



**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 10th December 2020

4:00 p.m. – 7:45 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Councillor Roger Hickford (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Neil Gough (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Phil Allmendinger	University Representative
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in Attendance:

Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
-----------------------------------	------------------------

Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson:

Mayor James Palmer	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
--------------------	--

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Ryan Howsham	Strategy and Programme Manager (GCP)
Simon Manville	Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Gemma Schroeder	Project Manager Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport and Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

2. Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 1st October 2020, were agreed as a correct record and the Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

4. Executive Board Membership

The Executive Board received a report which presented details of a request from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Business Board concerning its representation on the GCP Executive Board. It was noted that since the report had been published, the GCP had received a letter from the Chair of the Business Board, which had subsequently been published on the GCP's website and circulated to members, formally proposing the recommendations that had been agreed at the Business Board meeting on 19th October 2020. These recommendations included a request to nominate two representatives instead of one. Members noted that this proposal fell outside the scope of the Executive Board's Standing Orders and Terms of Reference, and would therefore require the constituent councils' approval and amendment to their constitutions if the Executive Board was minded to support the request. The GCP had proposed an alternative arrangement, whereby the Business Board nominated a representative and a substitute, as set out in the Standing Orders, with the Chairperson of the Executive Board retaining the discretion to allow both the representative and the substitute to participate in meetings.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Established that following the Business Board's decision on 19th October, the GCP Chief Executive had communicated with the Business Board's chief officer and the CPCA Chief Executive to outline the difficulties with the proposal and to present an alternative solution. Members supported the proposed alternative and highlighted the Mayor's attendance at Board meetings as a demonstration of the GCP's willingness to accommodate requests from the CPCA.
- Argued that an additional representative of the Business Board would disrupt the balance of the Executive Board's membership, given that other City Deal partners only had one representative. One member argued that a single point of contact would also provide better continuity.

- Acknowledged that the City Deal document had referred to how it was envisaged the governance framework might operate, including reference to the possibility of GCP Executive Board members being the Council Leader, LEP Chair and the University Pro-Vice Chancellor. This was not specified in the governance arrangements agreed by all parties in order to provide flexibility for those bodies responsible for appointing or nominating GCP Executive Board members to determine who was best placed to represent them.
- Noted the suggestion by Mayor Palmer that the Greater Cambridge City Deal was the only such organisation in the country that did not involve a current member of the local enterprise partnership as its representative, an arrangement of which he questioned the legality.
- Recognised that the lack of communication between the Business Board and the current Business Board representative on the Executive Board was detrimental to the working partnership.
- Paid tribute to Dr Andy Williams, who the Business Board was proposing as its second non-voting representative, noting his extensive participation as a member of the GCP Joint Assembly, as well his widespread involvement in and knowledge of the Greater Cambridge area. It was resolved to:
 - (a) Ask the Business Board to reconsider this matter and make a nomination that is consistent with the GCP Executive Board's Standing Orders and Terms of Reference (as summarised in paragraph 4.4); and
 - (b) Confirm, subject to the above, to consider whether to use the discretion available to the Chairperson and voting members of the Executive Board (as summarised in paragraph 4.5 of the report) to allow both the Business Board nominee and the substitute member to attend the GCP Executive Board meetings, should the case be made to do so.

5. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that sixteen 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 nine questions related to agenda item 8 (Cambourne to Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project), two questions related to agenda item 9 (GCP Future Investment Strategy), two questions related to agenda item 10 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy), one question related to agenda item 12 (Greenways: Haslingfield), and two questions related to agenda item 14 (Chisholm Trail Project).

6. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board noted a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 19th November 2020.

7. GCP Quarterly Progress Report

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Referring to the Joint Assembly discussion, specifically the request for additional information on the number of apprenticeships that had started in September 2020, she reported that there had been a reduction of approximately 40% compared to the previous year. This emphasised the importance of the new Skills contract currently under procurement and due to commence in April 2021. The Executive Board's attention was also drawn to the recommencement of the mapping phase of the autonomous vehicle trials in January 2021 following delays resulting from the recent national lockdown.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Highlighted the GCP's vital role in connecting businesses to students looking for apprenticeship opportunities, especially in the current climate when businesses were facing Covid-19 related matters. The central role of careers advisors and the CPCA in promoting this engagement and connection was also noted.
- Acknowledged the significant efforts of some businesses to support new apprenticeship starters, including the hosting of careers fairs, and recognised the difficulty of interviewing, preparing and inducting starters in a virtual environment.
- Observed that there had been significantly less demand for bus maps and signage as a result of decreased movement and patronage during the pandemic, which had impacted the Smart agenda and made it more difficult to increase usage.

It was resolved to:

Note progress across the GCP programme.

8. Cambourne to Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum (LLF), attended the meeting to present feedback from the LLF virtual meeting held on 8th December 2020. She reported the main areas of concern that had been discussed at the meeting, which included the alignment of the scheme to other major infrastructure projects, the consideration of alternative routes, the timing of the Environmental Impact Assessment, plans for the Hardwick section of the route, and the proposed independent audit. The Executive Board was informed that the LLF had agreed three resolutions, as set out in Appendix B.

Nine public questions were received from Mal Schofield, James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past Present and Future), Dr Marilyn Treacy, Terry Spencer, Carolyn Postgate, Jane Renwick, Pauline Joslin and Alistair Burford. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Gavin Clayton, South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for Cambourne division, was invited to address the Executive Board. Noting that congestion issues had worsened along the route in recent years, he stressed that this would be exacerbated by the arrival of thousands of residents in the planned Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge developments. He also highlighted concerns about the potential impact on transport availability for students and their later options as school leavers. He conveyed support from Cambourne Town Council for the report's recommendations, as well as for the development of an integrated transport hub, and emphasised the urgent need for a fast, reliable and affordable public transport service between Cambourne and Cambridge.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly observed that while there continued to be a difference of views among Assembly members on some aspects of the scheme, and notwithstanding the representations from members of the public that had been received and considered, it had been agreed unanimously to ask the Board to determine the project's next steps. He suggested that the Assembly would have welcomed this report as an indication of the next steps, as well as the proposed independent evaluation and EIA.

The former Chairperson of the Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, was invited to address the Board and in particular provide feedback on the debate from the meeting held on 30th January 2020. Emphasising the extensive discussion and scrutiny of the project at previous Assembly and Board meetings, he highlighted amendments that had been made to the scheme based on these debates and the concerns raised by residents and other stakeholders. He argued that the scheme was driven by the joint need to provide residents along the route with an attractive alternative to car travel and to provide support to 14,000 additional jobs resulting from the planned expansion of the University's West Cambridge site. He recognised genuine concerns about elements of the scheme, especially the potential environmental impact, and commented that he had identified significant misconceptions of the scheme held by people that had communicated with him. He suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on highlighting the benefits to those with concerns about the scheme and offering reassurance that the quality of village life, which residents valued highly, would not be destroyed. He welcomed confirmation of the benefits of C2C to Cambourne residents, as expressed by Councillor Clayton. In conclusion, he stated that while some members had grave concerns, the majority of members were generally supportive of proceeding from the Outline Business Case to the Full Business Case stage, appreciating that the precise alignment would be informed by detailed design work and the EIA. Observing that City Deal funding had been devolved so that Greater Cambridge could address its infrastructure priorities at a local level, he argued that the fact that the GCP had been seen to be incapable of achieving this represented a failure of governance.

