



**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 28 September 2023

4:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Elisa Meschini (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Mike Davey	Cambridge City Council
Andy Williams	Business Representative
Andy Neely	University Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in attendance:

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

Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson

Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
----------------------	---

Officers:

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

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of Interest

Andy Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 8 (Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme), as a consultant to businesses on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Andy Neely declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 9 (Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway), as a resident of the Waterbeach area.

Councillor Davey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 10 (Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project), as a resident of Riverside.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 29 June 2023, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

The minutes of the extraordinary joint meeting of the Executive Board and the Joint Assembly, held on 26 June 2023, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that thirty-three 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 fourteen questions related to agenda item 6 (Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps), ten questions related to agenda item 7 (Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3), three questions related to agenda item 8 (Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme), two questions related to agenda item 9 (Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway), three questions related to agenda item 10 (Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project), and one question related to agenda item 11 (Quarterly Progress Report).

5. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 7 September 2023.

6. Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps

Fourteen public questions were received from Mal Schofield, David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), Neil Mackay (on behalf of Mackays of Cambridge Ltd.), Rory Comyn, William Bannell, Ian Black, Jenny Williams (read out by Sara Lightowlers), Martin Lucas-Smith, Edward Leigh, Elizabeth Whitebread (on behalf of Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone, and read out by Sara Lightowlers), Sarah Hughes (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance), Richard Wood (on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users, and read out by Sarah Hughes), Sara Lightowlers (on behalf of Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone), and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Melbourn and Bassingbourn division, was invited to address the Executive Board. Expressing concern about a potential disruption to the Making Connections proposals, Councillor Van de Ven highlighted the need to reduce health inequalities by improving air quality, as well as transport and access opportunities, particularly for young people. She drew attention to examples of residents who struggled to attend employment, learning and medical commitments due to inadequate bus services or sustainable transport infrastructure and unaffordable taxis, with further reductions to such services under consideration. It was acknowledged that the Making Connections proposals sought to address health and social inequalities while improving the local bus network, and members were informed that the Combined Authority continued to consider its own bus reform proposals.

Councillor Naomi Bennett, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the Executive Board. Highlighting a perceived lack of belief that the local bus network could be sufficiently improved, Councillor Bennett proposed a temporary pilot scheme, such as orbital bus services connecting Park and Ride sites with key employment and education centres, potentially funded by a council tax precept. Acknowledging that such a pilot scheme would not resolve the wider congestion issues, she argued that it would still have an impact and could help overcome this barrier to public acceptance. Members were informed that it would be difficult to obtain the necessary capital investment from the private or public sector without certainty of long-term funding, with a risk of exacerbating people's difficulties by encouraging a reliance on a temporary service. It was also noted that the Combined Authority had already implemented a mayoral precept, which raised almost £4m per year.

The Executive Board received a report from the Director of City Access detailing a revised Making Connections scheme, including an Outline Business Case, following further technical work in response to the consultation findings that had been presented

to the Executive Board in June 2023. The Executive Board were asked to consider whether the proposals were at the stage to be recommended to the County Council, in order to be progressed to a Full Business Case.

Noting that two of the GCP's constituent councils had indicated their reluctance to continue with the current Making Connections proposals shortly before the Joint Assembly's meeting on 7 September 2023, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly informed the Executive Board that it had been agreed not to scrutinise the amended proposals at the meeting of the Joint Assembly, although he noted that some of the members had been prepared to do so. Instead, the Joint Assembly had asked the GCP to prepare a high-level strategic assessment of the threats and opportunities of starting again, taking account of a range of factors and impacts, and he welcomed the inclusion of this assessment at Appendix 4 of the report in front of the Executive Board. Nonetheless, the Joint Assembly had asked the Executive Board to establish whether a political consensus in support of the current proposals could be achieved, and for the constituent authorities to reaffirm their commitment to finding and supporting solutions to the original objectives underlying the Making Connections proposals. The Joint Assembly requested that, in the event of the Executive Board deciding not to continue with the current proposals, consideration be given to potential alternative sources of recurring revenue income to support bus services and the active travel network, along with the necessary demand management measures to support them. He acknowledged further reluctance to support the proposals had been expressed prior to the Executive Board's meeting, but expressed concern about withdrawing the only detailed and recommended option that was under consideration without any alternative options being proposed. He highlighted the extensive level of work that had been carried out to date and emphasised the importance of taking action.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed Mayor Dr Johnson's commitment to continue working in partnership with the GCP, given his role in the wider region, and supported the Combined Authority's ambition to deliver bus reform and to improve transport options across the area. Members expressed concern about the continuous decline of the local bus network and emphasised the importance of improving it.
- Paid tribute to people that had participated in the Making Connections consultation, drawing attention to the vast amount of information and opinions that had been collated, both supporting and opposing the proposals. It was argued that the GCP had diligently considered and responded to the thousands of responses that had been received, and members also paid tribute to the work of officers in continuously developing and amending the proposals throughout the process.
- Acknowledged that there was currently not a political consensus in support of the proposals, although members expressed concern that this had been demonstrated outside of the meeting environment, which it was suggested undermined the accountability of the Executive Board. It was also recognised that there were significant divisions within political groups.

- Noted the Strategic assessment of the threats and opportunities of not proceeding with Making Connections that had been included as Appendix 4 to the report and expressed concern about the higher number of threats that it identified compared to opportunities, including the potential impact on the emerging Local Plan. Members drew attention to proposals from the government to significantly increase the size of Cambridge, highlighting the importance of improving sustainable transport for the region to sustain its success and strategic role for the country.
- Noted the identified impacts on businesses of not continuing with the proposals and the likely subsequent increase in congestion and deterioration of public transport which would be detrimental to the wellbeing of both workers and customers. Members highlighted that many businesses had their own corporate sustainability targets, and it was suggested that they would therefore be required to respond to a further reduction in buses either by promoting and facilitating sustainable transport or by disincentivising car usage by reducing the car park size. It was argued that private bus services run by businesses for their employees would exacerbate current inequalities and further undermine the economic model of current public bus services. Members also highlighted that ambition, commitment and consistency were fundamental to achieving business confidence and long-term investment in the region.
- Expressed concern about abuse received by councillors in relation to the Making Connections proposals, as well as the polarised nature of the debate which tended to focus solely on the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone, and argued that it did not facilitate the debate, the process or the wider city.
- Highlighted the costs of congestion to businesses and people who spent significant periods of time in traffic.
- Agreed generally that the preferred option of Scenario 1A met the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme, with members highlighting the extensive work carried out on developing the proposals and considering alternatives for a sustainable financial solution to fund improved bus and active travel networks. However, one member also drew attention to the fact that the preferred option had not been scrutinised by the Joint Assembly and argued that this made it difficult for the Executive Board to make a suitably informed decision.
- Agreed that the preferred option of Scenario 1A responded appropriately to many of the issues raised during the consultation and paid tribute to the extensive consideration that had been given to the wide-ranging responses that had been received in the consultation, particularly welcoming changes based on concerns about the impact on people with lower incomes. Members expressed concern that the reduced level of revenue generation would not be sufficient to fund the planned improvements to the bus and active travel network, although it was acknowledged that a compromise had been necessary and that further alternative funding could potentially be obtained.
- Observed that the final decision on the implementation of any road charging was a responsibility of the County Council, and reluctantly agreed that the proposals were not yet at a stage where the GCP could recommend them for approval, especially

as they had not yet been effectively scrutinised by the Joint Assembly. Members argued that greater partnership working between the constituent authorities, different political groups, and the government was required to overcome current differences in opinion and resolve ongoing concerns.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (1) Note the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and the Making Connections proposals;
- (2) Note the results of the consultation that was undertaken on the Making Connections proposals as outlined in Section 4 and Appendix 2 of the report;
- (3) Note the request from the Joint Assembly meeting on 7 September with regard to this item as outlined in Section 3 of the report;
- (4) Note; Appendix 4 of the report prepared in response to the request from the Joint Assembly;
- (5) Agree that the preferred option (Scenario 1A) as outlined in Section 7 and the Outline Business Case (Appendix 5):
 - a. meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and
 - b. responds appropriately to the issues raised during the consultation.
- (6) Agree that the proposals are not at a stage to enable recommendations to be made to the Highways & Transport Committee of the County Council (as Highways Authority) to endorse the Outline Business Case and to progress the Making Connections proposals to the Full Business Case stage.

7. Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3

Ten public questions were received from Yunus Bostanci, Iris Bostanci, James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), Jim Rickard, Stephen Partridge-Hicks, Dr Marilyn Treacy, Carolyn Postgate, Paul Hollinghurst (on behalf of Railfuture East Anglia, and read out by Peter Wakefield), Edward Leigh, and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chief Executive presented a report to the Executive Board which included an updated Future Investment Strategy (FIS) based on the current forecast cost of the programme. It proposed a reprioritisation of the programme which included pausing the Cambridge South East Transport Strategy Phase 2 (CSET) and the Foxton Travel Hub, alongside various changes to other schemes, while opportunities for additional funding were explored. An annual report would allow the Executive Board to review management of the overprogramming element of the GCP's budget.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had supported the FIS and accompanying proposals, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly argued that the detailed designs of any paused schemes should not be re-examined at this stage, and that alternative funding should

be sought as a matter of urgency, with progress being reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. He informed the Executive Board that members had also requested for the active travel components to be continued within the schemes that were subject to being paused.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the need to reprioritise the GCP's programme but drew attention to the integrated nature of the various schemes, expressing concern about the impacts that pausing or changing certain schemes may have on others. Members were reassured that alongside an annual report dedicated to the issue of overprogramming and reprioritisation, individual issues would be considered by presented to the Executive Board on a case-by-case basis, while issues would also be included in the Quarterly Progress Report that was on the agenda of each meeting.
- Welcomed the proposal to consider funding the A505 bridge to Royston within the Melbourn Greenway as part of the reprioritisation work, and paid tribute to local members for supporting the project.
- Highlighted the importance of the CSET scheme for connecting housing with five separate campuses that accounted for 60% of the area's research and development work, as well as for improving access to Addenbrooke's and the wider Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and expressed concern about the potential impacts of pausing the scheme.
- Noted that a number of concerns had been raised as part of the CSET consultation, including about the consultation itself and the decision-making process, but highlighted the significant amount of work that had been carried out in developing the scheme, and considered whether a time limit should be imposed on any pause of the scheme, particularly given the impact of current levels of inflation on building and engineering costs.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Agree the Future Investment Strategy 3 for investment across the GCP Programme;
- (b) Agree the reprioritisation of the programme, including pausing those schemes listed in Paragraph 4.9 of the report with specific changes to other schemes set out in Paragraph 5.6;
- (c) Agree to explore opportunities for additional funding, as set out in Paragraph 5.3 of the report;
- (d) Note the current forecast cost of the programme and the work officers are doing to manage this; and

- (e) Agree the proposed process for managing the ‘overprogramming’ element of the GCP budget including annual reports on the forecast cost of the programme.

8. Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme

Three public questions were received from James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), John Latham (on behalf of Hobson’s Conduit Trust), and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Executive Board received a report from the Director of Transport on the outcome of a targeted consultation on a minor route variation of the Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme (CSET), and which sought approval for the variation. Following the Executive Board agreeing to pause CSET’s Phase 2 in the previous agenda item (Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3), additional funding would be sought to enable a request to be made to the County Council to submit a Transport and Works Act Order application as the relevant Highways Authority for the area.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had received a petition related to a proposed alternative scheme to CSET, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised that the route alignment had already been approved by the Executive Board, although members had supported the minor route variation that had been proposed.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board established that it would be required to approve the restart of Phase 2 if additional funding became available.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the response to the Stapleford Consultation;
- (b) Approve the minor variation to the preferred route; and
- (c) Agree to formally pause the scheme and, should funding become available, make a formal request to Cambridgeshire County Council to submit a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application as the relevant Highways Authority for the area.

9. Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway

Two public questions were received from James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Executive Board received a report from the Transport Director which included the outcomes of the consultation on two possible route alignments for a busway from Waterbeach to Cambridge and on three potential locations for a new park and ride facility close to the new town at Waterbeach. A revised central option for the busway was recommended for progressing to the preliminary design stage, along with the Park and Ride site Option C. As a further aspect of the GCP's work in the corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge, the report included a proposal for a public consultation on a new alignment of the Waterbeach Greenway to provide better connectivity between GCP schemes.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly informed the Executive Board that the Joint Assembly had supported the recommendations set out in the report.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board suggested that consideration should be given to how consultation processes on such schemes were carried out.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the recent public consultation;
- (b) Approve the revised central alignment as the preferred busway route alignment to be taken forward to the next project stage, where further work will be undertaken to refine the route and develop the preliminary designs, and undertake more detailed environmental impact assessment;
- (c) Approve Park and Ride site C as the preferred location to be taken forward to the next project stage, where further work will be undertaken to develop the preliminary designs and undertake more detailed environmental impact assessment;
- (d) Approve the Outline Business Case for the project and that it provides the basis for a revised scheme budget of £109.4M; and
- (e) Approve the proposals to consult on a revised alignment of the Waterbeach Greenway.

10. Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project

Three public questions were received from James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), Martin Lucas-Smith, and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Naomi Bennett, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the Executive Board. Drawing attention to the fact that the concerns of local residents were focussed on maximising safety whereas the concerns of those of people who only drove through the affected area were focussed on maximising speed and ease of transit, Councillor Bennet highlighted the A1134/A1303 roundabout as an accident blackspot and expressed her support for the proposed scheme. She also

drew attention to feedback on the Elizabeth Way roundabout that had been submitted by local residents as part of the consultation, and drew attention to the current dangerous conditions for cycling along Newmarket Road.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had broadly supported the recommendations, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted two areas of concern that had been discussed. Members had suggested that the location of the Park and Ride site should be reconsidered, to enable it to capture traffic at an earlier stage and to allow bus services to also travel along the A14 and enter Cambridge along Milton Road, and he expressed concern that this request for reconsideration of the location had not been reflected in the report to the Executive Board. Suggesting that further information was necessary on how the proposed developments of the Grafton and Beehive centres would impact the scheme, he noted that the Joint Assembly had been keen to consider any delay to works on the Elizabeth Way roundabout as phasing, rather than pausing.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the need to consider the implications of potential developments at the Grafton and Beehive centres to ensure the scheme was appropriate, but highlighted the importance of resolving issues related to the Elizabeth Way roundabout in a timely manner, especially given the timeframes for those developments were beyond the control of the GCP. It was also observed that any implications from proposed developments at the site of Cambridge United Football Club should be considered as well. Members were informed that the planning and highways authorities were discussing the proposed plans with developers before the GCP carried out the design of any work on the roundabout, and it was clarified that there was no proposal to reduce the budget for works on the roundabout.
- Highlighted the significant traffic issues that were caused at the A1134/A1303 roundabout by vehicles accessing the adjoining McDonald's restaurant and expressed concern that the GCP was being forced to curtail the potential of the scheme as a result of the business's location and custom. It was clarified that the GCP did not have the authority to relocate the restaurant or redesign its private access, and members were informed that schemes would only be proposed if their designs were safe.
- Drew attention to tree translocation on the Genome Campus and suggested that the GCP could consider similar approaches to plant life as part of the development of its schemes.
- Clarified that the recommendation related to the location of the Park and Ride site was only to note the Outline Business Case, with officers to continue working with both the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on the next steps before any decisions were made, although it was acknowledged that this could be more explicit.

The following amendment to recommendation (d) was proposed by Andy Neely, seconded by Councillor Milnes and agreed unanimously (addition in bold):

- (d) Note the Outline Business Case for the new Newmarket Road Park and Ride proposals and direct officers to work with the Joint Assembly and Board on next steps, **particularly with regard to the location of the Park and Ride site**;

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the outcomes of the recent consultation on Newmarket Road and the Park and Ride;
- (b) Agree to progress the Eastern Access Phase 1 works along Newmarket Road, from the Chisholm Trail to Airport Way to detailed design stage;
- (c) Agree to revisit the scheme around Elizabeth roundabout to allow for the development of a wider strategy for the area reflecting the opportunities afforded by the emerging Grafton and Beehive developments, including possible developer contributions;
- (d) Note the Outline Business Case for the new Newmarket Road Park and Ride proposals and direct officers to work with the Joint Assembly and Board on next steps, particularly with regard to the location of the Park and Ride site; and
- (e) Note the budget for the scheme of £58,472,000.

11. Quarterly Progress Report

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

Councillor Karen Young, Cambridge City Councillor for the Queen Edith's ward, was invited to address the Executive Board. Although she welcomed the proposed fast-tracking of work on the Addenbrooke's roundabout, Councillor Young expressed concern that it could result in not achieving the best scheme possible for cyclists and pedestrians. She drew attention to concerns that had been raised with the design and suggested that the removal of some of the trees appeared to be unnecessary. It was clarified that although the funding from the Combined Authority that enabled the fast-tracking of a section of the scheme was time limited, the work would still undertake the usual process. Concerns had been raised during the consultation, which would be addressed in consultation with local members and stakeholder groups before a final design was presented to Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval. It was also confirmed that the GCP was working with various teams at the County Council to ensure that was as safe and beneficial as possible.

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, and which included an update on the future maintenance of the GCP's active travel infrastructure, alongside an updated version of the GCP's Assurance Framework. It also proposed the fast-tracking of the detailed design for the Addenbrooke's roundabout section from the A1134 Cycling Plus scheme, as well as an £80k

contribution towards the City Council's secure cycle parking scheme at Queen Anne Terrace car park.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had supported all the recommendations, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly informed the Executive Board that members had established the detailed design of the Addenbrooke's roundabout would be presented for consideration at a later date.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board drew attention to the recent launch of the Innovation Prospectus, which sought to encourage the market to trial new and innovative technologies across the Greater Cambridge region, and it was noted that a number of companies had expressed interest following the launch.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the update on the future maintenance of the GCP Active Travel infrastructure;
- (b) Agree an £80k contribution to funding of the City Council's secure cycle parking scheme at Queen Anne Terrace car park;
- (c) Approve the request to fast track the Detailed Design for the Addenbrooke's Roundabout section from the A1134 Cycling Plus scheme; and
- (d) Approve the update to the GCP Assurance Framework (Appendix 9 of the report).

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 14 December 2023.

Chairperson
14 December 2023

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 28 September 2023
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation

	From	Question	Response
1	Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>"2.8 The Greater Cambridge area is forecast to grow significantly. Successive development plans over the last 20 years have supported the economic success of the area and provided for housing and employment land to support that growth. The adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans plan for 44,000 more jobs and 33,500 homes by 2031.2 The 2021 Census showed that significant population growth has already taken place, with 35,000 more Greater Cambridge residents than in 2011.</p> <p>Greater Cambridge is a net 'importer' of workers, with a travel to work area stretching beyond Cambridgeshire into parts of Hertfordshire, Essex, and Suffolk."</p> <p>The CPCA Board met today (20th September 2023) Their Board Papers show a very different growth pattern. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan) for Greater Cambridge (Page 375. " A Connected Region") ("The Plan is closely aligned to the further aspirations for the region as outlined in England Economic Heartland Transport Strategy (EEH 2021)"</p> <p>The spatial context as described by the GCP and CPCA, are very different. The implications are serious. The issues where to build new homes and appropriate transport infrastructure are far from clear. It might also be the case that the CCC has other plans and expectations.</p>	<p>The narrative on growth set out in the Making Connections Outline Business case is drawn from the adopted Local Plans for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City, the emerging Shared Local Plan for Geater Cambridge and Census data.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan being developed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service will set the shared strategic spatial context for Greater Cambridge to 2041.</p>

		<p>Regardless, the TTWA for Cambridge (Fig 1 WSP Atkins Report Page 42 of 531) is certain to expand east/west as East West Rail connect Bedford and Tempsford with Cambourne and Cambridge South Station.</p> <p>In the absence of a clear sense of direction the likelihood of dependency upon the car as the essential mode for commuting remains high.</p> <p>Question.</p> <p>Joint (Shared) Local Plan to 2041 - How does the GCP intend to provide one shared strategic spatial context that delivers achievable and sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge, whilst preserving and enhancing the nature of our unique green corridors?</p>	
2	<p>David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Living Streets is committed to improving conditions for walking and deeply disappointed by the lack of funding to support it. The GCP proposed £5m annual funding at least signalled intent to take action and to recognise walking as top of the national transport hierarchy.</p> <p>So we ask: with the STZ in tatters how are the GCP and politicians now intending to meet the Department of Transport’s requirements to put walking first?</p> <p>There has been no dedicated funding stream for walking in any GCP strategy and some schemes may include impediments to walking - floating bus stops and shared-use cycle paths are examples. People won’t walk more if it is risky or unpleasant.</p>	<p>It is correct that the STZ as proposed offers opportunity to fund walking, cycling, public transport and other initiatives to support sustainable travel.</p> <p>However, the City Access programme is not only Making Connections. In particular the review of the Road Network Hierarchy will consider how we can make best use of the existing road space in the city to make safer more attractive spaces for walking, cycling and wheeling.</p> <p>GCP do put Pedestrians at the top of the active travel hierarchy and design with them in mind. Shared paths are appropriate to use depending on the widths available in the area and the level of usage. This is in line with LTN120. Where we have sufficient space and numbers, we are delivering segregated facilities.</p>

