors. All adaptations will carry some consequences for the shape of the scheme

		<p>which is deliverable, but our commitment remains providing better and more sustainable access to the site to all those making journeys there.</p>
<p>Roxanne De Beaux on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>There was a strong call in the Making Connections consultation for walking, wheeling and cycling improvements. 80% of respondents supported making the city more accessible for disabled people, 75% supported more secure cycle parking, 73% supported more cycling and walking connections and 72% supported additional funding for maintenance and improvements to footways and cycleways. GCP modelling suggests that if a Sustainable Travel Zone was implemented, it would result in over 50,000 additional daily walking and cycling trips.</p> <p>However, there is no need to wait until then to make improvements to enable more people to choose active travel. While Camcycle believes it is vital to ringfence 20% of STZ revenue for walking and cycling, there is also an urgent need to deliver quick wins. The GCP recognises the importance of preparing the bus network before STZ implementation, and should do the same for active travel.</p> <p>This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resurfacing of damaged footways and cycleways</li> <li>• Widening of paths to meet national guidance and reduce pedestrian-cycle conflict</li> <li>• Removal of exclusionary barriers and pinch-points including the redesign of the barrier on King’s Parade</li> </ul>	<p>You are right that there is clear support from the public for the walking, wheeling and public realm elements of the Making Connections proposals. GCP is committed to making Greater Cambridge a better and easier place to walk, wheel, and cycle, and revenue raised from the Sustainable Travel Zone would be intended to support continuing improvements and maintenance of cycling, walking and wheeling infrastructure. The precise balance and detail of investment remains to be defined, in part on the basis of the response to this consultation.</p> <p>All of the consultation evidence will form part of the evidence base that supports future decision making on how the sustainable travel fund should be best invested if some form of the Making Connections proposals proceed.</p> <p>Beyond the Making Connections proposals which form the focus of this meeting, wider work is taking place at GCP to improve the experience and options for active travel in our area. This includes other City Access workstreams such as a Road Network Hierarchy Review for Cambridge, which takes a whole-city approach to understanding which routes and areas can be prioritised for place-making and active travel, including pedestrians. An update on</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Improvement of junctions through measures such as the installation of continuous footways and the adjustment of signals to make sure they prioritise people walking and cycling</li><li>• Installation of more secure cycle parking in public spaces and on residential streets</li><li>• Behaviour change support such as free or low-cost cycle training, cargo bike hire and e-bike loan schemes.</li></ul> <p>Will the Board commit to selecting STZ options that deliver an equal or greater income for active travel than the consultation proposal, that ringfence 20% for walking and cycling, and that begin in 2023/24 with a package of active travel quick wins?</p>	<p>RNHR is planned for later this year.</p> <p>Elsewhere across the Transport Programme, GCP is committed to improving active travel in the Greater Cambridge area, and this includes walking and wheeling as well as cycling. In the proposed budget for the March 2023 Executive Board, around £125m was allocated to active travel projects.</p> <p>GCP is following the Active Travel Hierarchy that is adopted within the Active Travel Strategy for the County Council, this puts pedestrians at the top of the Hierarchy, and our schemes are designed taking this into account. We are providing for pedestrians across the Greenways network through reduction in speeds in urban areas to improve general safety, improvements to multiple crossings across the network and in some areas providing better segregation such as along Cowley Road, Milton Road and Histon Road.</p> <p>With regards to the allocation of potential revenues from the Making Connections scheme, it will be for the Executive Board to determine what the right balance should be, drawing upon what we have heard in the consultation, ongoing engagement with our communities, and detailed technical work to be carried out at the next stage if the scheme proceeds.</p>
--	--	--

Roxanne De  
Beaux on behalf  
of Camcycle

**Agenda Item No. 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways:  
Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives**

Camcycle believes that, overall, there are just too many sections of the Greenway designs that are not just poor quality, but inappropriate for people of all ages and abilities and potentially dangerous. The Ditton Lane junction, the route through Swaffham Bulbeck, High Ditch Road, the Quy hotel access road, the Stow Road and Anglesey Abbey crossings, and the narrow, shared-use path on Riverside will not meet the objectives of the Greenways and fail to meet national design standards.

On Riverside, the previous improvements to the western section should be used as a template for the eastern section. These provided additional space for people walking, a quiet street for cycling and rationalised parking. The current GCP proposals fail to recognise the huge opportunity to improve facilities for pedestrians and reduce conflict in this residential area. By not designing suitable networks for people walking, it is also compromising the quality of the cycle routes. The GCP have responded to many of the concerns raised by dismissively stating that 'This would be outside of the scope of the route'. The GCP should look at rationalising parking on Riverside (as it has done elsewhere on the Greenway schemes) to meet the project's objectives of better walking, wheeling and cycling routes for all.

Regrettably, given the long delay on these much-needed schemes, we ask the Board to refuse to endorse the current proposals, and instruct officers to start engaging properly with parish councils, local communities and other

The GCP welcomes CamCycle's continued interest and involvement in the design workshops that they have attended on the Greenways. The schemes seek to find a compromise between meeting design standards such as LTN1/20, local environmental constraints and the needs of all users, including pedestrians. However, the Greenways should not be branded as potentially dangerous. All schemes are subject to independent Road Safety Audits that look at the safety for all users.

At the Joint Assembly officers committed to looking at specific sections in detail and ensuring updates were provided at the final sign off of the Executive Board (at Full Business Case). They included:

1. The Ditton Lane junction - As previously discussed, installing an underpass would be cost prohibitive due to the numerous utilities in the vicinity of the existing carriageway. A high-level estimate for installing this feature would be circa £4million pounds and add up to 18 months to the programme. Our design team looked at three alternative designs to the underpass and selected the best alternative junction option, which is the current proposal. We have committed to reviewing this again at Detailed Design.
2. The route through Swaffham Bulbeck - Following the engagement process, GCP met

	<p>key stakeholders to co-create high-quality schemes that deliver for everyone and meet the Greenways objectives.</p>	<p>with the County Council, District Council, and Parish Council on site to discuss the issues raised. Our design team is exploring the option of rerouting the Greenway to make it more cycle and equestrian friendly. When the proposed route is finalised this will be subject to Executive Board sign off at Full Business Case.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. High Ditch Road – The proposed junction improvements are to improve visibility and the realignment of the shared use path adjacent to carriageway is to make crossing the carriageway safer.</li><li>4. The Quay hotel access road- The proposed section is designed to ensure both active travel users and hotel guests and staff using the same access are considered.</li><li>5. Stow Road and Anglesey Abbey crossing – The crossing points at these locations mean cyclists may have to dismount. However, there is provision for a 3-metre wide refuge island to ensure safety for cargo bikes etc.</li><li>6. Shared-use path on Riverside- Reference the previous footpath scheme to the western section, there isn't enough room to continue this throughout the Riverside section. GCP met with The Riverside resident's association on site to discuss this. It was stated that parking should remain, but GCP stated that enforcement issues regarding existing issues</li></ol>
--	--	--

		<p>are outside the scope of the scheme. GCP are looking at the option of installing a two-way cycle access from Stourbridge common to reduce the potential conflict between NMU users.</p>
--	--	--