

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly held on
Thursday, 14 June 2018 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Councillor Tim Wotherspoon | Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairman) |
| Councillor Tim Bick | Cambridge City Council (Vice-Chairman) |
| Councillor Nicky Massey | Cambridge City Council |
| Councillor Kevin Price | Cambridge City Council |
| Councillor Noel Kavanagh | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Councillor John Williams | 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 |
| Helen Valentine | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Christopher Walkinshaw | Cambridge Ahead |
| Dr John Wells | Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute |
| Andy Williams | AstraZeneca |

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

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Councillor Ian Bates, GCP Transport Portfolio Holder | Cambridgeshire County Council |
|--|-------------------------------|

Officers:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Mike Davies | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Beth Durham | Communications Manager, Greater Cambridge Partnership |
| Niamh Matthews | Head of Strategy and Programme, Greater Cambridge Partnership |
| Rachel Stopard | Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership |
| Peter Blake | Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership |
| Kathrin John | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Victoria Wallace | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon was **ELECTED** Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

Councillor Kevin Price as the outgoing Joint Assembly Chairman expressed his thanks to

Joint Assembly members and to Councillor Wotherspoon for his support as Vice Chairman. He thanked officers for their help, advice and guidance during his time as Chairman and thanked members of the public for their engagement with the Greater Cambridge Partnership during this time.

The new members of the Joint Assembly; Jo Sainsbury, Heather Richards and Councillors Massey, Sollom, Topping and Wilson were welcomed.

2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Tim Bick was **ELECTED** Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon thanked the former members of the Joint Assembly for their work during their term as members of the Joint Assembly and passed on the Joint Assembly's best wishes for a swift recovery to former Joint Assembly member, Councillor Kevin Cuffley.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 28th February 2018 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

- Replacing the figure '200,000' with '20,000' on page 5 of the minutes in relation to the additional jobs planned in the west and to the south of Cambridge.

6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman informed the Joint Assembly that ten public questions had been received, nine of which would be taken at the meeting under agenda items 8, 10 and 12.

7. PETITIONS

The Chairman notified the Joint Assembly that a petition had been received regarding Histon Road, asking to 'implement a 20 mph speed limit for the lower part of Histon Road and a night time HGV Traffic Control Order'. The petition contained more than 50 signatures but had not reached the required 500 signatures to be formally considered by the Joint Assembly.

8. GCP TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Edward Leigh was invited to ask his public question. The details of this and a summary of the response are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which provided an update on the work to further define the public transport elements of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's transport strategy, and provided a reminder of the range of schemes under development.

The Joint Assembly discussed the report and made the following points:

- Cllr Williams pointed out that the main mode of public transport at least in the short term was the bus, the main difficulty with which was deregulation. Even if the Mayor chose to pursue franchising, this would take a long time to achieve. Therefore a way had to be found to work with Stagecoach and other bus operators for the Greater Cambridge Partnership to achieve what was set out in the report. It was felt that the report was light on detail in relation to this.
- The report highlighted that public transport journey times, even for short journeys, were appalling. This made the car a more attractive option even for short journeys. Councillor Williams suggested that as the precedent had been set by the Greater Cambridge Partnership subsidising the Park and Rides, until demand management measures were brought in the GCP should be prepared to subsidise an enhanced bus services from areas with poor bus journey times, so that the shift from car to public transport could be made.
- Councillor Kavanagh supported the intention to trial autonomous on demand vehicles on the southern section of the Busway between the railway station and Trumpington Park and Ride, via Addenbrooke's. However he raised concern for safety along the proposed route; it was thought this was getting more dangerous due to cyclists and walkers being directly alongside buses, with no barrier between them. Councillor Kavanagh requested that the Greater Cambridge Partnership put aside funds to make this stretch of route safer as it due to its success, it was only going to get busier with cyclists and pedestrians.
- The creation of the Bus User Group was supported and their input to the Greater Cambridge Partnership was welcomed and encouraged.
- Councillor Price pointed out that although the Mayor was not in favour of buses, the Joint Assembly recognised that they had a part to play.
- Making effective use of buses was essential in the short term at least. However Councillor Topping felt the GCP needed to look further into the future on the concept of mobility as a service, making use of IT systems that made the best use of bus routes to collect the most number of people on a route. Councillor Topping urged the Greater Cambridge Partnership to work with private sector partners such as the science parks in South Cambridgeshire, who were currently spending nearly a £1 million a year on providing travel for their employees from the railway station to the science hubs, to make better use of bus services. Councillor Topping suggested that these companies wanted to work with bus companies and the GCP on the concept of mobility as a service.
- Christopher Walkinshaw felt that the report did not recognise the part that cars needed to play in an integrated plan, especially outside the city. More needed to be made of this and the opportunity to interchange between the car and other modes of transport.
- Councillor Bick highlighted the importance of services and suggested that weekend travel should also be factored in, as this was just as much a part of the economy as weekday travel and also created congestion.
- Helen Valentine felt that the graphs in the report were alarming and reinforced CAM Metro as the only solution to the projected increase in traffic, as the problem could not be resolved just with buses and cycling.
- Councillor Massey emphasised the need to reduce the cost of public transport which she felt was currently unaffordable for the regular user, with the car being the cheaper option. This needed to be addressed.
- Councillor Sollom felt that the report was missing case studies and lessons learned from other parts of the world that had tried to execute an equivalent level of mode shift to that which the GCP was trying to achieve.
- Councillor Wilson pointed out that sixth form students travelling to Hills Road and Long Road colleges by car needed to be taken into account in the scale of the challenge