		So we ask: what plans exist to create an infrastructure that cuts pollution, protects walkers and enables those 20 minute walks that will reduce health risks and cut NHS costs?	
3	Neil Mackay Managing Director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>In 2003 when a Congestion charge was first introduced to London, Mackays of Cambridge went down to investigate the effects on business because we had heard that Cambridge may be considering following suit.</p> <p>What we discovered in our research gave us great cause for concern. The tourist centre of the city saw little effect as the majority of people used the mature and excellent public transport system that existed already. However we found businesses in the outer reaches of the zone that reported reduction in footfall of 60%. Those businesses were being forced to relocate completely altering the business demographic of the city.</p> <p>I have been out and interviewed many business owners and posted those interviews online. Every County councillor has received a link to those filmed interviews.</p> <p>The effect on small and medium sized business of introducing a congestion charge will be hugely negative.</p> <p>Given the massive and conclusive rejection of Congestion charging by business and the public will the executive board finally decide to put this plan to bed once and for all so local business can plan for its future within our city?</p>	<p>We have carried out and published a business impact assessment which presents the evidence of impact of the London congestion charge and draws on evidence of the impact of other similar schemes across the UK and abroad on business. I don't recognise the statistic you quote about reduced footfall on the edge of London's congestion charge zone from the evidence reviews that we have undertaken, but would be happy to review that evidence if you're able to provide it. Overall, on balance evidence does not indicate a negative impact on retail businesses from congestion charges in other locations. It further shows that general interventions to improve walking and cycling and reduce the dominance of car can have positive rather than negative impacts on retail businesses. Having said that, the BIA did identify the risk that the consultation version of the scheme would have more negative impacts for some businesses than others, particularly some sectors and for smaller businesses, and it was on that basis that proposed changes to the scheme published in these papers included a reversion to peak time only charging, which some members of your social media group have advocated, as well as a discount of 50% on the charge for locally owned small businesses and free days for customers to use for retail businesses where they may need to make bulkier purchases.</p>
4	Rory Comyn	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p>	<p>There are varying measures of air quality and quite a lot of detail set out in the OBC. There is no level of poor air quality that doesn't cause health problems. The Centre</p>

	<p>Cambridge City Council has considered setting targets for PM2.5 reduction and we welcome the introduction of targets under the Environment Bill, although the potential to achieve significant reduction is limited by the high regional contribution.</p> <p>There are few measures that can be undertaken locally that will specifically reduce the small amount of PM2.5 produced locally.</p> <p>Regional, national and international measures will be more effective.'</p> <p>Is the GCP aware that it's widely understood, outside this chamber, that, although the climate emergency is a pressing matter, the real necessity for the congestion charge, here and now, is to enable further speculative development of the city.</p> <p>Does the GCP know that the target, set out as one justification for the Congestion Charge: for the GCP to help create 44000 jobs by 2031, was met in 2022! ?</p> <p>Does the GCP know that the concomitant delivery of housing due by 2031, is merely on target?</p> <p>Does the GCP understand that development which eviscerates communities, and scatters them to the winds, and which entrenches and exacerbates inequality is, by definition, unsustainable?</p> <p>Is that what the GCP stands for?'</p>	<p>for Cities notes that Cambridge has the 8th highest number of days of poor air quality in the country in its 2023 cities outlook.</p> <p>Members' comments:</p> <p>We are aware that some people think the congestion charge is to enable speculative developments, but it is not true. We understand what unsustainable growth is and we are working to avoid it from occurring, as that is necessary to control it.</p>
--	--	---

5	William Bannell	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>In the Government's guidelines regarding the proper carrying out of consultations with the public, it states the following</p> <p>"We will also reduce the risk of 'consultation fatigue' by making sure we consult only on issues that are genuinely undecided." (- gov.uk website "consultation principles")</p> <p>Considering that since 2018, there have been more than 65 consultations, 15 of which took place during the pandemic, regarding a wide range of GCP schemes which are clearly all part of a wider, overarching general scheme to transform Cambridge's roads, some of which consultations have been open for a mere 3 weeks before closing again, how can the GCP expect to receive meaningful feedback from the public when there is an obvious likelihood of "consultation fatigue", and how can the GCP justify the blatant over-use of the consultation mechanism, against the government's guidance, to show support of any part of their over-arching agenda for Cambridge?</p>	<p>Members' comments [these do not correspond to the published question, as Mr Bannell asked a different question]:</p> <p>This is not about unsustainable or speculative development, it is about doing what is best for the Greater Cambridge region. The leaders of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, along with the Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, wrote to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to highlight concerns about water scarcity in the region.</p>
6	Ian Black	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>The Making Connections 2022 consultations raw data posted at the link below on 26 May 2023 remains incomplete, i.e. the data set does not contain the redacted unstructured text comments entered by survey participants. Given the length of time which has passed since the consultation concluded, the delay in releasing the full cohort of data raises a number of concerns.</p> <p>To explain:</p>	<p>In response to the query about the publication of the redacted free text responses: here we need to balance our commitment and legal duty to transparency with our legal duty under UK GDPR legislation as well as the requirement to achieve value for money in public expenditure. You will hopefully appreciate that reviewing and redacting around 150,000 individual text responses for potentially identifying information both individually and in combination across multiple answers could be a very expensive undertaking. We have commissioned a digital redaction to maximise value for money and are in the process of QA checking the</p>

	<p>The total number of submissions recorded in the raw data of 24,071 confirmed that 57.92% (or 58% rounded) either ‘strongly opposed or opposed’ the congestion charge. The total number of submissions has not changed since the conclusion of the consultation so, the configuration of hardware and software used to capture the submissions online either automatically identified duplicated submissions at the point of capture (i.e. the same individual repeatedly entering the same data) or if the configuration of hardware and software was not able to identify duplications, work since the conclusion of the consultation has taken place to identify duplications, but that the unstructured textual comments has not changed the total number of responses.</p> <p>QUESTION: When will the final set of redacted unstructured textual comments be available, and by what hardware, software or manual method was it de-duplicated and what chain of custody was employed to ensure its integrity since that time?</p> <p>FYI, for part of my career, I sponsored the acquisition and latterly led the growth of the world’s largest financially regulated compliance archive, meeting Securities and Exchange Commission 17/a 3 & 4 regulations. This platform required the de-duplication of petabytes of real-time (i.e. billions of messages) streaming data from many of the world’s largest financial institutions. To that end, I am familiar with technical data, architecture standards, and working practices, and I would appreciate a technically complete response, including a survey capture and process workflow diagram.</p>	<p>outputs. We have a duty to ensure we are compliant with the relevant privacy law before releasing this information, and will publish in due course when that is complete.</p> <p>In response to your query about data processing: the survey was hosted on ConsultCams, a web platform provided to Cambridgeshire County Council and the GCP by bangthetable</p> <p>Response to the questionnaire was not limited by IP address to ensure that we did not restrict access for those using shared computers in public spaces including hospitals, public libraries and student accommodation, or for family members sharing devices and computers within a household. Neither was registration or provision of personal details required in accordance with public consultation best practice which is to avoid putting up barriers that might discourage participation especially from groups which tend to be under represented. The process of de-duplication was therefore undertaken after the data had been downloaded and shared with the consultant team for processing and analysis.</p> <p>A number of automatic and manual checks for duplicates were undertaken on both respondent identifying data and on the free text responses and these are explained in the consultation report. In addition to checking the free text, we also reviewed responses from those that only answered Q9 and nothing else (which asked us about support or</p>
--	--	---

			<p>opposition to the zone). Only about 1% of the total sample responded to Q9 only and those respondents were 98% strongly opposed to the STZ. The consultation analysis we undertook was reviewed by the Consultation Institute.</p>
7	Jenny Williams	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>We're a car-less family who cycle and walk with our pre-schooler across Cambridge and the surrounding villages. In quiet, safe streets, we recognise that there are lots of benefits to our active travel, including increasing our daily exercise and exploring the outside world with our daughter. However, for large parts of the city, this is not our experience. We deal with walkways that are too thin for our stroller and too thin to walk holding hands with our child; pavement parking that forces us into busy roads; as well as poor driving and aggressive attitudes from drivers desperate to get through congestion as quickly as possible. It means walking in polluted air and next to overly loud traffic that terrifies our child. The poor and potholed state of the roads and walkways has caused damage to our bikes and tripped up our daughter numerous times. All of which can make active travel highly nerve wracking.</p> <p>In light of the Joint Assembly's request to the Exec to reflect and report back on Making Connections yet again, we want to know why our needs are not as important as those of people in cars and how much longer we need to wait to see substantial improvements to our safety when travelling around the city?'</p>	<p>The revised proposals set out in the papers are obviously aimed at balancing the needs and opinions of many different people. It is evident from the 24,000 responses, and from the questions posed to the Board today that people have strong and varied opinions.</p> <p>The proposals set out aim to make tangible improvements to the issues you raise through the development of a fund for ongoing delivery and maintenance of improvement to facilities for walking and cycling, and by reducing the overall volume of traffic on the roads to improve safety and environment.</p> <p>Making Connections was aimed at tangible improvements to the issues that you raise. There are other elements of City Access and the wider GCP programme that also aim to make improvements such as the review of the road network classification. This considers changes to the way that traffic and people use roads and streets to move around the city, and one of its aims is to improve health and wellbeing through providing a better and safer environment for physical activity. We will bring forward proposals on those in due course depending on how the Board decides to proceed today.</p>

			<p>Other GCP projects have already invested over £115m in active travel, including the Chisholm Trail, Cross-City Cycling, and the Greenways. Future works will include implementation of Cycling Plus schemes - with an indicative budget of £20m to spend on further improvements to the active travel network.</p>
8	<p>Martin Lucas-Smith, Petersfield resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>If one thing has achieved consensus, it's that public transport needs massive improvement, and that this should be done through franchising, to end the current Stagecoach monopoly.</p> <p>Those unable to afford a car are highly dependent on an ever-dwindling bus system, especially in rural areas. Those at the income level just above are forced to spend thousands for a car they can barely afford. Those too young to drive, and many others, have little transport independence. Those who can afford a car, and businesses, sit in traffic congestion, wasting time and money. These cannot continue.</p> <p>The hard fact is that improving public transport under franchising requires a subsidy income stream. There are really only two routes that raise enough funding. A congestion charge, or a Workplace Parking Levy which taxes large businesses.</p> <p>The report for the February 2020 Exec Board meeting stated that a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) would raise ~£23m annually.</p> <p>At a Joint Assembly meeting, I asked why a WPL was not being pursued. The answer given was that 'WPLs can raise revenue and reduce traffic but on a smaller scale than the proposed STZ'.</p>	<p>I would challenge the assertion about widespread report: previous consultations have found WPL to be less supported than road user charging.</p> <p>The GCP and its partners have explored a Workplace Parking Levy as one of a number of alternatives to road user charging, with consultations in 2017, 2019, and 2021, and a Citizens' Assembly in 2019. Technical work was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of a WPL against a range of criteria.</p> <p>A WPL was less preferred as an option in public feedback and was found to be ineffective at fulfilling other necessary objectives besides revenue generation. In particular, although a WPL would raise revenue, it would raise less than an STZ and would achieve negligible traffic reduction, with any gains being more than outweighed by the anticipated increase in journeys over time as Cambridge continues to grow.</p> <p>Without this reduction in congestion and the ability to limit further traffic growth, our transport network would become less and less effective for all users, and more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Investments in public transport and active travel that the revenue raised could pay for would yield fewer results without the road space and smooth circulation to let them work.</p>

