

**GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Thursday 6th June 2019  
2:00pm – 4:55pm

PRESENT:

**Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly**

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Tim Bick (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Davey	Cambridge City Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Transversal
Jo Sainsbury	IMET
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Christopher Walkinshaw	Cambridge Ahead
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute
Dr Andy Williams	AstraZeneca

**Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance**

Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
---------------	-------------------

**Officers**

Tom Bennett	Head of Communications (GCP)
Peter Blake	Director of Transport (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## **1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

It was proposed by Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Sollom and resolved unanimously that Councillor Wotherspoon be elected Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly for the coming year.

The Chairperson expressed his gratitude to the Joint Assembly for his re-election before thanking former Joint Assembly member Councillor Dave Baigent and welcoming Councillor Mike Davey as a new member of the Joint Assembly, representing Cambridge City Council.

## **2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON**

It was proposed by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Sollom and resolved unanimously that Councillor Bick be elected Vice-Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly for the municipal year 2019/20.

The Chairperson thanked Councillor Bick for his support over the preceding twelve months and looked forward to working closely with him again in the coming year.

## **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kavanagh (Cambridgeshire County Council), Councillor Massey (Cambridge City Council) and Councillor Topping (South Cambridgeshire District Council).

Apologies were also received from Councillor Bates, who usually attended the meeting as the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board Transport Portfolio Holder.

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Davey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as an employee of Marshalls located on the east side of Cambridge.

Dr Andy Williams and Christopher Walkinshaw both declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Project Spring (item 12 refers) as the companies they worked for were participating in this initiative.

## **5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th February 2019 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following correction:

- Minute 7: GCP Future Investment Strategy – The last word on the 7th line of the 9th paragraph should be changed from ‘on’ to ‘one’.

Referring to the final paragraph of Minute 6, the Chief Executive reported that discussions on the feasibility of reflecting GCP's strategic thinking in guidance to planning authorities were ongoing. Details would be presented to the next meeting, on 12th September 2019.

## **6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that five public questions had been submitted and accepted. One of these questions had been subsequently withdrawn, while another question that related to item 8 on the agenda would receive a written response, as the questioner was unable to attend the meeting. It was agreed that the questioners for the remaining three questions would be called to address the Joint Assembly at the start of the relevant agenda item.

## **7. PETITIONS**

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

## **8. CITY ACCESS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS**

David Stoughton was invited to ask his public question, the details of which are set out in **Appendix A** to the minutes, along with a summary of the response.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which contained the findings from Choices for Better Journeys, a public engagement exercise established to determine people's views on the City Access project's aims to secure a step-change in public transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality in and around Cambridge. Attention was drawn to the four overarching principles and fourteen implementation principles that were listed in section 4.4 of the report, which were being proposed as a result of feedback from the public engagement exercise.

While discussing the report and the proposed principles, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the paper and the findings from the public engagement exercise, praising the contributions from participants and noting that it was now important for the Greater Cambridge Partnership to respond accordingly. Particular appreciation was extended to the usefulness of the charts and tables within the Choices for Better Journeys Summary Report. It was argued that the results demonstrated a significant alignment in thinking between public and private transport users, although caution was urged on how to interpret and act on the results.
- Expressed concern over the practice of bus companies transferring older vehicles in their fleet to Cambridge from other cities with stricter emission controls, noting that the chart in section 3.8 of the report demonstrated that local buses contributed 34% of road traffic nitrogen oxide pollution. It was suggested that the lack of a clean air zone encouraged bus companies to deploy older vehicles. Some members argued that the introduction of a clean air zone would bring Cambridge in line with many other cities across the country and would force bus companies to make improvements, while others

suggested that the principles should include specific mention of a need for an improvement in the standards and emission levels of public transport vehicles.

- Recognised the discordance between encouraging people to take more buses while the number of services was constantly decreasing.
- Suggested that when considering how to ensure it was cheaper to use public transport than private transport, particular attention should be given to families rather than just individuals.
- Agreed with the principle of improving public transport before any demand management scheme became operational, given the lack of viable alternatives for many people, but questioned whether that could be achieved or how it could be measured.
- Expressed support for a Citizens' Assembly but asked that members were involved in shaping its scope. The Chief Executive also expressed her support for the Citizens' Assembly and acknowledged that it would have been desirable for either the Assembly or Board to scrutinise the scope, but noted that it needed to be ready for September and that unfortunately this did not tie in with the meeting schedules. She would however look at ways of engaging members in the process.
- Reiterated the importance of considering transport in and out of Cambridge from towns and villages across the country, rather than just focusing on transport within in the city. The Joint Assembly was keen to ensure that such communities from outside the city were well represented on the Citizens' Assembly.
- Encouraged a greater level of transparency, given that substantial sums of money would be taken from people and they would want to be assured that the money was being well spent. It was noted that Transport for London adopted a high level of transparency when introducing congestion charges and bus changes, which had led to wider acceptance of the schemes.
- Sought clarification over whether there would be specific feedback from the focus groups with young people and those on a low income that were mentioned in section 2.1.1 of the report, noting the concern expressed by young people and their parents about transport to schools and colleges. The Head of Transport Strategy confirmed that the results would be forthcoming.
- Drew attention to the particular support from participants in the public consultation for more circular routes and suggested that this should be reflected in the list of principles.
- Expressed frustration that after four years of struggling to overcome congestion, the City Deal continued to be faced by the same problems and that major decisions were not being made. It was suggested that the first Gateway Review in December 2019 would need to demonstrate achievable solutions whose impacts were not jeopardised by political differences and conflict. The Chairperson noted the concerns but praised the work carried out so far and the momentum that it had built.