The Transport Director presented the report, which included the Outline Business Case for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and sought the Board's approval to undertake an independent audit of the project, while initiating the process of an EIA. Drawing attention to the scheme development process laid out in Figure 1, paragraph 4.2 of the report, he emphasised that the Board was not being asked to make a final decision on the scheme but was instead being asked to agree to progress to the next stage of the process established by the Department for Transport. Noting that correct process had been followed throughout and that all documentation was publically available on the GCP's website, he informed members that the exploration of a wide range of alternative routes had concluded with a compelling strategic case for the proposed scheme.

The Project Manager informed the Board that the preferred option was essentially a refinement of the Phase 1 proposal considered in December 2018, with some amendments based on stakeholder input. He emphasised that while the extensive documentation published online demonstrated the large amount of investigations already undertaken, significant further studies would be carried out in the next stage of the project, if the Board decided to proceed. He expressed the GCP's support for the future development of a Travel Hub in Cambourne, as well as the Travel Hub at Scotland Farm that had been added to the scheme. Concerns that had been raised about the route, such as the potential for "rat running" and access for cyclists and pedestrians, would be considered during the design stage, while the EIA would identify issues such as loss of vegetation and allow for appropriate mitigation to be developed. Improvements would be made to the noise barrier already in place along the A428 and work would continue with partner organisations to refine the alignment to minimise the impact on the landscape. He highlighted the importance of safeguarding a corridor along Babbage Road as soon as possible, which would serve the Cambourne to Cambridge route as well as potential future usage for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro. A route amendment had been made from Adams Road to the Rifle Range Track in order to minimise the impact on the greenbelt, while an elevation of the route after crossing the Bin Brook would avoid causing flooding.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the Joint Assembly's request to determine the project's next steps and emphasised the urgent need to make progress on the provision of public transport along the route. It was argued that one of the reasons for the project taking so long to develop was a failure of governance.
- Observed that the project had been developed and refined on the basis of a series of physical, policy, environmental and economic constraints and assumptions and argued that it was appropriate for these to be tested and validated through an independent audit review. It was suggested that the review should be completed by June 2021, so that its report could be considered at the Executive Board meeting on 1st July 2021.
- Emphasised the importance of the proposed independent audit review being organised and carried out in a transparent and robust manner by an independent body, to ensure that focus was on the content of its final report, rather than the process that had been followed in its production. It was suggested that the audit

should also consider contributions made from stakeholders outside the GCP. The Chief Executive recognised the need for independence and observed that this would be ensured through liaison with representative groups, as well as the Executive Board. She suggested that a detailed proposal for the audit review could be prepared within a week, although the exact terms of reference would be established by the independent auditor.

- Welcomed the initiation of the EIA, noting that it would enable the consideration of many of the concerns that had been raised by local communities and stakeholders, and allow for the development of mitigation.
- Suggested that the GCP should improve communication with residents and other stakeholders on future schemes, to highlight and emphasise the benefits that the project would potentially provide them.
- Acknowledged the importance of obtaining public support for the scheme through further extensive consultation.
- Confirmed that all information on the development of the scheme was publicly accessible on the GCP's website.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Note the outcome of Phase 2 public consultation;
- (b) Note the conclusions of the Outline Business Case presenting a preferred high quality public transport, walking and cycling route;
- (c) Note the conclusions of the Outline Business Case in relation to a travel hub location;
- (d) Agree to undertake an Independent Audit Review of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme to validate the key assumptions and constraints and to determine whether they remain appropriate;
- (e) Report the findings of this Independent Audit Review to the July Board; and
- (f) Request that officers initiate the process of an EIA, however recognising the potential impact of the Independent Audit Review and the need to conclude the Independent Audit Review in advance of any public consultation on the EIA.

9. GCP Future Investment Strategy

Two public questions were received from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle) and Edward Leigh. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised concerns raised by the Assembly which related to a proposed redeployment of two-thirds of the £75m that had been

previously allocated towards improvements to public transport services. While he welcomed officers' response to these concerns, he observed that the reallocation was still available for use and argued that the Board should avoid making any decision on the matter until further consideration had been given to its impact. He suggested that any future demand management scheme for private cars in Cambridge would need to be preceded by improvements to the bus service, funded from this pot.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which included an updated version of the Future Investment Strategy (FIS) following the first Gateway Review, which also took into consideration the impacts of Covid-19. Originally developed and agreed by the Executive Board in March 2019, the FIS outlined how the GCP would invest in order to maximise the benefits for residents and businesses in Greater Cambridge through delivery of the City Deal. Despite a significant drop in movement and economic activity during the pandemic, it was proposed to continue with significant investment in sustainable transport infrastructure to support growth and environmental objectives, such as the partner councils' net-zero carbon commitments.

Acknowledging the concerns expressed by the Joint Assembly about the proposed reallocation of public transport funds, she informed the Board that the recommendations had been amended to reflect this and to provide greater flexibility on how these funds could be spent. Any planned expenditure would be subject to a business case establishing how the original objectives of the funding would be met. She also drew attention to the request for further allocations of £22.8m to unlock housing delivery and support the Smart Programme. It was highlighted that if the spending contained in the report, as well as that of accompanying reports on the agenda, was approved by the Executive Board, planned over-programming would reach £128m. While it was argued that such a figure was appropriate given current uncertainties, additional funding or scheme prioritisation could become necessary in the future.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Clarified that there were various types of demand management schemes, including physical schemes, such as those involving changes to road space allocation or parking, and fiscal schemes, such as congestion charges or pollution charges.
- Considered the potential future use of hydrogen fuel cells, alongside electricity, in public transport vehicles. The Head of Transport Strategy recognised their potential benefits but also drew attention to their challenges, which included the provision and implementation of the necessary infrastructure, as well as ensuring that the hydrogen was not produced through burning fossil fuels. She highlighted that the GCP would need to progressively trial different technologies with partner authorities, including the CPCA, in order to establish which worked best for the Greater Cambridge area and which would best allow for the decarbonisation of the local public transport fleet.
- Acknowledged that while sustainable transport options, such as cycling routes, were vital for those within a cycling distance of Cambridge, it was important to provide for the transport requirements for people across the whole region.