	<p>However, officers now propose a smaller STZ, to raise only £33m, so it and the WPL are now in the same ballpark. So the answer given last time is irrelevant.</p> <p>A WPL has already seen surprisingly high levels of support, from both sides, including the South Cambs Tory MP. It would be a much simpler scheme and has no significant regressive effects. It would be one of the few ways of taxing the growth industries exacerbating the congestion problem.</p> <p>I ask that the WPL be put back on the agenda.</p>	<p>Our city as a whole would become less healthy, and less attractive to spend time and money in.</p> <p>There is quite a lot of flexibility on the revenue that could be raised by a WPL depending on how it is defined. The £23m figure to which you refer was the estimated total revenue from an early stage assessment of a package of parking interventions, including a WPL in addition to an increase in all off-street parking charges of £5 above the existing rate. It would obviously be possible to raise more or less revenue than that by varying the charge rates and exemptions.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the burden of a WPL does not necessarily fall solely on business in the way it can sometimes be portrayed. The Highways Authority has no ability to control whether or not an individual business chooses to absorb the cost, or passes it on to the employees using the spaces. Based on evidence from Nottingham as a preliminary assumption we would expect it to be roughly half and half. To the extent that businesses pay the charge, it raises money but does not manage demand effectively (because there is no behavioural impact on the driver, and because it only applies to commuting traffic). Where the charge is passed on, it will affect demand, but will raise similar issues for individual drivers as would a STZ charge set at a similar level. We would need to do specific technical work but would expect the effects of a WPL for those to whom the charge it is passed on to be fairly similar to the effects of an STZ, raising similar issues of those on low incomes, those with caring and volunteering needs.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Finally, it is worth noting as a point of information were the board to ask us to proceed with considering a WPL it would require us to begin a new business case process, conduct a further statutory public consultation. Unlike an STZ, a WPL cannot be decided locally and would require final permission from the Secretary of State for Transport.</p> <p>Members' comments:</p> <p>We acknowledge there is significant support for workplace parking levies and we are not committing support or opposition to their potential future implantation. They would of course create an incentive to employers to assist their staff in more sustainable ways to travel, but we do not consider they would generate sufficient revenue.</p>
9	Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>If the Board is unable to support the Making Connections plan, which includes the only funding mechanism on the table to pay for an expansion in bus services, will it instruct officers to develop a business case for introducing a Workplace Parking Levy?</p> <p>This would provide a reliable income stream to start funding long-term improvements to bus services and reductions in fares. It would also create an incentive to employers to assist their staff in finding new ways to travel to and for work, including cycling, taking public transport, and car-sharing. All of these outcomes are widely supported and essential to decarbonising transport, reducing road congestion and improving public health.</p>	<p>The answer to this question will be similar to the previous one. The GCP and its partners have explored a Workplace Parking Levy as one of a number of alternatives to road user charging, with consultations in 2017, 2019, and 2021, and a Citizens' Assembly in 2019. Technical work was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of a WPL against a range of criteria.</p> <p>A WPL was less preferred as an option in public feedback and was found to be ineffective at fulfilling other necessary objectives besides revenue generation. In particular, although a WPL would raise revenue, it would raise less than an STZ and would achieve negligible traffic reduction, with any gains being more than</p>

There is in Nottingham a successful model for implementing a Workplace Parking Levy. It can be tailored relatively easily to avoid unintended consequences: for instance, schools, hospitals and care homes could be exempted at the outset. And it costs very little to run, as there are no cameras or complex billing system.

Whatever the board's collective view is, could the business and University reps please state for the record their respective positions on the principle of a Workplace Parking Levy.

outweighed by the anticipated increase in journeys over time as Cambridge continues to grow.

Without this reduction in congestion and the ability to limit further traffic growth, our transport network would become less and less effective for all users, and more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Investments in public transport and active travel that the revenue raised could pay for would yield fewer results without the road space and smooth circulation to let them work. Our city as a whole would become less healthy, and less attractive to spend time and money in.

There is quite a lot of flexibility on the revenue that could be raised by a WPL depending on how it is defined. Nottingham raises about £9m annually with their WPL. You are correct that operating costs are lower than an STZ but overall net revenues are expected to be lower than the proposed STZ despite this.

It is worth noting that the burden of a WPL does not necessarily fall solely on business in the way it can sometimes be portrayed. The Highways Authority has no ability to control whether or not an individual business chooses to absorb the cost, or passes it on to the employees using the spaces. Based on evidence from Nottingham as a preliminary assumption we would expect it to be roughly half and half. As above: we would need to do specific technical work but would expect the effects of a WPL for those to whom the charge it is passed on to be fairly similar to the effects of an STZ, raising similar issues of those on low incomes, those with caring and volunteering needs.

			<p>Finally, it is worth noting as a point of information were the board to ask us to proceed with considering a WPL it would require us to begin a new business case process, conduct a further statutory public consultation. Unlike an STZ, a WPL cannot be decided locally and would require final permission from the Secretary of State for Transport.</p> <p>Members' comments:</p> <p>We have considered workplace parking levies extensively over the years and have always concluded they would not generate sufficient income. The scheme in Nottingham does not generate sufficient income to support the bus network in the city, and requires significant additional financial support as a result.</p>
10	<p>Elisabeth Whitebread Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Like most parents, I am deeply concerned about the impact of climate change on my children's future. Indeed, it is the top thing that will determine who I vote for in both local and national elections. Transport emissions account for a full 35% of Cambridgeshire's carbon emissions and are the single biggest source of emissions across the county, as well as contributing to local air pollution which breeches World Health Organisation limits across Cambridgeshire. My home in Cambridge breeches three WHO limits, which means my children - who are 5 years old and 18 months - are at risk of reduced lung development, cancer, and disease-related mortality.</p> <p>Given the failure of all Parties thus far to deliver a solution to these problems, I would ask who the politicians represented here think I should</p>	<p>Members' comments:</p> <p>Traffic limiting schemes introduced in Paris and Ghent were initially unpopular but are now widely supported by residents, who welcome the reduction in congestion and recovery of the cities. It is disappointing that the Making Connections proposals have not continued to receive the political support they previously had, and we apologise to those who think we will not be thanked in the future if we do not implement them.</p> <p>Cross-party working has been a positive benefit of this work, and it is disappointing to see that fracture for seemingly political reasons. Because of how the GCP works, we require unanimity, so without that there is no</p>

		<p>vote for? I can't vote Conservative as they campaigned against the STZ. I can't vote Lib Dem, as they withdrew their support first. I can't vote Labour as they didn't stick up for the STZ when the Lib Dems withdrew, and campaigned against it in Cherry Hinton. And I can't vote Green, because they failed to campaign for the STZ when it was the single biggest opportunity we've had - and are likely to have - in this region to cut carbon emissions, which I thought was their main concern.</p> <p>What are you all going to do now to rebuild trust and address the twin emergencies of climate and air pollution? Are you going to fight to do what's right and win my vote? Or do you not care about either?</p>	<p>sense in continuing with the current proposals. We need to act quickly to find a solution and way forward.</p>
11	<p>Sarah Hughes STZ Campaign Officer Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>The CSTA firmly supports the principle of a Sustainable Travel Zone for Cambridge. The funding and opportunity it presents offer a unique moment to reshape the city and wider county around the needs of its people.</p> <p>Years of work by officers, a Citizens' Assembly and wide consultation have brought us to the current point where there are detailed plans for a single scheme that acts powerfully in three ways simultaneously towards City Deal objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First, it reduces traffic, which frees up road space for public transport and active travel, reduces carbon emissions, improves air quality and makes Greater Cambridge a nicer place to be - Second, it puts in place a mechanism to generate substantial funds every year, ring-fenced to spend on sustainable transport - Third, it encourages people to make the switch from driving to sustainable transport. 	<p>It is my professional view as expressed in the paper that Scenario 1A best balances achievement of scheme objectives with responding to concerns expressed during the consultation.</p> <p>It frees up road space, particular during the peak. It raises an ongoing, locally controlled source of revenue to invest in sustainable transport and it encourages consideration of mode shift.</p> <p>Whilst not delivering as much benefit as Scenario 2 in terms of traffic reduction or revenue raising, moving to 'peak time only' operation, including a free day a week for car drivers and a locally owned small business discount substantially reduces the potential negative impact on small businesses and the self-employed, and goes further to reflect consultation feedback than Scenario 2.</p> <p>As has been set out in the technical work, there is potential for a contribution to these objectives to be met by other interventions including things already</p>

		<p>The scheme also offers a strong response to the concerns raised in the consultation. With chargeable hours reduced by half and a system of free days, there are considerable opportunities to drive without paying a road charge. There are also discounts for local SMEs and those on low incomes, and there is no charge for most patients and staff visiting the hospitals.</p> <p>Transformational change is within reach. Will politicians choose to lead the way? If they vote not to proceed, the problems of congestion, pollution and underfunding will remain, and they will need to turn to ‘next best’ solutions and bring in a patchwork of smaller, less powerful schemes, each requiring months or years of planning, consultation and debate.</p> <p>Can Officers outline how the current proposals meet the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and explain how these objectives could be met by other schemes if the STZ doesn’t go ahead?</p>	<p>underway in the GCP programme, but the findings of previous stages of technical work has been that no other one intervention alone (other than STZ) could meet objectives, so achieving them is likely to require a combination of measures to raise revenue and manage demand. These are issues that will be addressed as we take forward our work on the road network hierarchy review and the integrated parking strategy. .</p>
12	<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users Cambridge Area Bus Users Website Manager</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Do board members recognise that others are doing their bit for clean air, connectivity, and countering the climate crisis?</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are pursuing the case for bringing bus services under public control (franchising) and a number of rail schemes.</p> <p>Bus operators are decarbonising their fleets, and bringing their diesel buses up to Euro VI (super-low particulate emission ULEZ compliant) standard.</p> <p>Will the Greater Cambridge Partnership seize the opportunity to play its own part?</p>	<p>As has been set out in the technical work, there is potential for these objectives to be met by other interventions but the findings of previous stages has been that no other one intervention alone could meet objectives as effectively or efficiently, so achieving them is likely to require either a combination of measures to raise revenue and manage demand, all of which will have their supporters and detractors, or an adjustment of objectives.</p>