## **9. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH WEST TRAVEL HUB**

Councillor Sollom was invited to ask a public question on behalf of Hauxton Parish Council, as neither the Clerk nor Chairperson of the Council had been able to attend the meeting. The details of this and a summary of the response are attached as **Appendix A** to the minutes.

The Chairperson drew attention to a representation that had been submitted by Trumpington Residents' Association and circulated to all Joint Assembly members. The Director of Transport presented the report which provided an update on the progress of the West of Cambridge Package. It included the results of the public consultation and conclusion of the Outline Business Case undertaken on the Travel Hub Capacity options at J11 of the M11 and associated public transport / vehicular priority measures. The Joint Assembly was informed that the results favoured a park and ride site to the west of the M11, although there was opposition based on congestion issues and environmental impacts.

While considering the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Reiterated concerns over the negative impact that the project would have on towns and villages along the A10 and the importance of engaging with these communities throughout the design process, as indicated in section 4.8 of the report. Clarification was sought over how it would be ensured that such concerns were addressed.
- Suggested that traffic being forced to cross over the A10 from the M11 slip road in order to reach the travel hub would have a heavy impact on the flow of traffic as far away as Foxton, which had previously been considered a problem point by the Joint Assembly. Members sought clarity over how the current bridges were intended to be used and whether further bridges would be required. The Director of Transport noted that there were many factors to consider throughout the detailed design process and that all the proposals would be considered by the planning authority.
- Expressed concerns over the financial implications of a tunnel in the design scheme and requested a cost-benefit analysis of its inclusion. The Director of Transport recognised the concerns and noted that it would be hard to justify the cost if the park and ride site was only intended as a temporary project.
- Identified the amount of Trumpington Meadows Country Park that would be infringed upon as a cause of concern, noting the danger of the route extending its loop even further. It was recalled that the Country Park had been an essential piece of mitigation for the development of Trumpington Meadows and had contributed to residents being reasonably supportive of that development. The Joint Assembly was keen for the Executive Board to remain open to alternative options that would have less impact on the Country Park and cycle path.
- Acknowledged the request from the Trumpington Residents' Association for the travel hub to be equipped with the Travel Hub to be equipped with the same facilities and services as existing park and ride sites. This would be an important factor in encouraging people to use the Travel Hub. It was suggested that there could be merit in incorporating targeted facilities, such as for tourist buses and heavy goods vehicles at a single site.
- Observed that little attention was given to cyclists or pedestrians in the report and it was suggested that consulting with these users would be beneficial.

- Suggested that the diagram in Figure 2 should include the possible Foxton Travel Hub scheme.
- Acknowledged that long-term transport schemes, such as that of the proposed Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), assumed that development of the travel hub would go ahead. It was noted that incorporating the CAM proposal into the scheme, as mentioned in section 3.12 of the report, would have implications on the road layout and long-term planning of the travel hub. The Director of Transport emphasised that the project was not designed to create a carriageway for the CAM system, which would come forward with its own business proposals over the next few years.
- Proposed short introductory videos as a helpful way of presenting such projects, suggesting that they would also help overcome the difficulties of interpreting diagrams and charts that were designed in colour but printed in black and white.

## 10. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT SCHEME

Tony Orgee, Chairperson of the Cambridge and South East Transport Study Local Liaison Forum (LLF) attended the meeting to report on the outcome of the LLF workshop held on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2019 and the public LLF meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

Councillor Colin McGerty was then invited to ask his public question the details of which are set out in **Appendix A** to the minutes, along with a summary of the response.

The Director of Transport presented the report which provided the Joint Assembly with an update on progress of Phase 1 of the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme and the results of further work on Phase 2. It was noted that discussions were being held with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority regarding any future combining of the scheme with the CAM.