- Suggested that there could be a greater focus in the FIS on the reuse and regeneration of funding, rather than just spending, with the Smart Programme and electricity grid expansion project given as examples of funded projects that had the scope to subsequently raise additional resources.
- Recognised the concerns that had been expressed by the Joint Assembly about reallocating funds previously allocated to public transport improvement. It was emphasised that specific funding allocation was not being sought and that such future proposals would need to clearly demonstrate the impact that the reallocation would have on improvements to cycling and public transport, as confirmed by the Head of Transport Strategy in her introduction.
- Welcomed the proposed addition of environmental objectives to the strategic criteria for prioritisation of future investment but called for greater focus on achieving carbon net zero objectives. It was suggested that milestones and targets should be set, while the GCP should increasingly work with partners to develop schemes to tackle the effects of congestion.
- Highlighted the need to demonstrate additionality and value for money that would be provided by zero carbon buses.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Confirm that the FIS continues to meet the ambitions of the City Deal and address the need for transformational solutions to meet programme objectives, including environmental and net-zero ambitions, as well as supporting Greater Cambridge and the wider area to recover from Covid-19;
- (b) Note that the Greater Cambridge area has seen significant changes to the economy, travel patterns, working practices and the public transport operating environment during Covid-19, but uncertainty remains as to future trends;
- (c) Agree that flexibility should be retained at a programme and project level to respond to emerging trends in order to deliver the GCP's objectives;
- (d) Agree the updated criteria for prioritisation of future investment, which have been amended to bring environmental objectives into the strategic criteria;
- (e) Agree the prioritisation for additional future investment, in particular:
 - Further develop investment proposals within the previous £75m public transport allocation, including creating flexibility within this allocation to meet City Deal objectives, as follows:
 - i) Develop a fund to enable operator investment in zero emission buses, aiming to move all buses in Greater Cambridge to zero emission within a defined time period;
 - ii) Develop a further programme of permanent active travel measures, building on the emergency programme led by Cambridgeshire County Council, in particular aiming to address key gaps in the Greater Cambridge cycling network;

- iii) Develop proposals to invest in public transport services, forward-funding a future network offering more people competitive journeys; and
 - iv) All proposals would be subject to business cases and would need to demonstrate how any funds committed towards one area impacted on ability to deliver others.
 - Allocate £20m to a fund for unlocking housing delivery, based on a recoverable investment model;
 - Allocate £2.8m to the Smart programme, to continue work to support delivery of GCP objectives.
- (f) Agree that the projects prioritised in the Future Investment Strategy are prioritised in principle, with further work to be undertaken by officers in line with usual project development processes and the City Deal Assurance Framework, before funding is committed; and
- (g) Note that, taken together with existing commitments, this would increase overall allocated spend to £751m (of which £20m is identified as recoverable investment) against a projected income of £603m. Cost recovery and income generation opportunities will continue to be explored more widely.

10. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

Two public questions were received from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle) and the Windsor Road Residents' Association. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly welcomed that the recommendations in the report had been refined to include a future decision on the long-term strategy, which reflected some of the concerns that the Joint Assembly had raised about the length of time taken to develop the strategy. Although there was wide support for the short-term measures that were being implemented, he suggested that their effects would be limited and even counter-productive without an overarching long-term strategy.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which provided an update on the city access project and the delivery of short term measures, while setting out work on potential packages of longer-term interventions. Despite the severe impact of the pandemic on public transport, it remained crucial to tackle issues of congestion and air quality in order to achieve net zero carbon commitments, while adapting to changes to working patterns and future transport regulations or patronage. Attention was drawn to figure 1 in section 4.19 of the report, which summarised the development of five packages of measures, in the short term, medium term and long term, taking into account the recommendations of the Citizens' Assembly and building on the three key themes of creating space for people, being environmental and zero carbon, and delivering high quality, affordable public transport. Acknowledging the concerns raised by the Joint Assembly, she informed members that a report would be presented to the Board on 18th March 2021 to provide an update on progress and determine how the GCP could support a return to people using public transport.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Confirmed that the report provided an update and as such did not include recommendations for any decisions or firm proposals, which would be considered at a later date once relevant business cases had been developed and analysed.
- Acknowledged concerns raised by the Mayor that the City Access Strategy did not mention the Local Transport Plan and that CPCA officers had not been consulted on matters that he argued were statutory responsibilities of the CPCA. The Transport Director confirmed that regular discussions were held with CPCA officers, including fortnightly meetings between the GCP Head of Transport Strategy and the CPCA Bus Strategy Manager, although he undertook to expand this engagement and consider ways that feedback on this could be included in future reports.
- Acknowledged the inconveniences for some residents and commuters that would result from some of the planned improvements, including bus rescheduling and parking restrictions.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Note the current transport context as set out at paragraph 4.5;
- (b) Agree the proposed approach to taking forward public transport improvements and city access in this context, namely:
 - Continue to develop and deliver the short-term measures aimed at encouraging uptake of sustainable transport as outlined at paragraphs 4.7-4.16, with a focus on supporting economic recovery;
 - Build on these measures by developing further interventions to reduce air pollution and carbon emissions, and reallocate road space to better prioritise sustainable modes of transport as outlined at paragraphs 7.2-7.17 and in figure 2. This would include:
 - building on the electric bus pilot, setting an ambitious but achievable time period for all buses to become zero emission;
 - developing a model for supporting operator investment in zero emission vehicles;
 - working with the County Council and others to develop measures to ensure only clean buses operate within defined areas;
 - working with the County Council and City Council to review the city road network to better reflect the needs of sustainable transport; and,
 - working with partners to further develop plans to maintain access particularly for disabled groups and blue badge holders.
 - Recognising the points made at the Joint Assembly, consider how additional progress can be made towards a final package of measures aiming to improve public transport and reduce congestion, air pollution and carbon emissions, at the next GCP Executive Board meeting in March 2021;
- (c) Agree to allocate £9.9m of additional funding as set out in section 9.

11. Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly: One-Year On Report

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which included an update on progress that had been made over the past year by the GCP in response to the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly held in September and October 2019. A follow up workshop took place in September 2020 in order to provide participants with an opportunity to review the original recommendations in light of the impacts of the pandemic, during which they emphasised their hope to see the beneficial impacts of the pandemic, such as lower traffic levels and better air quality, captured and maintained in the future. It was proposed that a further update report could be presented one year down the line.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board suggested that the GCP could encourage a more continuous dialogue with participants of the Citizens Assembly, including seeking their comments following Executive Board and Joint Assembly meetings. The Head of Transport Strategy informed members that participants were provided with details for how to watch the meetings and undertook to invite their comments following GCP meetings.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Note the progress in implementing the response to the Citizens' Assembly recommendations, including the further actions proposed as part of the paper at item 10, Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy;
- (b) Agree the one-year-on report at Appendix 1 of the report;
- (c) Agree to provide a further report on progress in a year's time; and
- (d) Note the findings from a workshop held with Citizens' Assembly participants in September, seeking their reflections on their recommendations and priorities particularly in the light of Covid-19.