outlined in the report. Due to the lack of bus services from villages outside the city, many of these students drove into the city to attend college in order to reduce their journey times.

- Councillor Kavanagh thought that while a lot was being done for cycling, a lot more could be done and that the aim should be to have a cycling network similar to that of the Netherlands. A large number of people were already cycling however more would cycle when it was made safer and there was a more comprehensive network of segregated cycle routes and safer junctions.

In response to the points raised, the Transport Director responded:

- While cycling was key, the report focussed on public transport.
- It was acknowledged that the bus should be part of the GCP's plans. The GCP wanted to work with partners to deliver the CAM metro system however this would not cover the whole of the GCP's area. Buses were therefore integral and needed to be made as attractive as possible.
- Members were assured that mobility as a service was being addressed under the GCP's Smart theme.
- It was recognised that the existing public transport network focussed on the city centre, but people needed to get to areas such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
- The GCP's information would be fed into the Combined Authority's bus review.
- Cost and fares would need to be a consideration. The GCP had found that cost was not a driver for commuters but the GCP needed to ensure students and off peak commuters were catered for.

Councillor Wotherspoon referred to London's franchised bus system, the cost of which was £500-600 million per year.

9. A428 CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE

A paper on the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge had been withdrawn from the agenda due to a pause requested in the Mayoral Interim Transport Statement, as agreed at the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority meeting on 30 May 2018. This decision was deferred until October 2018.

10. MILTON ROAD

Anne Hamill, Michael Page, Barbara Taylor and Maureen Mace were invited to ask their questions. Nick Flynn and Erik de Visser were unable to attend to ask their questions. Details of the questions and a summary of the response are provided in Appendix A to the minutes.

Jocelynn Scutt, Chair of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum, was invited to address the Assembly and made the following points:

- The Milton Road LLF was generally pleased with the plans coming forward for Milton Road. Ms Scutt paid tribute to the residents, residents' associations, Camcycle and the GCP and County Council officers and consultants for their work on the scheme.
- General appreciation was expressed for the plans and the importance of consultation with local residents was emphasised.
- There were still some concerns regarding the scheme, which were:
 - Concern regarding crossings; there was a wish for a crossing at Downhams Lane. An issue regarding the Westbrook Centre was highlighted and it was

- requested that attention be paid to this.
- The length of bus lanes.
- Floating bus stops in relation to the elderly and people with disabilities.
- Issues with the positioning of bus stops
- Buses failing to stop
- A request had been put to Andy Campbell of Stagecoach to pay attention to the B bus on Histon Road.
- The protection of verges.
- The LLF wanted to work closely with GCP officers on residents parking.

It was felt that there had been a real recognition of the importance of public consultation regarding the Milton Road scheme.

The Greater Cambridge Partnership Transport Director presented the report, which set out the preferred option design for Milton Road. This met the original objectives of the scheme and took into account the considerable public engagement that had taken place. The Joint Assembly was informed that:

- The technical work on the Downham Lane proposal was ongoing.
- The removal of residents parking would form part of the public consultation.
- The existing bus lane was being reduced in size. Additional lanes were going to be on the outward bound side. This was to improve bus services which would still be needed after the introduction of the CAM Metro.