		<p>The GCP has a unique opportunity to reshape the city and wider county around the needs of its people.</p> <p>The current, amended, Sustainable Travel Zone Scenario 1A meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing traffic, freeing road-space for public transport and active travel, reducing carbon and particulate emissions, making Greater Cambridge greater; • generating substantial funds, ring-fenced to spend on sustainable transport; • enabling and encouraging people to use sustainable transport <p>Scenario 1A also offers a strong response to issues raised in the consultation. Discounts for local SMEs and for those on low incomes, together with alignment for hospital visitors and patients to existing car park discounts, address initial concerns.</p> <p>Do board members agree that these amended proposals offer the most equitable way forward?</p> <p>Can GCP Officers explain whether the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme could be met by other schemes if the STZ doesn't go ahead, and give an estimate of the time delays and financial costs which the GCP would incur whilst work on other schemes was progressed?</p>	
13	Sara Lightowlers Cambridge Parents for Sustainable Travel	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Families in Cambridge and the surrounding area are like those anywhere else. Most of us want the same things: things like getting the drop off done and to work on time, having enough money to live comfortably, a home and a community somewhere that's safe and healthy for our kids, and feeling secure about their future on this planet. Lots of us feel like we're struggling</p>	<p>Depending on the Board's steer today we will need to consider next steps across the programme as a whole. Considering alternatives will require one or more additional public consultations as well as the beginning of one or more new business case processes.</p> <p>Members' comments:</p>

		<p>with some or all of these things now, and the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone was aimed at helping with that. But whatever solution is suggested to deal with our problems, there will always be naysayers who try to profit by spreading opposition and stirring up divisions. So my question is, will the politicians have the courage to get a solution - which we all know we need - over the line, so that the process of healing our communities can begin?</p>	<p>The City Deal, which was agreed by all political parties at its outset, originally included road charging as a potential mechanism. However, political groups are now divided on this issue, and I have sympathy for those who question our courage to stand by our convictions.</p>
14	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Last week, following the government’s decision to water down its net zero commitments, Greenpeace said that Britain had “gone from leader to laggard on climate change”. Car manufacturers agreed, with Ford saying that the three things businesses needed were “ambition, commitment and consistency”.</p> <p>Local politics seems to be following the same depressing path: where is the decisive action we need to provide safe and affordable transport networks for residents of all ages, tackle our region’s climate goals and help our businesses thrive?</p> <p>Cambridge has been a pioneer in transport planning: often the first to trial new cycle infrastructure and the first UK transport authority to embed “demand management by road pricing” in its policy back in the 1990s.</p> <p>This area is not a leader any more. It’s a national embarrassment that we cannot include our city in the list of places that are taking decisive action on pollution, congestion and carbon emissions such as Bath, Birmingham, Bradford, Bristol, London, Nottingham, Oxford, Portsmouth, Sheffield and Newcastle.</p>	<p>As given in previous answers there are alternative measures to consider to manage demand for cars and raise revenue to invest in sustainable transport. Previous rounds of technical work have shown them to be less efficient or contribute less to the objectives the Board has set.</p> <p>Depending on the Board’s decision today we will need to consider next steps so I cannot give you a precise timeline.</p> <p>As you rightly point out: considering alternatives will require one or more additional public consultations as well as the beginning of one or more new business case processes.</p>

		<p>The publication Local Transport Today called the Sustainable Travel Zone scheme “an exemplar of integrated mobility”, yet you are about to throw that all away.</p> <p>If you do, what is the ambitious alternative that will match the boldness called for by the Citizens’ Assembly?</p> <p>Where is the commitment to the economic, social and environmental goals that each council has signed up to? The climate emergencies that have been declared? The focus on reducing road deaths?</p> <p>Where is the consistent funding we need to improve cycling, walking and public transport?</p> <p>If you do not have a feasible solution to reduce vehicle traffic and generate income for sustainable transport, it will impoverish every person, business and community in this region.</p> <p>If this plan goes back to the drawing board, when’s the next consultation on a viable alternative?</p>	
1	<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>1. In relation to A1307 and CSETS Phase 2, given the pressures on budgets, why not revert to the 2017 scheme which is £100m cheaper and would deliver similar transport benefits and a higher BCR – rather than allocating no budget at all to improve journeys on the A1307, which you are still advising is one of the most important transport corridors into Cambridge, serving the Biomedical Campus and central Cambridge?</p>	<p>1. As Mr Littlewood is aware, I would question his numbers and the capacity of his proposal to meet local plan growth across our geography.</p> <p>But putting that to one side, back in 2017, the LLF pushed for the scheme to better serve the villages along the route, and not just serve commuters to the three campus sites – an off-road solution. The public in a consultation agreed, as did this Joint Assembly and the Executive Board.</p>

	<p>2. In relation to the A1307, what will happen if the GCP is not able to secure additional funding, given that the recommended Investment Strategy is already £122m over programmed?</p> <p>3. Your report refers to CSETS Phase 1 as “under construction”, however Phase 1 consists of several discreet projects and at least one of these, changes to road layout on the Gog Magog Hills, is still at the planning stage and could be halted in order to save funds. This scheme is opposed by our charity because we have an independent road safety report which identifies that the scheme will worsen road safety at Wandlebury and it will also be harmful to ecology and the landscape. Please will the Board consider withdrawing this scheme in order to save budget, save ecology and save the well-loved landscape of the Gog Magog Hills?</p>	<p>The request therefore is not to revert to some other proposal, but to take the CSETS scheme back to 2017, ignore what happened in the intervening period, and start again.</p> <p>2. The recommendation is that the scheme is paused whilst alternate funding is sought. Failure to secure funding will mean that the scheme does not progress.</p> <p>3. A key objective of the CSET Phase 1 projects is to reduce accidents at accident cluster sites such as the Haverhill Road and Wandlebury Junction.</p> <p>The scheme has been developed with stakeholders and is widely supported because it addresses a safety concern at the existing junction providing the safest solution for all users at this accident cluster site.</p> <p>The scheme is currently going through the planning process which is considering the relevant impacts of the scheme on environment and highway safety.</p> <p>With funding for this scheme secured, given local support for the project and the ongoing independent planning process, scrutiny of environment and ecology effects, there is every reason to continue to deliver this scheme subject to approval.</p>
--	--	--

2	Jim Rickard	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>If finance is not available to proceed with the GCP's preferred route for CSET, then rather than pausing all activity, will you consider implementing at least some of the improvements to the A1307 proposed in previous strategies? You will remember that in the 2018 consultation the two routes along the A1307 corridor attracted between them more votes than the GCP's preferred route, so I don't think there would be a problem with public opinion.</p> <p>One example is the bus-only spur around the south-eastern corner of the biomedical campus, which formed part of Strategy Two in the 2018 consultation. I speak as a user of the citi 7 bus service, which suffers chronic delays at peak times on the section of its route between Dame Mary Archer Way and the Addenbrooke's bus station, making a nonsense of the timetable. The same bottleneck also applies to buses on the 'A' and 'U' routes. If a new bus-only spur alleviated those delays and also allowed buses from the key Haverhill corridor to access more central parts of the biomedical campus, it would be a significant step in reducing congestion now and making public transport more attractive. In fact any improvements along the A1307 would complement those you've already achieved with Phase 1 of CSET.</p> <p>So in summary I'm asking whether you will consider using some of the paused expenditure to fund improvements which have a lower cost, which will reduce delays to public transport now, and which will be valid whatever else may happen in the future.</p>	<p>The GCP has delivered a number of improvements along the A1307 with others still under construction, for example the new Bartlow Roundabout and the Linton Greenway.</p> <p>The business case has demonstrated that CSETS Phase 2 is the most suitable solution to the planned growth at the Biomedical campus alongside resolving the current traffic issues. This is the reason that funding will continue to be sought to take forward the scheme should the Executive Board take the decision to pause.</p> <p>If the expenditure is paused, so will the CSETS scheme. Funding would not be available to take forward other measures along the A1307 other than those that form part of the agreed CSETS Phase 1 programme.</p>
---	-------------	--	--

3	<p>Stephen Partridge-Hicks Resident of Sawston</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>How much money will you need to spend in order to progress CSET to the stage where it is ready to submit to the government for the TWAO? Does this represent a good use of funds for a scheme that has a cost of at least £160m and has no funding available for it?</p> <p>Please answer the question - Peter Blake ignored it and refused to give a £ cost when this question was asked at the Assembly.</p> <p>How long will you allow the GCP to search for more money without making any improvements to local transport?</p> <p>Why not set a fixed date of say 3 or 6 months to end CSET if insufficient money is raised?</p> <p>And today why not commit a small budget, say £250k, today to work up the alternative?</p> <p>This alternative isn't new, it is based on the GCP's on-road scheme from 2017/2018 with a spur road into the biomedical campus and bus lanes on the A1307 that can be built for at least £100m less than CSET? This would enable rapid implementation when CSET is finally cancelled, benefiting the travelling public and employers alike.</p>	<p>The preparation of materials for the TWAO submission is based on the previous business case and is therefore at an advanced stage. Minimal (£150K) spend is required if any in view of recommendation to pause the scheme.</p> <p>The technical work will be valid for 18 months which feels like an appropriate period of time to seek funding for the scheme.</p> <p>As with the question from James Littlewood, the request is not about a small budget, it is a request to take the scheme back to 2017 and start again, ignoring the LLF, the views of the public, Assembly and Board with all the consequences and abortive costs that would incur.</p>
---	--	--	--

4	Dr.Marilyn Treacy	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>The paper states:</p> <p>“Since 2020 significant events have occurred within the national and international context that have caused high inflation within the UK. This has led to costs of projects across the country increasing significantly. Within the construction industry the overall index for construction went up by 40.5% from May 2020 to May 2023.”</p> <p>The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme is the largest by far, and most heavily engineered, of the current GCP schemes. The expected inflation uplift applied to the budget of £157m is low at 15.5%. If the costs increase in line with the more realistic GCP stated inflation figure of 30%-40% to give a cost of over £200m, other schemes will be at risk from a shortage of funds.</p> <p>As approximately 50% of the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge route is scheduled to be on road, the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme could never be called “off-road.” The scheme has a BCR of between 0.43 and 0.47.</p> <p>Question: Would it not be more pragmatic and make better business sense to cut back the costs of this particular scheme by substituting an inbound bus lane down Madingley Hill, avoiding the costs of a heavily engineered additional M11 bridge and saving £100m thus helping ensure the availability of funds for other GCP schemes which will benefit a wider section of the population?</p>	<p>As set out in the paper, inflation in construction is high, rising approximately 40% between May 2020 and May 2023.</p> <p>The way this has affected schemes is set out in the table, with the cost of Cambourne to Cambridge currently estimated at £181million. These costs take into account appropriate value engineering and inflation to give an up to date estimate.</p> <p>The scheme will be subject to further scrutiny during the Transport and Works Act process and then final approval of the finalised costs will come through submission of the Full Business Case to this Executive Board before construction begins.</p>
---	-------------------	--	---