12. Greenways: Haslingfield

One public question was received from Lesley Sherratt. The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which included an update on progress with developing the Greenways, outcomes from recent public consultations, and an outline of scheme details and budget proposal for the Haslingfield Greenway. It was noted that the scheme was the final Greenway to be presented at this stage of development, with all schemes returning to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for final approval in 2021.

The Executive Board considered the report and paid tribute to officers for developing the Greenway schemes, noting the widespread support for the Haslingfield Greenway.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Note the progress made in developing the Greenways, working with local communities and stakeholders to date;
- (b) Note the outcome of public consultations;
- (c) Approve an outline budget for the Haslingfield scheme of £8m; and
- (d) Note the outline programme and key risks.

13. Date of Future Meetings

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was due be held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday 18th March 2021.

14. Chisholm Trail Project

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that he had agreed to add a late item to the agenda in order to provide an urgent update on progress with the Chisholm Trail, including the Abbey-Chesterton project, and to seek further financial support to secure delivery of the project in response to a request from Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Transport Committee on 1st December 2020. He noted that the GCP needed to be able to respond quickly to the request to clarify the status and funding of the project and it would not be in the public interest to defer a decision to the next scheduled meeting.

Two public questions were received from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle) and Jim Chisholm. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly acknowledged that the Joint Assembly had not been able to consider the item prior to the Executive Board and indicated that the Assembly supported the Chisholm Trail and would like it to be delivered as soon as possible. Notwithstanding this, he expressed concern about the size of the overspend and questioned its causes, noting that the public funds allocated by the GCP were heavily competed for and that such issues damaged public confidence in such projects. The Transport Director noted that the causes of the overspend were detailed in the County Council's Highway and Transport Committee report, attached as Appendix 1 to the GCP report.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Sought clarification on the likelihood that the requested allocation of £1,783,109 as contingency towards further potential costs would be spent, arguing that it should only be used if absolutely necessary. The Transport Director informed members that County Council officers had been unable to guarantee the final total required, resulting in the requested contingency, and he provided reassurances that details would be reported back to the Board if it became necessary to use the additional funding. It was noted that the main risks of unexpected costs related to the Newmarket Road underpass, and one member suggested that a more affordable contingency would be a pelican crossing instead of an underpass.
- Requested that the Chisholm Trail be completed in an agile way that allowed for the rest of the route to be used while the final stages were still being completed
- Supported the allocation for further funding to delivery of the Chisholm Trail but expressed concern about the size of the overspend. Although it was acknowledged that the project had been undertaken in full awareness of the potential financial risks and it was also suggested that if a case had been made for it a higher budget may have been agreed in the first place, members expressed strong reservations about the situation, observing that the funds would have to be diverted from other GCP priorities.
- Suggested that the GCP's contracting methods for project management should be reviewed and amended to ensure that similar situations did not arise in the future, with one member suggesting the GCP should take on project management of future projects. It was requested that the review include an analysis of the reasons for the overspend on the Chisholm Trail.

The following additional recommendation was proposed by Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Gough and agreed unanimously:

- (e) Request a report to the March 2021 Executive Board meeting providing a detailed analysis of the circumstances that led to the overspend; setting out the implications of this for the wider GCP programme; and how project management for this and other projects will change in future in response to this experience.

It was resolved to:

- (a) Reaffirm GCP's commitment to delivery of the Chisholm Trail, Phase 1 and 2, and commit the GCP to finding the resources necessary to complete the scheme;
- (b) Support the County Council's request for the remainder of the costs for the Abbey-Chesterton Bridge to come from developer contribution S106 monies, estimated at £2,063,409;
- (c) Allocate an additional £4,798,516 to the project, plus an allocation of £1,783,109 as contingency towards further potential costs;

- (d) Require officers to bring forward proposals for GCP delivery of Phase 2 of the Trail, including revising and updating the programme for scheme delivery; and
- (e) Request a report to the March 2021 Executive Board meeting providing a detailed analysis of the circumstances that led to the overspend; setting out the implications of this for the wider GCP programme; and how project management for this and other projects will change in future in response to this experience.

Chairperson
18th March 2021

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

No*	Questioner	Question	Proposed Answer
1	Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Paragraph 1.12 states "The scheme has been developed in accordance with the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG)." *</p> <p>* TAG Page 9 states "1.8 The uncertainty around future travel behaviour and needs brought about by the coronavirus disease pandemic, amongst other sources of deep uncertainty, also provide a significant challenge to assessing which investment options may suit those needs and provide the best returns for the taxpayer. There is a need to consider how best to accommodate this uncertainty in appraisal and provide consistency across the local, regional and national portfolios. This highlights the need and importance of collecting, evaluation evidence to better inform these considerations over time."</p> <p>Question. Bus patronage in England was on the decline before the first Covid outbreak in the UK." The number of local bus passenger journeys in England fell by 238 million or 5.5% to 4.07 billion in the year ending March 2020 [Source. DfT. Annual Bus Statistics].</p> <p>A meaningful update on travel behaviour will be available with the publication of the UK 2021 census.</p> <p>Would the Board please consider deferring further expenditure on this contentious project until the</p>	<p>The C2C project has been developed over a number of years.</p> <p>Whilst the longer term impacts of COVID are uncertain, we will continue to monitor the situation and draw on emerging data once more is known. We will continue to develop the scheme in accordance with DfT requirements and will adhere to the revised business case guidance from the Department, developed in response to the pandemic, when it is produced early next year.</p> <p>However, there remains an urgent need to progress planning to provide better, reliable public transport and cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities in housing developments being built around the city.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		insightful 2021 Census information is available?	
4	James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge PPF	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Mark Carney is delivering the Reith Lectures on BBC Radio 4 this winter and considering “How We Get What We Value”. Carney argues that society has come to embody Oscar Wilde’s old aphorism: “knowing the price of everything but the value of nothing”. We see this in the report discussing the northern option for this scheme (p56 para 1.18), which is dismissed on the basis that it would be more expensive and performs less favourably. No consideration is given as to whether such a scheme might better protect the landscape that is valued by the community. Please can the GCP ensure that decisions are made that take into account the value we place on our landscape and environment?</p>	<p>The most significant and sensitive environmental constraints on the C2C corridor lie to the north of the A428: Madingley Hall and its Grounds, The American Cemetery, and Madingley Wood SSSI.</p> <p>GCP ensures that decisions taking into account environmental issues. The proposed alignment avoids these nationally recognised sites and has been developed in accordance with DfT requirements. Extensive information, including environment information is published on the website.</p>
5	Terry Spencer	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p><i>An all-ways junction at the Girton Interchange</i></p> <p>Until the Covid-19 pandemic, the A1303 Madingley Hill was often heavily congested with inbound traffic at Junction 13 of the M11, especially at morning peak times.</p> <p>If congestion does revert to the pre-lockdown levels, then one obvious long-term solution would be to provide an all-ways junction at the Girton Interchange, to connect the A428 directly to the M11 in both directions, so as to reduce traffic along the A1303 and bypass Junction 13.</p>	<p>As part of a full and transparent appraisal process, compliant with DfT guidance, the GCP has readily and regularly considered, documented and published deliberation of alternative routes, including northern alignments and proposals from stakeholders. All are published online.</p> <p>The GCP has actively lobbied Highways England for an improvement at Girton Interchange. A joint open letter was issued and published in October 2017. However, at present there are no plans for further works for the foreseeable future.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>An upgrade of the Girton Interchange, where the A14, M11 and A428 converge, has been suggested many times in the last few years. It would be the perfect location for a Park and Ride facility serving traffic from the north-west and north of Cambridge, and for a coach station and a CAM station. It would encourage modal shift away from cars onto public transport, with potentially-huge economic benefits. An all-ways junction will also be required if the proposed Oxford to Cambridge expressway is built.</p> <p>The GCP has not lobbied actively for an all-ways junction at Girton, which would solve the congestion problem at Junction 13. This was suggested in an open letter to the GCP in January 2020 from a group of twelve prominent local politicians, including Antony Browne MP.</p> <p>My questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why hasn't the GCP looked seriously at a northern route for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway via the Girton Interchange as a way of solving the problem of congestion at Junction 13? 2. What actions is the GCP taking or planning to take to persuade the government to upgrade the Girton interchange as suggested? 	<p>A route/Park and Ride at Girton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not best meet the objective of the C2C scheme - to support developments primarily south of the A428 - it would be longer and more expensive • would not be accessible from the A428 west without major changes at Girton Interchange - not currently planned. <p>Full evidence of assessment of alternatives in line with DfT Transport Analysis Guidance has been detailed throughout Option Appraisal Reports 1, 2 and 3 and supporting Technical Notes. All are published online.</p> <p>A response to the previous LLF recommendation for a route via Girton was published online.</p>
7	Carolyn Postgate	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Agenda item 8 paras 1.1-1.3 are all inaccurate, based on 2015 data when it was predicted peak traffic would stretch</p>	<p>In the context where confidence in public transport is undermined and people are returning to cars more quickly</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