Joint Assembly members discussed the report and made the following points:

- Councillor Price pointed out that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to prevent parking on verges, had been successful in other areas such as Kings Hedges. A TRO for Milton Road had recently been applied for, but had been unsuccessful. Councillor Price suggested that a TRO should be part of the plans and proposals going forward for Milton Road, to ensure there was no parking on verges.
- Councillor Bick raised concern regarding the absence of sufficient crossing points along Milton Road, which exaggerated the separation of the community across the road and did not provide enough crossing points for cyclists to enable them to use the directional cycle lanes. It was felt that due to the lack of crossings, the project did not achieve as much for cyclists and pedestrians as it could.
- Councillor Massey queried how cyclists having to give right of way to pedestrians on the 3m shared use pavement referred to in paragraph 3.14 of the report, would be managed. In response to this the Transport Director pointed out that all road users had a responsibility to respect each other and that the vast majority were respectful.

Joint Assembly members supported the suggestion of a Traffic Regulation Order forming part of the plans and proposals for Milton Road going forward.

11. CITY ACCESS

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which provided an update on work to explore a number of options for reducing congestion and improving air quality in and around Cambridge. The Joint Assembly discussed the report and members made the following points:

- Councillor Williams welcomed funds generated through demand management methods being used to improve public transport further by subsidising fares, routes, frequency and hours of operation, as well as being borrowed against. He emphasised the importance of the Park and Ride to the residents of the South Cambridgeshire villages that would never have a good public transport link to the city. He said that parking at the Park and Ride sites had to be free and hoped that there would be more

Park and Ride sites.

- Councillor Price welcomed the report which outlined the alternative ways of congestion charging. Councillor Price pointed out that he had originally been opposed to congestion charging as he felt that this penalised people who could not afford to live in Cambridge but worked in the city. It was highlighted that unless there was a good alternative public transport system, people would continue to use their cars and until there was such an alternative, people should not be penalised for having to use their cars to get into the city.
- Councillor Bick expressed reservation regarding trying to reduce congestion with a pollution tax, as this benefitted those who could afford to replace their vehicles with less polluting alternatives, while disadvantaging those who could not afford to do so. Any powers to use a pollution tax should be used to target commercial vehicles and buses as this would target businesses which could choose which vehicles to deploy.
- Councillor Topping urged that intelligent charging should not exacerbate the inequalities that existed around Cambridge, expressing concern that the proposals would inflict the most cost on those who could not afford to live in Cambridge but worked in Cambridge. It was questionable whether Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire had the critical mass needed in terms of population to make intelligent charging viable. Councillor Topping supported pollution charging which although was not a complete solution, may achieve buy-in from the public and persuade them that something needed to be done.
- Councillor Topping was pleased that parking was not being charged for at Park and Ride sites, but acknowledged and expressed concern that this cut off an income stream.
- Jo Sainsbury cautioned against doing too much work on physical demand management interventions as this was likely to alter traffic distribution and therefore skew public transport analysis. A clear programme of short, medium and long term studies and implementation would be welcomed in order to understand timescale, progression and impact.
- Helen Valentine requested that the Joint Assembly be able to see the early work on equality and fairness and queried whether there would be an intelligent approach to intelligent charging.
- Councillor Massey pointed out that the report did not discuss school traffic which accounted for 15% of peak time traffic. She suggested that private schools state in their contract with parents that children had to be picked up and dropped off at park and ride sites rather than at school, in order to reduce traffic.
- Councillor Wotherspoon reiterated the point made by Councillor Topping that Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire did not have the critical mass to make a congestion charge viable. Attention was drawn to the minutes of the previous meeting during which the position of South Cambridgeshire District Council's former Council against congestion charging was referred to, as was the FIA study on demand management.
- It was pointed out that the GCP's 'Big Conversation' had found that much better public transport would encourage mode shift, but improved public transport required more road space.

In response to the points raised by Joint Assembly members, the Transport Director clarified the following:

- Park and Ride was part of the public transport mix. The issue of charging for parking at Park and Ride sites needed to be part of a wider conversation.
- A real public transport alternative had to be in place before anything could be brought forward.
- Size and scale needed to be appropriate to the area being considered.
- The deliverability and benefit of any school traffic and transport measures, would

need to be explored and considered.

Joint Assembly members were broadly supportive of the proposals set out in the report and were in favour of work proceeding on this.