5	<p>Carolyn Postgate Coton resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>At its meeting on 7 September, the GCP Join Assembly noted: “It was acknowledged that the GCP was already overprogrammed, therefore any new or alternative schemes would also be unaffordable.” (p.37) The GCP has not yet submitted the Cambourne to Cambridge project to the Department for Transport, and thus the costly public enquiry phase has not yet begun. The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme will cost over £200m. What is the process for the GCP to review its original decision, and to consider an on road bus lane scheme, which could be delivered at a quarter of the cost, thereby freeing funds to implement other GCP schemes?</p>	<p>As set out the scheme will be scrutinised during the Transport and Works Act process and then final approval of the finalised costs will come through submission of the Full Business Case to this Executive Board before construction begins.</p> <p>Through this prioritisation process, officers are recommending that this scheme is prioritised.</p>
6	<p>Paul Hollinghurst Secretary, Railfuture East Anglia</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>At the Joint Assembly Meeting on 7th September 2023, the option of pausing CSET was discussed, with "Some members raised concerns about pausing CSETS Phase 2, given its strategic importance locally and nationally. The Joint Assembly highlighted the need to pursue options for securing alternative funding at the earliest opportunity."</p> <p>Rather than looking for alternative funding for the bus road, the GCP should instead support restoring the railway line from Cambridge to Haverhill.</p> <p>In 2016 the Cambridge to Haverhill Corridor viability report assessed the rail reopening but was not followed up by the GCP as the indicative capital costs were considered "substantial and cannot be funded within the current City Deal allocation"</p>	<p>The GCP has followed the DfT’s WebTAG Business Case process when looking at the case for CSETS Phase 2, and should the Executive Board agree, then the project will be shelf ready.</p> <p>A Rail scheme such as the Cambridge to Haverhill scheme would be significantly more expensive, and at this stage no funding has been identified.</p> <p>The GCP looked at this in previous stages of the business case – the technical report published in May 2020 concludes that alternative routes following the railway alignment would have lower benefits and higher costs relative to the shortlisted route alignments.</p> <p>At the present time, we understand that the rail industry has no plans to reintroduce the Haverhill Rail line.</p>

		<p>In Spring 2021 the railway reopening was assessed by the DfT as "suitable for Restoring Your Railway funding in principle" and "a good case for future development".</p> <p>In February 2023 Transport East concluded that the lack of a rail connection to Haverhill was a key challenge and are now carrying out a Connectivity Study which will include how to serve Haverhill.</p> <p>Does the GCP agree that given alternative sources of funding are being looked at and the railway reopening is repeatedly considered of interest by organisations such as the DfT and Transport East, and national strategic importance by the GCP itself, then it is time to seriously look at reopening the railway?</p> <p>This high-quality transport option would transform the whole corridor to Haverhill, covering a catchment area of 100,000, The CSET bus road provides very limited benefits especially beyond Granta Park to Haverhill.</p> <p>(For reference attached is a copy of the Restoring Your Railway bid, and also a recent article about restoring the railway from the industry respected magazine Modern Railways.)</p>	
7	Yunus Bostanci	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>My name is Yunus and I live in Meldreth. My family doesn't own a car, so we go almost everywhere by bike, train or on foot. For today, we booked a car from our local car club because it is the only way to get to Cambourne.</p> <p>When I came to the Greater Cambridge Partnership for the first time, I was 10 and a Junior Travel Ambassador at Meldreth Primary School. I am now 15 and in my last year at Melbourn Village College. I will go to Sixth Form in Cambridge next year.</p>	<p>If the Executive Board agree to the paper then we will be working on the design for the bridge alongside getting the right approvals in place to build the scheme. This will involve a planning permission and local consultation, so having support from you and your friends as we go through these processes would be very helpful.</p>

		<p>I have noticed that, especially since the pandemic and now with high petrol prices, more and more people cycle in Meldreth and Melbourn. I know from my dad that more people from his work are traveling between Royston and Cambridge by bike or e-bike, using the very dangerous roundabout to cross the A505 and along the dangerous A10. It's therefore such good news that there is now a plan to make this route safe. Many of my friends from Melbourn Village College live in Royston. With the bridge, we will be able to visit each other more easily and independently.</p> <p>My question is, what more can people my age do to help with the next stages of the Melbourn Greenway?</p>	
8	Iris Bostanci	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>My name is Iris Bostanci. I was 7 years old and still at Meldreth Primary School when I first came to a GCP meeting to ask you, 'How old will I be by the time the Melbourn Greenway will be completed so I can safely cycle to Royston?' I am now 12 and in year 8 at Melbourn Village College.</p> <p>I'm excited and hopeful that there is now a plan to build a cycle bridge to Royston. I will be using it and so will my friends. Everyone I tell about this is really excited and impatient to see progress. The first thing they all ask is, When will work begin?</p> <p>So I want to thank you for your work on this and also ask you, one more time, 'How old will I be by the time I can safely cycle to Royston?'</p>	<p>As I said in my answer to Yunus, we now have to go through the work to design and get the right approvals in place for the bridge as well as the rest of the route. We continue to work hard on doing this and are hopeful of delivery by the end of 2026 for the bridge, with other elements of the Greenway completed by the end of 2025.</p>

9	Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>As the Board considers the recommendation to proceed with the Cambridge South West Travel Hub at the revised cost of £69.5 million, please ask yourselves whether this is an effective, proportionate and fiscally prudent use of public money.</p> <p>In essence, this £69.5 million is to build and connect a 2,250-space car park, equivalent to £31,000 per parking space. How many car trips will that remove from Cambridge?</p> <p>Even if every space is used twice in the course of a day, that still only accommodates 17% of the forecast 26,000 additional trips onto the Biomedical Campus in 2031. The Outline Business case for Cambridge South station forecast approximately 3,200 daily rail trips onto the Campus in 2031. Only a proportion of those will be new trips to the Campus. But even if all of them were new, that still accounts for only another 12.5% of the forecast increase in trips by all modes.</p> <p>Now with no funded bus priority plans for the A1307 and A1301, how is the GCP planning to provide sustainable travel options for the other 70+% or >18,000 daily trips onto the Biomedical Campus within the next eight years?</p>	<p>It is not correct to state that the Travel Hub is just a car park.</p> <p>The Travel hub consists of a car park as well as a coach park, a bridge for active travel users over the M11, a new off road link for the bus across the M11 to Trumpington Park and Ride and has the Melbourn Greenway routed through it.</p> <p>The scheme is part of a number of solutions for the Biomedical campus which include Cambridge South Station (which GCP have helped to fund) as well as looking for additional funding for CSETS Phase 2 which would significantly help account for the transport requirements at that site.</p>
10	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle strongly welcomes the inclusion of the A505 bridge to Royston within the reprioritised Greenways programme. We thank officers for this change and the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign for their persistent call over 10 years for this vital link. Around a quarter of cyclist fatalities occur at</p>	<p>We disagree with the view that the schemes are being watered down.</p> <p>All of the schemes have been out to engagement or will have been out for engagement in the last 18months with the outcome of those exercises being put forward to the Executive Board to agree.</p>

		<p>junctions and providing safe crossings is essential to breaking down barriers to cycling for people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that this dedication to providing safe junctions is missing from the Greenways programme as a whole. Too many of the routes are being watered down leaving dangerous crossings, substandard widths and paths that simply won't be good enough to tempt people out of their cars. Camcycle has previously called for the Greenways to be delivered quickly, but it is astonishing to see that the amount of time spent on these schemes has not led to better quality designs, but worse. Now the GCP is clearly sacrificing quality – and safety – for speed and this is not right. If the GCP continues to refuse to engage properly with stakeholders and residents before designs that are not compliant with LTN 1/20 are baked in, then the process MUST be paused. Officers must adjust their designs and board members must not vote through substandard schemes. Routes must be safe and accessible for all.</p> <p>We'd like to ask when designs for the A505 bridge to Royston will be drawn up, when it will be built and ready to ride and, most importantly, how will Camcycle and the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign be included as co-creators to ensure a high-quality crossing that meets the needs of all ages and abilities?</p>	<p>We are committed to working with stakeholders and have held workshops on all of the Greenways with the Non-motorised User Group, which includes CamCycle. We continue to hold meetings with the NMU group as the schemes develop.</p> <p>The design of the bridge will be taken forward by our consultants and NMU groups will be engaged with during the development of the scheme.</p> <p>It is important to say that we have to take into consideration the views of multiple groups, including the Ramblers, Living Streets, CamCycle and others. This is alongside the views of Local Councillors and Parish Councils.</p>
1	<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Please will you listen to the 5,000 people who have signed a petition asking you to save the green belt countryside, protect the Gog Magog hills and choose a greener solution for the A1307 instead of agreeing to progress an 8km bus road through the countryside? Rather than agreeing to progress to a TWAO application, please will you agree to start work on a greener and cheaper alternative that delivers similar transport and economic benefits?</p>	<p>The petition was presented to JA and referred to in Chair's report</p>

2	<p>John Latham Chairman Hobson's Conduit Trust</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I am the Chairman of Hobson's Conduit Trust. The Trustees remain very concerned about the range of negative impacts that the proposed CSET scheme would have on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and on Hobson's Brook, including the 15 metre square concrete deck of the intrusive proposed bridge over the Brook, creating a sterile dark cavern. We have argued, among other things, for splitting the bridge into two and for the use of more sympathetic design and materials.</p> <p>We have made various other proposals reducing the impact on Nine Wells of the CSET scheme, but we do not yet see their inclusion. The CSET scheme threatens Water Vole and Grey Partridge habitat, and the drainage arrangement proposed is likely to bring quantities of salt from de-icing to pollute the pristine chalk stream.</p> <p>The Papers for the GCP Executive (Item 1.19 page 412) state :</p> <p>‘ 1.19 A full statutory, Environmental Impact Assessment was completed. ‘</p> <p>I am still unable to locate this EIA, or any evidence that the full EIA has yet been completed. This is despite being told at the September GCP Joint Assembly that the EIA (rather than an earlier EIA consultation) was about to be published.</p> <p>The Trustees much prefer an alternative scheme in the A1307 corridor which would deliver similar and further transport benefits, and cost £100 million less, with much less impact on the environment.</p> <p>Importantly, the A1307 on-road alternative scheme would not involve building three massive concrete bridges with huge embedded CO2 over Hobson’s Brook and the River Granta. In fact the alternative would not pass</p>	<p>Officers will continue in dialogue with the Trust to explore ways of mitigating the impact on the Nature Reserve. It is not possible to create two structures for the busway and maintenance track, but we continue to explore options of design and materials.</p> <p>The EIA has been completed and outcomes will be reported in an Environmental Statement which will form a key component of any future TWAO application which will be examined by a Planning Inspector.</p> <p>We have already published the near final Environmental Statement. The final Environmental Statement is planned for publication by the end of September – there are no material differences.</p> <p>The scheme has been developed over a number of years in accordance with DfT requirements. The on-road option was discounted, in part following interventions from the LLF and results of public consultation.</p>
---	--	---	---