	<p>the length of Madingley Road onto the A428 dual carriageway. Current conditions are that Madingley Road is running freely with no delays, due to different working patterns during the Covid crisis. No one is able to predict future travel patterns or if confidence in public transport will ever return and basing assumptions on 2015 data is not acceptable.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Research Group’s report on Agenda pages 135ff, (albeit with a small sample of employers), suggests that in 3-5 years’ time working from home will increase (Question 14), travel in rush hour will reduce (Question 10), and changes in mode of travel show increase in cycling or not much change, (therefore no modal shift to public transport) (Question 17).</p> <p>Furthermore the National Travel Attitudes Study (NTAS) - Wave 4, Page 5 (footnote on Agenda Page 104) states: “The lack of confidence in the use of public transport looks likely to remain after travel restrictions and social distancing measures have been removed.”</p> <p>In addition, Agenda item 9 para 4.16 (page 104) states: “With government deferring big spending and policy decisions until next year, the regulatory, operational and funding environment for public transport remains very uncertain.”</p> <p>Therefore I ask</p> <p>1. What evidence is there to support the statement “schemes such as C2C will be stronger as a result of Covid-19?” (ref Agenda item 8 para 1.13).</p>	<p>than any other mode, the need to provide quality, reliable public transport options to encourage people out of private vehicles and avoid future pressure on the network is stronger.</p> <p>In Greater Cambridge, people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode and morning and afternoon travel peaks have returned.</p> <p>For C2C, the case for providing public transport, cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities in the Local Plan to the west of the city remains.</p> <p>We will continue to monitor the impacts of COVID, draw on emerging data and review the project’s business case in accordance with DfT requirements .</p> <p>However, there remains an urgent need to progress planning to provide better, reliable public transport and cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities.</p> <p>The longer term economic impacts of the pandemic remain uncertain. We will continue to monitor the situation and the C2C BCR and OBC will be reviewed in advance of application to reflect relevant longer term impacts of COVID once more is known.</p> <p>The BCR relates to transport-related benefits but the total return on investment reflecting wider economic benefits is higher (3.48) because of the land value unlocked for development.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>2. Should the scheme not be halted until the Cambridge University Centre for Business Research ‘GCP Quarterly Progress Report’ findings are published in February and June 2021? (ref Agenda item 7 Para 15.3).</p> <p>3. If the existing dire economic situation and new work patterns continue, what effect will it have upon the already unacceptably low initial BCR of 0.43? (ref Agenda item 8 para 10.6).</p>	<p>Planned changes to the Treasury Green Book evaluation make this wider-economic case more compelling.</p>
8	Jane Renwick	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>It is hard to understand how, after all this time, we are now left with only one C2C route option on the table. We are told that to reconsider an alternative route at this stage would be a deviation from the “proscribed process “. Is this the process that has failed to take seriously or follow up on any alternative routes suggested in numerous consultations, local meetings, local forums, focus groups, residents groups and environmental groups? The summary dismissal of other ideas has suggested an idea of pre-determination concerning the whole matter. We are now left with one route, the Preferred Route, reached apparently through this “proscribed process”.</p> <p>Are the GCP, by arranging for an independent audit of their Preferred Route, just following another step along the “proscribed process” to reach their pre-determined goal?</p>	<p>The independent audit is in addition to, the prescribed process to provide further assurance of a robust process in reaching the proposals as they are recommended for stakeholders and local communities.</p> <p>As part of a full and transparent appraisal process, compliant with DfT guidance, the GCP has readily and regularly considered, documented and published deliberation of alternative routes, including northern alignments and proposals from stakeholders. All are published online.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

10	Pauline Joslin	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>When planning the route of the C2C Busway/Autonomous Metro it is obvious that the GCP have not taken into account the concerns voiced by as many as 900 Hardwick residents who are opposed to the removal of the 2 miles of trees and vegetation on St Neots Rd and replace them with Tarmac. This visual barrier of approx. 3000 trees along St Neots Rd absorbs between 500 and 3000 tons of CO2 and its removal would double the pollution in our village. Is the GCP listening to the residents of Hardwick?</p>	<p>Yes, GCP is listening to residents of Hardwick, and all residents.</p> <p>A commitment to improve the noise barrier with the A428 which is in a state of disrepair and initial air quality assessment, indicating negligible effects as a result of the scheme are examples of responses to community concerns.</p> <p>As Ms Joslin is aware, previous to June 2020 when the scheme was paused, GCP officers regularly attended Hardwick Parish Council meetings and held a number of events in Hardwick to hear and respond to resident's concerns.</p> <p>Further engagement and more detailed plans would form part of public consultation as part of a full environmental impact assessment (EIA), which, should the Board agree, would only proceed subject to the outcomes of the independent audit.</p>
11	Alistair Burford	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Two years ago, the Board pack contained an Interim Report prepared by Mott MacDonald entitled 'Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project' (November 2018) which detailed 'Environmental Constraints' within the proposed route from Madingley Mulch to the Rifle Range (Phase 1). This report was subsequent to the Options</p>	<p>The options appraisal process considered environmental constraints and highlighted areas where there are potential adverse impacts.</p> <p>The environmental issues raised are typical of those found in most similar locations in the area:</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