12. GREENWAYS

Wendy Blythe was invited to ask her public question, the details of which and a summary of the response given are provided in Appendix A to the minutes.

Councillor Rod Cantrill was invited to address the Joint Assembly. In response to Councillor Cantrill's concerns regarding respect of the existing streetscape, Councillor Cantrill was assured that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was committed to there being no removal of verge trees on Barton Road.

Mike Davies presented the report which provided an update on the progress of the creation of a network of Greenways and the key issues. Funding had been allocated over a two year period to develop 12 Greenways. A bottom up approach was being used in order to maximise buy-in. 25 public events had been held to inform the routes for public consultation. Barton and Haslingfield would be the first route for consultation. Assurance was provided that there were no proposals to remove cobbles or historic features.

Joint Assembly members discussed the report and raised the following points:

- Councillor Kavanagh welcomed the Greenways initiative. He welcomed the reference to The Tins path route and bridge on this route, highlighting that the bridge had been a significant danger to cyclists and pedestrians particularly in freezing conditions. A possible new bridge was welcomed.
- Councillor Williams raised the maintenance of greenways as an issue. The path at the back of Fulbourn Tesco was given as an example where low hanging trees and undergrowth coming from Network Rail's side of the fence, had made the path virtually impossible to negotiate. Councillor Williams highlighted that it had been very challenging trying to get Network Rail to do anything about this. Councillor Williams highlighted that there was no money in the budget to maintain routes and asked that it was ensured that budget was assigned to the maintenance of greenways and suggested that a maintenance plan was needed.
- Councillor Williams requested that a safe crossing at Yarrow Road and the roundabout be ensured, as there were no safety facilities for cycling here and it was dangerous for cyclists to negotiate the roundabout. Officers provided assurance that this would be looked at.
- Councillor Williams suggested that a decent cycle route from Cherry Hinton North to the greenway was needed. In response to this, officers advised that Section 106 negotiations regarding Cherry Hinton were underway, covering cycleways and greenways.
- Councillor Topping queried whether the GCP was confident that cycle paths would not need to be widened in future, as this would raise issues with budget and land ownership. In response to this officers advised that path width was a matter for public consultation. It was likely that there would be a 3.5m wide tarmac path with a green strip alongside for horse riders and ramblers.
- Councillor Topping welcomed safe cycleways linking villages, which were needed in order to encourage mode shift.
- Councillor Sollom welcomed the public engagement that had taken place with villages regarding the Barton/Haslingfield greenway, however pointed out that Grantchester had not felt sufficiently involved. Villages in between routes needed to be engaged with. Councillor Sollom highlighted that a connection to the Cambridge Biomedical

Campus via the greenway was also needed. Councillor Sollom suggested that Comberton and Barton would be well served by the link to Trumpington in order to access the Biomedical Campus and asked if this could be considered in future phases.

- Councillor Wilson raised flooding of the St Ives Greenway and queried the action taken to mitigate this. Officers advised that the Busway had been prone to flooding and the issue was recognised.
- Dr Wells pointed out that the quick wins map showed that infrastructure was being built that was not on the master plan.
- Councillor Bick expressed concern on behalf of Cambridge Past Present and Future, regarding minimal consultation taking place on quick win schemes. Cambridge Past Present and Future requested assurance that paths could not be widened without a planning application.
- Andy Williams suggested that more thought was needed regarding short term journey interconnectivity and the interconnectivity with travel hubs. The Joint Assembly was informed that AstraZeneca sponsored additional cuts of the greenways that its employees used, with other cuts carried out by local rangers led by Councillor Susan van de Ven. The need for greenways maintenance plans coming forward was re-iterated.

In response to the points raised, Mike Davies informed Joint Assembly members that:

- The Gough Way link could be included in the Comberton Greenway link, options for which were being formulated.
- The Tins Path bridge was owned by Network Rail; initial discussions with Network Rail had taken place.
- Maintenance of greenways was one of the project workstreams. It was recognised that this was an important element of the project. Commuted sums were being looked at for this and local ranger networks were being encouraged. Any sponsorship activities would be welcomed.
- S106 negotiations were underway for Cherry Hinton North.
- Path width would be looked at during public consultation.
- A 3.5m wide tarmac path with a grassy strip running alongside it for walkers and horse riders, was being considered for the Waterbeach Greenway.
- There was scope to suggest other routes as part of the public consultation.
- A consultation event had not been held in Cottenham.
- Flooding of the Busway was recognised as an issue, however addressing this was complex in relation to the Environment Agency.