		<p>anywhere adjacent to Nine Wells and its surrounds, so would not impact water quality, wildlife or habitats, and would leave visitors undisturbed.</p> <p>Why are you not recommending reverting to and expediting the alternative lower cost scheme ?</p>	
3	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Camcycle agrees with the comments from the Joint Assembly; although the full CSET scheme may be paused, we believe that many of the active travel components could be delivered and would present excellent value for money.</p> <p>Can officers confirm if links such as an active travel route to Granta Park could be implemented if the rest of the scheme was paused?</p>	As a result of overprogramming, there are no funds available to pursue the scheme or aspects of it.
1	James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future	<p>Agenda Item No. 9 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>There are no traffic lights or roundabouts on the section of the A10 between Waterbeach and the Milton Park & Ride, so a bus road has no real advantage compared to a bus lane, in terms of journey times and reliability. Officers have advised me that they ruled out the option of having inbound and outbound bus lanes along the entire length of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach New Town due to pinch points and the A14 interchange. However they have not responded to my request for evidence that they have considered whether sections of inbound and outbound bus lanes could be provided in order to enable buses to bypass queuing traffic. In most cases, traffic is not queuing in both directions, and the proposal to use Butt Lane also now avoids the A14 roundabout. Before you make a decision to proceed with building a £110m road through open countryside, please can</p>	<p>There are currently three sets of traffic lights along the section of the A10 between the New Town at Waterbeach and Milton Park & Ride. These include the A10 junction with Denny End Road, and the A10 Junction with Butt Lane and also the new signalised crossing of the A10 near to the Car Dyke Road / Waterbeach Road junction.</p> <p>In the previous stages of the project, a number of various options were assessed ranging from bus priority measures on the A10 to a fully segregated bus route. This included options for bus lanes on different sections of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach New Town as part of the overall route.</p>

	<p>you make sure you are satisfied that this option has been adequately researched, and also direct me to where I can find it?</p>	<p>The assessment found that the segregated busway route offered significant advantages especially in terms of reliability of service, when compared to bus lanes on the A10. This optioneering process is set out in chapter 6 of the 2020 <u>Options Appraisal Report</u> and is summarised in Appendix B of the <u>Outline Business Case</u>.</p> <p>Other issues with using bus lanes on the A10, instead of the recommended segregated route, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although bus lanes and priority measures at traffic signals help to mitigate the impacts of congestion, they do not give complete priority to public transport and do not offer the same level of reliable journey times as a segregated route. Similarly, incidents on the A10 would also affect buses.• The available width along much of the A10 is constrained by homes and other existing development, particularly north of Car Dyke Road. It would be difficult to provide effective public transport priority through bus lanes without considerable property, access and environmental impacts• The additional carriageway width would result in longer crossings for active travel users• Giving suitable priority to buses turning on and off the A10 to/from Landbeach or Waterbeach at Waterbeach Road / Car Dyke Road is likely to require installing signals at these junctions and could increase delay for other traffic
--	--	--

2	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge And Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes progress on the Waterbeach Greenway which should provide a safe, high-quality cycle route for existing residents of Waterbeach village and up to 30,000 future residents of Waterbeach New Town. If this route fails to live up to its potential, it will negatively affect the lives of thousands of people in the area, reducing access to education and work, impacting health and adding to the congestion around Cambridge. To ensure the best outcomes, engagement and co-creation with stakeholders is key.</p> <p>This is especially important right now on the Waterbeach Greenway because we know that the two options for Milton High Street will include a shared surface for people walking and cycling. Proposing a shared-use path in a residential and shopping area on an active travel route to serve over 40,000 people is not good enough: it is a critical failure for this Greenway. We urgently need a better solution and believe this scheme should not proceed until an appropriate design is agreed.</p> <p>Why then is the GCP not meeting with its Non-Motorised User group (of which Camcycle is a part) until just seven days before the Waterbeach Greenway consultation is due to be published? It's clear that none of the discussion at that group will have any effect on the design of the route or the options included in the consultation. The technical expertise and local knowledge within that forum is being utterly wasted. Once again, we ask when will the GCP reconsider how it works with stakeholders and save itself (and all of us) lots of hard work and frustration?</p>	<p>The views of the GCP NMU group are taken into account in the design of our schemes. Historically the input has led to changes in schemes that are now on the ground including Milton and Histon Road, so it is not right to say that officers are wasting that input. In addition, as can be seen from the Greenways that have already been through engagement and/or consultation the views of NMU groups are expressed in the papers that come forward to the Executive Board for consideration.</p> <p>In terms of holding an event 7 days before the Waterbeach Greenway consultation begins, this is to give the NMU group a specific opportunity to see the plans before the consultation begins, allow them to raise any major concerns they have directly with the design consultants and to ensure that they can prepare their organisations for the consultation period ahead. It is not to redesign the scheme, that comes after the period of consultation when the Executive Board agrees to the next steps</p>
---	----------	--	---

1	<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 - Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>1. The roadside verges at Airport Way roundabout are of ecological value and include a rare species of plant, the Lizard Orchid which is listed on Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. There is no mention in the officer’s report of this constraint, nor the likely impact on this habitat if the Park & Ride at P1 were to go ahead. At the Joint Assembly, the Director of Transport said that the Lizard Orchids would be protected but he did not say what the impact on the road verge habitat will be, please can he say what the impact will be on the road verge habitat if a decision were made to proceed with location P1?</p> <p>2. If site P1 is not progressed, then planned works in the vicinity of Airport Way roundabout, on the southern side, would not be needed, for example the proposed active travel routes linking to the park and ride. Recommendation 2.1b is therefore unclear. Please can you confirm that a decision on 2.1b will exclude the works to the southern verges of Newmarket Road between in the park and ride traffic lights and Airport Way?</p>	<p>1 CPPF has previously advised GCP of the presence of the Lizard Orchid, and the area is to be surveyed in spring/summer 2024. The design team has already been briefed and detailed design will seek to avoid the Orchids.</p> <p>The recommendation is that officers should “work with the Joint Assembly and Board on next steps” If site P1 were to become the preferred site then the various steps involved in seeking planning consent would be commenced including further design and environmental appraisal. At that stage potential impacts and mitigations would be identified and would inform consultation and subsequent consideration by members of the planning application.</p> <p>2 The Newmarket Road site is too small and heavily constrained to accommodate future requirements of the corridor, when reflecting Local Plan growth. The current location also pulls traffic into the city centre environment, when encouraging the use of sustainable modes is necessary to meet local growth requirements and environmental objectives. It is also leased,</p> <p>As such a new site will be required at some stage, and will require walking and cycling connectivity. Decisions on the timing of these works may be revisited depending on what decisions are made regarding the Park & Ride, but the recommendation to progress to Detailed Design remains valid.</p>
---	---	---	--

2	<p>Martin Lucas-Smith, Petersfield resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 – Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>The Elizabeth Way roundabout is an ugly relic of outdated 1960s planning, and blights our area of Petersfield. It caters only for drivers, relegating walking and cycling to an inconvenient dingy underpass with blind corners, graffiti, a generally unpleasant environment, and inaccessible to some with disabilities. No transport professional would even consider designing such a monstrosity these days.</p> <p>The roundabout, and Newmarket Road, without any proper cycle infrastructure, are a huge barrier to mass cycling levels into town from the east. As a result, you see high levels of car use.</p> <p>Replacement with a modern, at-grade junction, is already council policy agreed in the Local Plan: the “Eastern Gateway”.</p> <p>It will remain a large important junction for cars, but as a multi-lane crossroads. I was struck by this photo of an almost identical change at Nottingham’s Maid Marian Way – how much better this is:</p> <p>https://www.cyclestreets.net/location/197806/cyclestreets197806.jpg</p> <p>The consultation saw misunderstanding: some thought it would be a ‘Dutch roundabout’. In fact it would be a Cyclops junction. Had the public been shown a clear mockup photo of ordinary pedestrian and cycle crossings separate from traffic, there would be little appetite for keeping a dingy, indirect, unsafe 1960s underpass.</p> <p>Officers suggest delay due to potential Grafton and Beehive Centre changes. But both propose much-reduced traffic levels. I.e., the effect on the road environment will only get better, not worse. So this is no reason to delay.</p>	<p>The points regarding Elizabeth Way roundabout are well understood, and align with the work undertaken to date and the concerns raised by many members of the public.</p> <p>This is also recognised by the Joint Assembly members who emphasised that this element of the scheme should not be paused, but recognised the reason GCP has recommended that the work is revisited, namely to enable alignment with the proposals for the Beehive and Grafton Centres.</p> <p>As indicated in the question, the likely outcome of those proposals will be a reduction in car traffic and increased use of Active Travel. As such there is an opportunity to reconsider the design of the junction in the light of the changes.</p>
---	---	--	--

		<p>Executive Board members wanted the area to reach higher public realm standards. The logical thing, therefore, is not to pause, but instead keep this as a current scheme, to give officers clarity to get on with follow-up design work to implement higher ambition.</p> <p>Delay risks the city being stuck with this ugly legacy of the 1960s for another decade or so. Please get on with it.</p>	
3	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>We note the change in levels of support for this scheme between 2021 and 2023 with 53% currently opposing the introduction of segregated cycle lanes and high numbers of respondents saying that they are not needed. Given that a representative survey of Greater Cambridge residents conducted by Sustrans in 2021 found that 74% were in support of segregated cycle lanes along main roads, we believe that this consultation was skewed by the damaging effects of the discussion on the Sustainable Travel Zone. The GCP is right to consider how proposals integrate with the East Barnwell plans, government guidance on cycle infrastructure design, the road hierarchy project and the GCP’s own transport objectives. Protected lanes are essential to deliver a safe route along Newmarket Road.</p> <p>With the current state of the STZ and the growth of anti-cyclist rhetoric within the media and public debate, we call on GCP officers and staff to clearly communicate the benefits and objectives of following the Highway Code’s hierarchy of users and prioritising improvements for people travelling on foot, by cycle and by public transport.</p> <p>We ask the GCP if it will follow the guidance for the DfT, Active Travel England and the Highway Code to put the safety of non-motorised users, the</p>	<p>GCP will continue to follow DfT guidance which includes and reflects the Highway Code, and the advice of its Executive Agency Active Travel England.</p> <p>The proposals for Newmarket Road respond to and help to deliver on the Government’s hierarchy of road users. As such there is a need t to prioritise the needs of active travel users.</p> <p>If the STZ does not proceed then other City Access elements such as Network Hierarchy Review, Integrated Parking Strategy and wider traffic management proposals will be reflected on further to ensure that the Newmarket Road can be a safer environment for all users, including active travel users.</p>