	<p>Appraisal Report referred to in today's Board papers (page 60 clause 4.8)</p> <p>On page 41 of the November '18 report, 3 significant constraints are highlighted;</p> <p>i) 'Buried Archaeology' at the Waterworks site;</p> <p>ii) The wooded area on St Neots Road in front of the waterworks is a 'Tree Preservation Order block & Bat Roost potential';</p> <p>iii) An area extending from the waterworks to beyond Crome Lea is marked as 'Brown Hare Activity'.</p> <p>In 2018/2019, further Ecology surveys were conducted and have confirmed bat activity at the waterworks site and a significant presence of Brown Hares between the waterworks and Crome Lea yet despite the hundreds and thousands spent on the surveys to make 'informed decisions' the preferred route alignment still runs straight through the middle of each of these significant areas.</p> <p>1: Can the Board explain why, given the constraints that have already been identified between the Waterworks and Crome Lea, that the route has not been revised to avoid these significant constraints so that we have a more accurate version of the proposed route?</p> <p>2: Before any further surveys are commissioned, should the Board not ensure that the surveys that have already been conducted have been actioned?</p>	<p>The decision to not locate the travel hub at the Waterworks minimises potential impacts on buried archaeology and the impact on the TPO belt. (The County's archaeologist has agreed with the assessment that the value of buried archaeology in the area would appear to be of local and regional and not likely of national importance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential impacts of bat roosts will continue to be assessed as part of any EIA. (It is understood that there is a major roost on the alignment based on information gathered to date.) - Brown hares are widespread across East Anglia and not unique to this area <p>The scale of impact and opportunities to mitigate would be fully assessed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>The decision on a preferred route is based on multi-criteria analysis and not just on environmental factors. The decision making process and the scoring of the options is presented in Options Appraisal Report in the Business Case.</p> <p>2. No specific actions from the surveys undertaken to date, other than the identification of areas where more detail is needed.</p> <p>Additional surveys for archaeology and ecology are required for the preferred route if this is approved to progress. The output from these will inform the detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of an approved preferred scheme, and any measures arising from the surveys will be discussed with the appropriate statutory body.</p>
--	---	---

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>3: If the Board is minded to approve the request for the EIA survey, will they also instruct the officers to make any necessary amendments to the route before returning the scheme to the Board and does the Board undertake to fully consult on any new proposed route alignment?</p>	<p>3. GCP officers are seeking approval from the Executive Board to proceed with initial technical work on the Environmental Impacts Assessment.</p> <p>Public consultation, where the emerging design and proposals for mitigation are presented for comment, is an integral part of the EIA process and would only proceed subject to the outcome of the audit.</p>
3	<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge PPF</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Cambridge Past Present and Future has been pressing for an independent review of this scheme for some time and we would encourage the Board to support this. In order to try and restore some trust it is essential that the community and stakeholders have confidence that the review is genuinely independent. To achieve this will mean ensuring the brief for the work and the process for appointing the independent reviewer is transparent. Please can the Board provide reassurance on this and some detail on the process?</p>	<p>Subject to Board agreement, the Partnership will proceed to undertake an independent audit. The process will be fully transparent and as more detail is available this would be shared.</p> <p>I also understand the need for the process to be independent. Therefore, subject to the Board's approval, I would envisage an independent commissioning party to be appointed to develop the terms of reference for the audit review, commission the audit, and oversee the process, ultimately reporting back to the Board. If supported by the Board, we will agree a process and make a commitment to openness and transparency and as more detail is available, this would be shared online.</p> <p>The audit will review the assumptions and constraints that underpin the outline business case for C2C scheme and the elimination of alternative options, including consideration of the evidence submitted to date.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

6	Dr.Marilyn Treacy	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>To date, consultants the GCP have used on this project have been interwoven in its DNA and far from independent. Please can you provide evidence that an independent audit will indeed be independent? Will the LLF be able to review and input into the selection of consultants, terms of reference and input information to be reviewed?</p>	<p>The audit will be undertaken subject to Board agreement. As the scheme promoter, it is right that the GCP Board would lead the audit commissioning process, but I also understand the need for the process to be independent and transparent. Therefore, subject to the Board's approval, I would envisage an independent commissioning party to be appointed to develop the terms of reference for the audit review, commission the audit, and oversee the process, ultimately reporting back to the Board. If supported by the Board, we will agree a process and make a commitment to openness and transparency and, as more detail is available, this would be shared online.</p>
14	Roxanne De Beaux Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 9: Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is pleased to see that the Future Investment Strategy report recognises the important role that cycling can play in addressing local issues and contributing to GCP goals. It's clear that people want to cycle more, the government wants people to cycle more, businesses expect their employees to cycle more, and public feedback from consultations and the Citizens' Assembly recognise cycling's role in tackling air pollution, congestion and climate change.</p> <p>We therefore strongly welcome the proposal for targeted investment to close gaps and establish important links in the cycling network. We also welcome the new criteria assessing whether transport schemes support the delivery of net-zero carbon objectives across Greater Cambridge.</p>	<p>The GCP will continue to work with partners to coordinate investment in the cycling network, and the work to identify gaps will consider where other proposals or funding exists. This will include the Covid-19 active travel schemes as well as proposals from the GCP, County Council, Combined Authority and other partners.</p> <p>Tackling climate change and emissions from transport will take a combined effort from both local and national partners – not just the GCP.</p> <p>Meeting net zero requires both modal shift to public transport and active travel, and decarbonisation of the transport network more widely.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>How will this investment be coordinated with other schemes which have a bearing on the cycling infrastructure network, such as the GCP Eastern Access Project, or the Combined Authority project to improve Coldham's Lane roundabout (which still requires additional funding for a properly 'cycle-proof' design.)?</p> <p>How will these cycling projects tie in with Covid-19 tranche 2 schemes like modal filters on Arbury Road and junction improvements at the Barnwell/Newmarket Road roundabout? Testing these interventions can speed up the process and have immediate benefits to the local community and commuters.</p> <p>The National Audit Office (NAO) made it clear last week that if we are to achieve the goal of net-zero by 2050 we must make drastic changes to how we live and travel. Do the GCP plans go far enough to enable Greater Cambridge to reach net-zero?</p> <p>If the GCP is serious about net-zero carbon objectives then they must heed the advice from the Citizens' Assembly to be bold! We urge the GCP to be ambitious with the locations and solutions chosen for this project.</p>	<p>The GCP's sustainable transport programme will support the achievement of net zero ambitions by creating a network that will provide more people with an alternative to using a car, and the Future Investment Strategy also proposes investment to support the bus fleet to move to zero emission vehicles.</p>
12	Edward Leigh on behalf of Smarter Cambridge Transport	<p>Agenda Item 9: Future Investment Strategy</p> <p><i>Why is GCP in the business of building roads and car parks?</i> Neither of these is consistent with the Paris Climate agreement nor the UK's Climate Change Act. The future scenario GCP is <i>still</i> planning for is one in which the planet</p>	<p>The GCP is investing in a range of sustainable travel projects to create a network that offers people an alternative to their car and supports our partners to meet their zero carbon ambitions.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