Joint Assembly members indicated their broad support for the Greenways initiative.

13. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT STUDY

Tony Orgee, Chair of the Cambridge South East Transport Study Local Liaison Forum, was invited to address the Assembly. He provided an update following the 6th June meeting of the LLF:

- There was concern that closure of the central reservation at the Dean Road crossroads would lead to HGVs diverting to unsuitable roads through local villages in order to access the A1307 towards Cambridge. There were similar views about having no right turn (except for buses) out of Linton High Street with the Back Road being considered to be completely unsuitable to deal with increased traffic. The LLF therefore welcomed that the Dean Road crossroads proposal would be given further consideration and that the Linton High Street no right turn proposal would be re-evaluated.
- The LLF wanted further consideration be given to speed limits along the A1307 and there was much support for a single speed limit outside villages.

- It was felt that further work would be necessary in relation to safety at the Babraham crossroads and in cycleway access to Granta Park. The consultation included cycleways and a greenway that went close to Granta Park but with gaps of hundreds of yards to the actual site entrance. The LLF felt that it was important that local councillors and stakeholders should also be involved in the further work on these matters.
- There was a plea for landscaping to be an integral feature of designs and for ecological matters to be given appropriate consideration.
- There were particularly adverse comments about the greenway, focused on the present section of cycleway between Wandlebury and the roundabout entrance to the Babraham Research Campus. It was felt that this narrow section of cycleway immediately next to the A1307 did not meet the principles of a greenway and was dangerous for cyclists.
- The LLF was pleased to see progress and that some interventions could be implemented this financial year. The LLF strongly requested that local councillors and stakeholders (for example, parish councils, CPPF, Granta Park, The Gogs Shop) were actively involved in working up the details of the interventions.
- A representative of the Trumpington Residents Association made a statement at the LLF meeting that was strongly critical of the delay in making decisions on the strategies in the consultation.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the results of the public consultation on the Cambridge South East Transport Study. Joint Assembly members made the following comments:

- Councillor Williams pointed out that the proposed AgriTech development, which appeared on the maps at pages 109 and 110, had been refused planning permission. The maps would be amended to reflect this.
- Councillor Williams also pointed out that the consultation response regarding the Wandlebury multi-use underpass had been negative, however there was no explanation of this in the report. In response to this, the Project Manager informed members that the Wandlebury underpass was well supported overall, however some groups had queried the cost. It was explained that signals had been rejected as a solution to the road junction. This left the underpass as the only solution for crossing the high speed road, as a bridge would be visually unacceptable. In response to this, Councillor Williams suggested that underpasses were not well used and prone to flooding and he was concerned that a road safety issue would be caused with people choosing to cross the road rather than use the underpass.

14. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The GCP's Head of Strategy and Programme presented the report which updated the Joint Assembly on the progress across the GCP programme, GCP Communications and Engagement and the West of Cambridge Package – Park and Ride. In response to queries raised by Joint Assembly members in discussing the report, officers clarified the following:

- The Government had been slow to publish information regarding apprenticeships. The national trend was declining significantly. The Greater Cambridge area was likely to see a decline in apprenticeships but this was not expected to be as steep as in other areas of the country. As information was not to hand at the meeting, the Head of Strategy and Programme would inform members following the meeting of the average age of apprenticeships. The next phase of work would go into primary schools to promote apprenticeships.
- Information regarding the location of Smart Panels was not available at the meeting, but would be circulated to members following the meeting.

- The Joint Assembly was informed that work on autonomous vehicles was on track.
- At officer level, work was being shared and discussed between the GCP and Combined Authority.
- In response to a query regarding the principles to determine whether the GCP would fund a project, members were informed that the GCP would not provide funding for projects that would have happened anyway, without the GCP's intervention. The GCP received many applications for funding, all of which were assessed.
- The GCP Communications Manager explained the concept of a community sounding group and the rationale for establishing this. The group was in its formative stages.
- Members were informed that when the pause on the Cambourne to Cambridge project had been lifted, the GCP would engage with the Local Liaison Forum.

The Joint Assembly noted the Quarterly Progress Report.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 20 September 2018 at 2pm.

The Meeting ended at 4.57 p.m.