In discussing the report and the route options detailed within it, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed the fact that Granta Park and Babraham Research Institute, the two main employment hubs of the area, were not shown as linking to the proposed sites. The Director of Transport recalled that the Joint Assembly had previously been critical of those two communities being over-compensated for and he reasoned that it was not possible to serve everywhere.
- Suggested that the choice of the site could affect whether the Greater Cambridge Partnership or the Combined Authority were responsible for the more complex section of the engineering works.
- Noted plans for public consultation on potential route alignments and suggested that it was essential to base this on a succinct assessment of the potential options.
- Noted that park and ride sites encouraged car use, which was a matter of concern given recent climate emergency declarations. It was however noted that the travel hub concept involved promoting the use of other modes of transport, not just cars. It was suggested that the site should be designed for people travelling from further afield, with

consideration being given to finding a way of discouraging use by people from local villages.

## **11. CAMBRIDGESHIRE RAIL CORRIDOR STUDY**

The Director of Transport presented the report on the Cambridgeshire Rail Corridor Study, an assessment by Network Rail that forecast growth across the local rail network over the next 15 and 25 years. The Joint Assembly was informed that Network Rail had used national levels of growth in its calculations, which were significantly lower than for local levels of growth and this demonstrated the importance for the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to pursue the improvement and expansion of the local rail network. Attention was drawn to the fact that the study assumed that Cambridge South station would be built, but this was not guaranteed and represented a further reason to keep applying pressure.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Contended that the current local transport plan was the one published by Cambridgeshire County Council and would continue to be so until the Combined Authority approved a new one. Therefore, the study should have referred to the County Council local transport plan, which included two stations (Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn) that did not appear in the Network Rail study. The Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that the rail network was nationally managed and did not recognise local transport plans.
- Expressed concern that the study concluded it was not necessary to improve the Cambridge to Ipswich train line until 2043. The route, which was single-track in parts, ran on an hourly basis and often consisted of one carriage trains. It was argued that there was a desperate need for an improvement to the current infrastructure and an expansion to the timetable immediately and that the level of growth around Newmarket served to exasperate this need. A comparison was made with the Ely to Cambridge link, which ran over a similar distance and represented a similar demographic but which carried ten times as many passengers due to a better infrastructure
- Suggested that the report failed to consider how commuting trends would change in the future, along with the residential preferences of those working in Cambridge.
- Expressed concern over the logistical implications on the area surrounding Cambridge train station with the proposed increase in number of trains.

## **12. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT**

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which provided the Joint Assembly with an update on progress across the Greater Cambridge Partnership programme, including specific reference to preparation for the Mill Road bridge closure, a request for a financial contributions towards the cost of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro outline business case and potential investment into Project Spring.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Sought further details regarding the 48 companies mentioned in section 5.4 of the report and clarification on when progress data would be forthcoming. It was suggested

that given the contract only began in March 2019, figures on the number of apprentices would not be available until March 2020.

- Acknowledged the reasoning behind making a contribution towards the CAM but expressed concern about doing so without gaining any influence in the project. It was suggested that providing between 25% and 50% of the total funding was a substantial contribution for what would be a partner only in name. Members emphasised that they were not objecting to the Combined Authority controlling the project, but they could not be expected to provide financial support without the opportunity to provide scrutiny or opinions.
- Noted discussions on the creation of an advisory board on the CAM that would include the Leaders of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that advice was being sought regarding the appropriateness of the requirement to provide funding in order to sit on the board.
- Reiterated the belief that the two Fulbourn schemes that were given a green rating should be changed to amber due to the lack of progress.
- Suggested that the “Cambridge Story” feature of Project Spring should be referred to as the “Greater Cambridge Story”. The Head of Strategy and Programme agreed with the sentiment and informed the Joint Assembly that such an observation had already been made to the consortium and was a good example of why the Greater Cambridge Partnership should accept the plea for support.
- Clarified that the first phase of Project Spring would cost £75k-£100k and that the requested £25k, although not a particularly large contribution for the Greater Cambridge Partnership, represented a significant portion of the project’s budget.
- Expressed concern that there was no item on the forward plan to consider and provide input on the Combined Authority’s local transport plan that was under preparation. The Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that constituent partners would go through statutory consultations and that a report would be presented at the next Assembly meeting.
- Observed that the Executive Board meeting on 12th December 2019 had a packed agenda and as a result the Greenways item would not be able to give sufficient attention to each of the individual communities and that considering them as a group would be unfair. The Chief Executive acknowledged the concern and pledged to consider the matter.

### **13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting would be held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday 12th September 2019 at Shire Hall. Cambridge.