	<p>will be hostile not only to economic growth, but to life itself. Busways are supposedly needed to let buses bypass congestion. Yet, until all energy supplies are zero-carbon, the only effective policy to reduce carbon emissions from transport is for citizens and businesses to reduce vehicle-miles.</p> <p>Page 81 of the agenda pack shows a Proposed Bus Network for the Cambourne busway. Nothing about it depends on there being a busway. The same would be true of the South East and Waterbeach busways. Using the Bus Services Act, the Combined Authority is empowered to design and commission exactly the bus services the county needs. All that is missing is a revenue stream to subsidise those services. But busways won't generate a revenue; quite the reverse: they will create a substantial additional management and maintenance cost for users and the highway authority. HM Treasury is now actively looking at road pricing. So, I urge Board members <i>not</i> to waste precious money on unnecessary busways, but to invest in what <i>is</i> needed to start the transition to a zero-carbon economy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Build out the cycle Greenways <i>and keep going</i>. 2) Build travel hubs – <i>not huge car parks</i> – to give people everywhere in Greater Cambridge convenient, safe and secure access to bus and rail services. 3) Intervene tactically in the road network to prioritise buses. 4) Prepare <i>now</i> to spend the allocated £75m to commission new bus services as we emerge from the pandemic. 5) Implement a Workplace Parking Levy. 6) Work with Government to design a road pricing scheme that serves local as well as national needs. 	<p>The GCP's sustainable travel programme does not include road schemes, but does include dedicated public transport routes enabling enhanced services and connections, and several travel hubs designed to facilitate multi-modal journeys.</p> <p>The city access project has undertaken analysis of a range of options to free up road space within the city and create a revenue stream for future bus services, which was set out in detail at the Executive Board's meeting in February. This work has emphasised the importance of ensuring people have good alternatives to travelling by car if demand management is to be successful.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

15	Roxanne De Beaux Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes more detail on the city access strategy and supports the short-term measures being implemented to encourage more people to walk and cycle. More secure cycle parking at workplaces and in the city centre is very important to address issues of cycle theft, particularly when seeking to increase uptake in the use of e-bikes. We also strongly support the city centre freight pilot with increased use of cycle logistics.</p> <p>Camcycle also supports a more widescale programme of roadspace reallocation to create safe and attractive active travel routes and agrees that if this is coordinated with a review of car parking and the city road network hierarchy, and communicated well as a whole scheme, it is more likely to achieve high levels of modal shift and public support. However, we believe that the recommendations underestimate the impact that could be achieved by fast, ambitious action. For example, Leicester’s pop-up cycle network (11 miles in 10 weeks) has already increased cycling by 45% and school street schemes in London have had a huge impact on modal shift.</p> <p>We'd like to again emphasise that the GCP must heed the advice of the Citizens Assembly and be much bolder with your approach.</p> <p>Why have we not yet seen progress or pre-consultation on the Active Travel Fund Tranche Two schemes?</p>	<p>The Government confirmed the emergency active travel fund allocations last month, as well as enhanced consultation requirements for tranche 2 schemes. The GCP is working with the County Council on implementation of the tranche 2 roadspace reallocation measures in this context and we hope to give a firmer timeframe very soon.</p> <p>The GCP continues to work closely with partners on the programme of schemes as a whole and how these support both active travel and social distancing in context of Covid-19, as well as their potential to offer longer term benefits.</p> <p>The proposed review of the city highway network hierarchy will also help to influence and inform future investment in active travel measures.</p>
----	---------------------------	--	---