		<p>need for modal shift and its own sustainable travel objectives at the forefront of decision making? It has also been stated in previous meetings that the success of the Newmarket Road scheme was dependent on the reduction of traffic achieved by the Sustainable Travel Zone? Is this still the case and, if so, how would traffic be reduced without an STZ?</p>	
1	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 11 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Although the GCP Joint Assembly agreed to the fast-tracking of detailed design for the Addenbrooke’s roundabout, no detailed designs for the roundabout were presented at that meeting. Camcycle did not support the proposals as presented at consultation and is extremely concerned that some aspects could worsen rather than improve safety for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>We ask the GCP which teams from the county council they are working with on the redesign (because it doesn’t seem as if the cycling team has been involved), when will the new designs be publicly available and, most importantly, has safety for those walking and cycling (rather than the flow of motor vehicles) been placed as the highest priority?</p>	<p>The project team has reviewed the consultation feedback which provided a variety of comments and suggestions also covering the points raised in the question. The whole point of fast tracking this particular section of the Cycling Plus scheme is to address existing safety issues for Cyclist and Pedestrians at this location.</p> <p>The team is currently working to adjust the design in order to find solutions to the issues raised. The revised preliminary design will be discussed with Local Members, other key stakeholders such as Camcycle, and with County Council Officers before being progressed to the detailed design stage. It is anticipated that this engagement will take place in October.</p> <p>To date there has been CCC Officer involvement from various teams including, Signals, Road Safety, Highways, and Active Travel.</p> <p>The detailed designs will be published and subject to Executive Board approval before construction commences.</p>

PARTNER BODY REPRESENTATIONS [including questions where known]

Member	Question/Representation (if supplied)	Answer (if detail supplied)
<p>South Cambs and County Councillor Susan van de Ven</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>As a District and County Councillor and Co-Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board, I am deeply saddened by the scuppering of progress on the Making Connections project and the chance it offers, sooner rather than later, to bring better air quality, and travel and access opportunities to young people for education and work, and indeed all those disadvantaged by lack of transport choices.</p> <p>Reducing health inequalities is the ambition of all Cambridgeshire councils working together with the local NHS in our Integrated Care System.</p> <p>Transport and access are important levers in the wider determinants of health. With access, one has opportunity. Without it, the likelihood is worse outcomes in life.</p> <p>The story of a village I represent is one which Making Connections is trying to address, and it will be replicated hundreds of times, in different ways, in all our communities.</p> <p>The last bus connecting Bassingbourn to Cambridge was withdrawn in 2017 due to congestion holdups in Trumpington. It was unable to deliver students to Long Road Sixth Form on time. Those who could started driving, adding to congestion and air pollution. Those young people in</p>	<p>Your points reflect many local users' experiences over the last year under the current system of private operators who must make decisions on their services based on profitability and the ability of routes to pay for themselves, leading to increasing cutbacks which make it harder for our residents to get to school, work, and make other independent journeys. This is strongly echoed by Making Connections consultation feedback.</p> <p>Under the Making Connections proposals, delivery of improved bus services would come under the responsibility of the CPCA, with whom we have worked closely. The CPCA are currently considering bus reform proposals which would see greater local government control over public transport, with the potential to set routes, timetables, fares, and other aspects of service either through enhanced partnership or franchising. This would also prevent private companies suddenly withdrawing services in the future, as we have seen over the last few years.</p> <p>The various impact assessments undertaken showed a range of negative and positive implications but, on balance, positive implications for health and equalities of delivering the proposed scheme where we have proposed mitigations to address as many of the negative impacts as possible.</p> <p>The assessments are equally clear that a decision not to proceed is not a neutral decision – the EqIA is clear on negative implications of not proceeding including to those</p>

	<p>households without a car have had their education severely compromised.</p> <p>Bassingbourn resident Kelly Whitley spoke at December's County Council meeting to ask what could be done to enable her sons to reach their Cambridge sixth form college, as well as their weekend and evening jobs. She and her children also struggle to attend appointments at Addenbrooke's. Taxi fares are unaffordable.</p> <p>Bassingbourn's remaining bus service goes only to Royston on such a limited basis that ridership is low and justification for continuing its subsidy is under review. We have watched the gradual decline of bus services and now the future is in question. There has been no investment in safe cycle links out of the village to nearby bus and rail stations.</p> <p>This is the granular detail in the creation of inequalities. These are the inequalities – lack of access to education, jobs, health services – that determine life chances and indeed differences in life expectancy.</p> <p>I welcome today's report on the potential of Making Connections for dealing directly with these inequalities and look forward to the Health Impacts paper produced in collaboration with Cambridgeshire Public Health. I hope that a way will be found of enabling this transformative project, which has been significantly revised to meet public concerns, to proceed, first and foremost for our children and young people.</p>	<p>currently suffering exclusion, social isolation and a lack of access to education, health and opportunity because they cannot access a car for whatever reason.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Thank you to officers for working relentlessly over a long period of time to meet the requests of the GCP's constituent partners and members.</p>	
<p>City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>We note the recommendations on page 40 including particularly</p> <p>5. Considers whether or not the preferred option (Scenario 1A) as outlined in Section 7 and the Outline Business Case (Appendix 5)</p> <p>a. meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and</p> <p>b. responds appropriately to the issues raised during the consultation1 .</p> <p>6. Considers whether or not the proposals are at a stage to enable recommendations to be made to the Highways & Transport Committee of the County Council (as Highways Authority) to endorse the Outline Business Case and to progress the Making Connections proposals to the Full Business Case stage.</p> <p>May we suggest adding the following:</p> <p>5 c. has the support and confidence of the general public ; and</p> <p>d If not, whether any steps can be taken which have a realistic prospect of gaining public support.</p>	<p>In relation to your question about funding bus improvements as pilot projects, there are a few points to make.</p> <p>First – the value for money of investing in new bus routes which requires capital investment by either private operators or public sector – without certainty of funding beyond a couple of years would be unlikely to be high.</p> <p>Second – this risks leaving people in a worse situation than they are now if they become reliant on buses to travel to work, school or colleges that then have to be withdrawn because they can no longer be funded. That is why the STZ proposal included front funding buses on the basis that STZ revenues could be guaranteed to continue funding.</p> <p>Third – it does not get around the issue that at present buses run unreliably and are a poor alternative to car because they are stuck in the same congestion as cars. Funding services is necessary but not sufficient to providing a reliable bus service. Congestion also raises the cost of running bus services which brings us back to the value for public money point.</p> <p>CPCA already has a Mayoral council tax precept in place which raises a little under £4m per annum with a £12 levy on a band D property. The CPCA is currently considering bus reform and as part of that is looking at the range of funding options available to it to make investment in the network including the mayor's revenue raising powers.</p>

	<p>We would also like to propose a pilot scheme as a proof of concept to tackle one of the major barriers to public acceptance .</p> <p>No one believes that GCP or the Combined Authority can make our buses work . This is nothing personal . Unless residents have lived in London, they have probably never experienced a bus system that more or less works.</p> <p>Will GCP consider funding orbital bus services joining the park and rides, Addenbrookes, and other major employment centres and schools such as the Biocampus and the Cambridge Business and Science Parks ? If these services are not routed through the historic centre, they will be more reliable and much faster.</p> <p>Will the GCP ask the Combined Authority to consider funding these bus services by a council tax precept ? This also provides an opportunity to test this option either as a short term bridge while government permission is sought for a Workplace Parking Levy or perhaps as a longer term solution.</p> <p>We recognise that other proof of concept bus services improvements would be required elsewhere in the region to address public confidence but will leave it local councillors to address those issues.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 Better Cambridge Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access</p> <p>I would like to comment very briefly on the public consultation responses outlined on pages 441 and 442 in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.6. Although I spoke at the Joint Assembly about these issues, neither the public or councillor questions at that meeting are reflected in the minutes. It is my job as a ward councillor to ensure my residents voices are heard so I am here again.</p> <p>There is a conflict between users of the roundabout with Barnwell Road . On the one hand we have local residents, many of whom are elderly and disabled or with small children or heavy shopping. Most of them are on foot, scooter or bike and travelling very short distances to shops, school and nursery . Their priority is safety not speed. They are well aware that the roundabout is an accident black spot and support the change to traffic lights and safe pedestrian crossings on each arm.</p> <p>On the other hand, we have a larger group of commuters, mostly travelling by car . They are mostly opposed to the change because they think that traffic flow through a roundabout will be faster than through traffic lights.</p> <p>I urge the board to put our residents safety first and accept the recommendation to proceed with the roundabout improvements described in 4.10 (page 442 to 443)</p> <p>I would also like to comment about Phase A3 and the Elizabeth Way roundabout in para 4.13 and pages 443 and</p>	<p>The Joint Assembly minutes when agreed and published will contain reference to the public questions and representations from partner body members.</p>
--------------------------------------	---	---

	<p>444. Again safety concerns were behind residents wishes to keep the underpass. Many shared details of accidents seem in this area and were extremely reluctant to consider crossing this busy junction by road. Irrespective of whatever improvements were made.</p>	
<p>City Councillor Karen Young</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 11 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Proposals have been put forward to improve Addenbrookes Roundabout and there is agreement that these improvements should be accelerated given the danger inherent in the current layout. There is a great amount of concern with the proposals from residents who live in the vicinity and also from cycling organisations.</p> <p>On deciding the final scheme under the accelerated procedure, will account still be taken of responses to the consultation? In particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no way from A2 to A3 • The A4 crossing is too far away from the roundabout for most people to use it • The narrowing of the island on Fendon Road, will make it very hard for pedestrians • Some trees are being unnecessarily cut down. 	<p>The project team has reviewed the consultation feedback which provided a variety of comments and suggestions also covering the points raised in the question.</p> <p>The team are currently working to adjust the design in order to find solutions to the issues raised. The revised preliminary design will be discussed with Local Members, Other key stakeholders, and County Council Officers before being progressed to the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The detailed designs will be subject to Executive Board approval before construction commences.</p>