Chairperson



20th September 2019

## Appendix A: Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions and Answers

No	Questioner	Question	Answer
1.	David Stoughton	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 8: City Access and Public Transport Improvements</b></p> <p>In respect of the proposed clean air zone I would like to ask what area it is expected cover? My current understanding is that it is only intended for the inner ring and will not extend to the station area. Yet the station area is predicted to continue to see some of the highest rates of traffic growth. In addition, since so many buses and taxis both licensed and private hire are concentrated on these roads, it also suffers one of the highest concentrations of pollutants from diesel vehicles.</p> <p>The BID area extends up Regents Street and covers the CB1 development around the station and it would seems sensible for the clean air zone to follow this precedent.</p>	<p>Introducing pollution management measures were one of the options that the GCP sought feedback on through the Choices for Better Journeys engagement. The paper being considered today sets out key principles for taking forward the work following this, rather than making proposals to implement a particular scheme. Aspects of proposals, such as the area covered, would then need to be considered. The Clean Air Zone Feasibility Study, which looked at the impact of including particular roads, would inform this work.</p>
2.	John Hammond Clerk to Hauxton Parish Council	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</b></p> <p>Hauxton Parish Council is very disappointed that the proposed option of a tunnel under the A10 providing free-flowing access to the Park &amp; Ride has been dropped. As the proposed Park &amp; Ride is located in our parish against the expressed wishes of the Parish Council and the community, can the GCP please explain what effect the planned four sets of traffic lights between London Road, Harston and the M11 roundabout is forecast to have on the existing traffic congestion and resultant pollution, particularly during peak periods, in</p>	<p>The report and Outline Business Case (OBC) does not include a tunnel in the overall best performing option as the cost of providing a tunnel under the A10 outweigh the potential benefits it may provide to the scheme.</p> <p>The traffic modelling shows that the impact of traffic on both the A10 and M11 are caused by the Junction 11 gyratory and not the A10 traffic lights. The proposed traffic management arrangements are predicted to reduce total delay at the M11 Junction 11</p>

		<p>Hauxton and Harston, and what arrangements, financial or otherwise, have been made to ameliorate the impact on residents of Hauxton?</p>	<p>gyratory in the peak... As the design of a preferred option is developed further it will be refined to maximise the benefit to the local and travelling community. Officers will continue the dialogue with the Parish council on the final options for the traffic management arrangements.</p> <p>There is an air quality diffusion tube at 47 High Street in Harston which has been used to measure roadside annual mean NO2 concentrations (the measure air pollution caused by motor vehicles) since 2006. Monitoring will continue on air quality as part of the scheme development.</p> <p>The report makes clear that continuing the dialogue with the local community is essential as the detailed designs of the scheme are developed. This will include options for local mitigation and improvement.</p>
3.	Cllr Colin McGerty	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10: Cambridge South East Transport Study</b></p> <p>Section 5.17 on page 169 of the agenda makes quite clear that site 5 (also referred to as site C) is the GCP's preferred site. It is an easy to access, easy to develop arable field sited outside the Green Belt. Section 5.27 on page 170 then claims that the LLF attendees strongly supported this site.</p> <p>This is not accurate. There was a great deal of discussion around the Park and Ride site location and concern for the environmental impact of the scheme. In particular, the suggestion of regeneration of the Fourwentways brown field site was put forward and this seems to have been completely ignored.</p>	<p>The report does not indicate that GCP has any preference between the shortlisted park and ride site locations. The shortlisted public transport route alignment and park and ride site options will be subject to further appraisal and public consultation prior to the recommendation of a preferred option to the GCP Executive Board in early 2020. The position of the LLF in the report was that indicated by the responses given to questions over preference.</p> <p>The sites previously considered at the longlisting stage included two sites off Newmarket Road, east of the A11 and south of the Fourwentways service station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A green field site on set-aside farmland between the A11 and Newmarket Road (Site 10)</li> </ul>

	<p>So my question is why has regeneration of Fourwentways as a Park and Ride site not even been put forward for consideration?</p> <p>Fourwentways is the only brown field site in the area and would offer the opportunity of significantly lower environmental impact and offer potential benefits to the scheme such as willing business that might be willing to run a fuel station, food outlet etc. and yet it is not even included in the long list of options in section 5.14.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The brown field site comprising the former Comfort Café and adjacent car park (Site 11).</li> </ul> <p>These sites were discounted, as they failed to provide sufficient parking capacity.</p> <p>A suggestion was put forward at the LLF workshop that these sites be considered in combination and together with the adjacent sites currently occupied by the Fourwentways service station and Travelodge.</p> <p>All the options identified for a site at Fourwentways would thus require the acquisition of land that has development land value and would additionally require the relocation of the Fourwentways Travelodge and service station.</p> <p>The delivery of any of these options would therefore involve the cost of acquiring land at commercial land value and also the cost and complexity of relocating existing businesses and infrastructure. Such costs are prohibitive to the business case.</p>
--	--	---