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>Will the GCP work with the County Council, Combined Authority and City Council to produce an overarching strategy for the current and proposed schemes so they can be considered in context for achieving short and long term ambitious aims of traffic reduction and increasing active travel rather than being decided by piecemeal consultations?</p>	
9	Windsor Road Residents' Association	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>We are concerned about the process and timing of decisions on permanency of the ETROs.</p> <p>1. When will decisions about the permanency of schemes be made? What is the role of the current consultations? What else will be taken into account?</p> <p>2. How are the effects of the ETROs to be assessed? Will the results of the consultations be binding and, if so, how can “other representations” and longer term effects be taken into consideration (see Agenda page 182, section 4.8)?</p> <p>3. Is it sensible to make permanent decisions while conditions are atypical?</p> <p>4. Would it not be wise to wait until a more stable situation appears to have been reached, when the social effects of the COVID-19 virus have diminished and travel patterns have stabilised?</p> <p>We are glad the GCP is monitoring traffic. The data presented are for September-November 2020; presumably</p>	<p>Decisions on the permanency of the schemes will be taken in autumn next year. This will include consideration of the response to the public consultations along with the objections and representations received during the trial period. The Board and the County Council’s Highways and Transport Committee will consider the responses before determining the statutory objections received and taking final decisions on the future of the experimental measures.</p> <p>The traffic monitoring data that has been collected for each of the Tranche 1 schemes will also be presented to the Executive Board and the Highways and Transport Committee to support the decision making process.</p> <p>Whilst traffic flow data has been captured at each of the trial sites there is no comparable ‘before’ data available for all sites.</p> <p>All the traffic data available, both before and during the trial period, will be made available along with the data that has been collected more widely across the city as part of the monitoring of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>comparative figures are available for the time before ETROs were introduced, and monitoring will continue. The current situation is abnormal. Many people are still working from home and limiting their shopping and leisure activities. In addition there are roadworks on major routes into and out of Cambridge. It is hard to be sure of cause and effect when multiple factors change simultaneously.</p> <p>5. What will be the criteria for selecting particular roads for ETROs in future? It seems to us that not all the current ETROs improve the cycling or walking experience, although they do affect motor traffic which usually has to take a longer route, directly causing inconvenience. Traffic already using this route is also inconvenienced indirectly by worsened congestion and air pollution. Pollution will also adversely affect active travellers.</p>	<p>The GCP is working closely with the County Council to determine arrangements for the implementation of a second tranche of experimental traffic management schemes. A full list of the schemes, including those being led by the GCP, was published with the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee papers in due course.</p> <p>Any further ETRO proposals would be a matter for the County Council to consider and the GCP will look to provide support, if asked.</p>
2	<p>Lesley Sherratt, Chair Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12: Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p>Grantchester Parish Council welcomes the principles of the Greenways project and understands the need to provide for cyclists from Haslingfield having an off-road route to get to Cambridge safely. We have welcomed the Barton Greenway and are grateful for the constructive consultation carried out so far with the Greenways team that has been responsive to the particular needs of Grantchester's largely older population (the oldest in South Cambs) and need to keep the Grantchester Road open.</p> <p>Unfortunately the proposed route for the Haslingfield Greenway still raises safety concerns once it reaches the village of Grantchester, for residents where it comes past the</p>	<p>The highest priority for the Greenway is to remove safety concerns. The routes must be safe, direct and attractive to use if we are to encourage more people to choose active travel.</p> <p>The reason we are recommending a route through Grantchester as well as the Baulk route which bypasses Grantchester is that it is a more direct route and it serves to link local centres (Hauxton, Haslingfield, Grantchester and Newnham).</p> <p>Whilst the Baulk route as was well supported as part of the Barton Greenway in our public consultations, the route</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>sheltered housing, for pedestrians through the very narrow parts and for cyclists themselves where visibility is poor, and where the Highway has to be crossed three times.</p> <p>Our Question is: with the link to the Barton Greenway after the M11 is crossed, and with the adoption of the ‘Baulk’ route as part of the Barton Greenway, is the substantial disruption to Grantchester village, especially given its conservation status, its demographic and the difficult safety issues, worth the cost of having the option of coming through the village when a safer, simple and more fully off-road route across the Baulk is already budgeted for?</p>	<p>through Grantchester was better supported as part of the Haslingfield Greenway.</p> <p>Statistics from the consultation are as follows:</p> <p>57% (236 responses) supported all 3 elements of the route through Grantchester:</p> <p>Of the 532 responses to the Barton Greenway consultation 41% (218 responses) supported the development of the Baulk route.</p> <p>We are mindful of/sensitive to the conservation status of Grantchester and will work to minimise disruption and impact on residents.</p>
16	Roxanne De Beaux Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 14: Chisholm Trail</p> <p>The Chisholm Trail is perhaps the most widely welcomed and popular GCP project and will help more local people to walk and cycle for everyday journeys and open up access to the city’s precious green spaces. Research from active travel charity Sustrans estimates that the current level of cycling in Greater Cambridge saves the region over £100 million a year in healthcare costs and delivers additional benefits in terms of reducing congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>We support calls for a clear understanding of how local authorities manage transport projects and fuller public disclosure of what has caused the cost overruns. There seems to be a pattern of cost overruns on all transport projects. The continual delays for this project long since</p>	<p>Coldhams Common - The project team have finalised the design for this section of the route and the footbridge, and the intention is to start constructions works early in the new year, before the 15 January date.</p> <p>Newmarket Road underpass work will commence – works will commence in Spring 2021, with a provisional road closure of Newmarket Road being late March/early April 2021.</p> <p>Coldham’s Lane crossing - the crossing represents the start of Phase 2 of Chisholm Trail. The Report Recommendations seek to require GCP officers to revise delivery arrangements for Phase 2 of the project in light of the problems to date. And these will be brought back to a future meeting and I will update on the</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>passed unacceptable. The whole Chisholm Trail should be finished as soon as possible and to the highest possible standard so that local residents can make use of this new sustainable route, unlocking city-wide benefits for all.</p> <p>Camcycle must question the slow progress and the additional risks that come from these delays, particularly the work on Coldham's Common which must be started by 15 January Commons consent deadline. To miss this deadline would be a huge waste of the efforts of officers to get permission to do this work on the Common and further delays and costs will be added if permission must be sought again.</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm that work on Coldham's Common will begin before the required 15 January deadline?</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm when the work on the Coldham's Lane crossing will begin?</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm when the Newmarket Road underpass work will commence? Please can the GCP explain why work on these sections has not yet been started?</p>	<p>timeline at that point.</p> <p>The programme has been focusing on Phase 1 and the Abbey-Chesterton bridge construction phases to date.</p>
13	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda Item 14: Chisholm Trail</p> <p>It has been a long time since I first wrote about a cycling route that could enable more to cycle both for work and utility trips in and around Cambridge. At that time I suggested that building such a route would be of Economic Benefit, and that money invested in cycleways would produce bigger savings for those using roads than money spent directly on roads.</p>	<p>I would acknowledge the sentiment in the question.</p> <p>The recommendations seek to reaffirm the GCP's support for delivery of this scheme, and addressing the financial challenges.</p>

Appendix A – 10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

	<p>Non-user benefits are far better recognised now.</p> <p>I made no reference to ‘Health & Wellbeing’, nor to the connections to ‘Green Spaces’ and the value for ‘Walking’. The developments of Cambridge North station, the NE Fringe, the Southern Fringe and the Biomedical Campus were not then even under consideration.</p> <p>The route has had increasing support from all quarters and the significance of such provision will be all the more valuable in the new ‘Normal’ when active travel must be promoted and CO2 and other pollutants vastly reduced.</p> <p>Planning Permission was granted in July 2017. It should have not taken three and a half years to build, yet no section has even been completed.</p> <p>I ask that the Board recognises the value of this project to all in and around Cambridge by continuing to fund it. I also ask that the governance of similar future schemes be such that an integrated plan can enable completion in a more reasonable timescale.</p>	<p>The recommendations also seek to require GCP officers to revise delivery arrangements for Phase 2 of the project in light of the problems to date. And these will be brought back to a future meeting.</p>
--	---	---

* Numbered in order of receipt

1. The LLF opposes a premature decision on the current Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme. It is unfit for purpose, anachronistic and environmentally damaging, and is now out of step with emerging proposals for East West Rail and CAM.

The LLF recommends a pause until:

- i) The Mayor’s CAM consultation has concluded and his proposed route suitable for autonomous vehicles, MRT and adaptable into a Metro is published;
- ii) The location of a new east west rail station in Cambourne is confirmed and the business case for the busway reworked in light of its impact. This is a multi billion pound scheme that needs to be thoroughly understood first.

In the meantime, we support the Combined Authority’s interim, high-quality bus priority measures and/or improved services on existing infrastructure that can support the Local Plan and provide immediate transport benefits to key employment locations while the bigger picture falls into place.

2. The LLF asks for input into shaping the EIA scoping exercise.

The EIA should not start until after the independent audit concludes.

The EIA should include a cultural heritage review of the entire landscape around the American Cemetery.

3. The LLF would welcome the decision of the GCP Board to appoint an independent auditor. This is the opportunity for the Board to build the trust of the local community in C2C process.

For trust to be built in this way, the audit must demonstratively be independent, transparent and not controlled by GCP officers. For this to be achieved, in our view, the independent auditor should be appointed unanimously by the voting and non-voting members of the GCP Board and agreed by the MPs for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge. The audit should be managed by a steering committee which is made up of people appointed by GCP and includes the LLF. The auditor should report to the steering committee which will have oversight over the audit process and undertake regular reviews of the progress and commenting on reports and other outputs by the auditor, and the audit should not be restricted to a narrow assessment of whether due process was followed, but will look at wider issues of how decisions were made.