



**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

Shire Hall, Cambridge

Wednesday 19th February 2020

2:00 p.m. – 5:40 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer (Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Ian Bates (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Phil Allmendinger	University Representative

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in attendance

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Helen Valentine	University Representative
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers

Peter Blake	Director of Transport (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Manager (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Claire Ruskin.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 3rd October 2019, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that seven public questions had been submitted and accepted. It was agreed that the questioners would be called to address the Board 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.

5. FEEDBACK FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 30th January 2020.

The Chairperson highlighted the extensive consideration the Joint Assembly had given to the Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy report, noting that every Assembly member had participated in the debate. He drew attention to references to the GCP being the right body to tackle the transport system problems in Greater Cambridge; the necessity to explore fiscal demand management measures as a means of raising revenue; support from businesses for the introduction of a congestion charge; the unfairness of punishing drivers for making a rational decision to drive to work; overwhelming support of the Citizens' Assembly for road closures; and local authorities' failure to find a conclusion to the debate that had been ongoing for decades regarding congestion and demand management in Cambridge, which required urgent action and difficult decisions to be made.

6. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY

David Stoughton was invited to present his public question. The question and a summary of the response is set out in **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which contained recommendations from the Citizens' Assembly (CA) that had been held in September and October 2019 to consider how to reduce congestion, improve air quality and provide better public transport in Greater Cambridge. As part of undertaking the CA, the Board had agreed to respond in full to all of its recommendations and it was proposed this would be done by Summer 2020. She drew attention to the CA's request to receive regular reviews of progress in the medium to longer term.

[At this stage in the proceedings, following repeated disruption by protesters, the meeting was adjourned to allow for an informal discussion on how to proceed. Following a short break the Chairperson reconvened the meeting and announced that it would continue in a separate room, but those members of the public who wished to observe proceedings would be able to do so via a video link in a separate room. After a further adjournment to allow the rooms to be set up the meeting reconvened and business continued.]

Suzannah Lansdell, associate of Involve (the public participation charity that ran the CA), informed members that the consultation had been part of a wider, national project called the Innovation in Democracy Programme (IiDP). She praised the GCP for involving citizens in such a deliberative form of democracy and emphasised the CA's broad representation of the area's demographics. All participants had agreed that some form of intervention was needed, with road closures being the most popular choice and increased parking charges being the least popular choice. Among the key messages that they wished to convey to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board were a call for bold and brave action, improvements to public transport and better integration and coordination of transport.

A selection of video interviews with on their opinions of the CA process was presented to the Board for information.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Queried whether the participants of the CA would recommend the process be replicated elsewhere. The representative of Involve informed members that a review of the CA was being carried out, along two others that had been held elsewhere in the country, in order to identify the suitability of using CAs on different issues. She suggested that they were particularly beneficial when considering matters that required negotiations to be made, as they allowed for different views to be expressed, considered and counter-balanced. She also observed that while they were currently only complimentary to the democratic systems in the UK, they were established features of political systems in some other countries, such as Poland.
- Welcomed the over-riding support for road closures by the CA, observing that initial objections to road closures currently enforced in the centre of Cambridge had been overcome and the schemes had proved largely successful. One member argued that vehicles were still able to travel down roads that had been closed and sought clarification on whether the CA participants had identified any roads that would be suitable for closure. The representative of Involve explained that the CA had only considered the general principle, along with the arguments in favour of and against road closures, without discussing details of particular locations.
- Discussed the role of public transport, noting that the CA argued that buses were key to resolving the issues at hand, although it was noted that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was already undertaking a Strategic Bus Review. This included some of the issues raised by the CA, including the possibility of franchising bus services. Members were assured that participants had appreciated the challenge of finding road space to allow a fast and reliable bus service.
- Noted that the proposed interventions didn't include details on how any resultant income would be spent, although it was argued that the CA had sought to create a funding base from which additional measures could be developed.
- Identified a high level of support from the CA for a lollipop bus service, which would involve ring-and-spoke routing. This was considered ideal for the layout and transport needs of Cambridge.

On conclusion of the debate, the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Thank the participants of the CA for their work, note the full report and recommendations from the CA, which considered how to reduce congestion, improve air quality and provide better public transport, and note the strong support for action to address these issues; and
- (b) Agree to bring forward a detailed response to the recommendations of the CA by Summer 2020 at the latest, and agree to the CA's request for regular reviews of progress in the longer-term.

7. PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS AND CITY ACCESS STRATEGY

Public questions were invited from Vincent Poole, Matthew Danish (on behalf of Camcycle) and Edward Leigh. The questions and a summary of the responses are set out in **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained an analysis of work carried out so far to establish options for the Board to consider developing further, as well as a set of proposed immediate interventions, which would address issues related to public transport, congestion and air quality. The Head of Transport Strategy commented on the extensive list of background documents in Appendix 1 of the report which formed an extensive evidence base. He emphasised that the issues would become more aggravated if no action was taken. Drawing attention to the resolution agreed by the Joint Assembly [set out in section 3 of the report], she noted that at the request of Executive Board members this had been reflected in the proposed recommendation.

The Vice-Chairperson of the Joint Assembly, Councillor Bick, addressed the Executive Board regarding the resolution that had received unanimous support by the Joint Assembly. He noted that each member had been consulted in its drafting and all had agreed on the urgent need to move forward on the issues of congestion, public transport and air quality, highlighting the significance of the diverse membership reaching unanimous agreement on such fundamental principles. While acknowledging that disagreement remained over the eventual package of measures to be implemented, all had agreed that decision-making should be based on evidence. He argued that the individual members of the Executive Board and Joint Assembly should avoid conflict and work together as a unified body.

Helen Valentine, a business representative on the Joint Assembly, had also asked to address the Executive Board. Echoing the call for urgent and bold action, she identified the need for a revenue stream to fund initiatives and for all options to be evaluated and considered appropriately before being discarded.

While discussing the report and its recommendations, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the contributions made by the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Joint Assembly, as well as the discussion at the Joint Assembly meeting that had subsequently informed the recommendations to be considered by the Executive Board. The force of the Joint Assembly's resolution, emphasised by its unanimity, was acknowledged.

- Recognised that many of the decisions that needed to be made were challenging and controversial, although it was suggested that these difficulties highlighted the need for the separate councils to work together, through the GCP, to overcome their differences and support each other. One member argued that while there were some areas where agreement could be reached, it was inevitable that there would be other areas where disagreement prevailed.
- Expressed concern over the slow progress achieved by the GCP as a delivery body. One member suggested that priority should be given to those projects on which there was agreement, in order to establish momentum. However, another member identified the need for short term measures to form a part of a long term strategy, noting that other planned projects by external bodies, such as the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) and East West Rail, would not be completed within the next decade.
- Considered whether identifying an income stream was necessary to ensure that short term measures would lead to long term change. It was argued that the different options should be considered in detail and that it was important for a wider understanding of how they would work.
- Observed that improving the quality of the bus service alone would not be enough if the separate issue of congestion was not resolved as well.
- Called for a greater range of innovative scheme proposals, such as the lollipop bus initiative.
- Acknowledged that despite its focus on city access, the strategy also affected residents, workers and visitors who travelled in the area outside the city.

On conclusion of the debate, and noting a correction to recommendation (d), which incorrectly referenced paragraph 10.4 instead of paragraph 12.4, the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the work to develop major improvements to the bus network, and agrees to use this as the basis for further work to identify how a significant uplift in public transport could be delivered including consideration of funding sources;
- (b) Note the detailed technical work to assess the options for demand management and potential impacts within this report, including:
 - A technical assessment of the list of interventions tabled by Cllr Bates at the Executive Board meeting in June;
 - Traffic modelling of pricing and physical interventions, which demonstrate comparative impacts of illustrative interventions on traffic volumes, journey times and modal shift; and
 - An Integrated Impact Assessment and baseline and scoping report, identifying possible impacts for consideration as part of any future package, including potential impacts in a do nothing scenario;

- (c) Develop a refined set of packages that provide options for different levels of intervention, taking together the technical work undertaken and recognising the feedback from the Citizens' Assembly and other public engagement activity, and reflecting the Joint Assembly's recommendation, for consideration at the June meeting. Options would:
- Offer packages of intervention based on different cost levels, referring to the major improvements to the bus network set out in the Systra report as well as offering walking and cycling enhancements and exploring options for lower fares;
 - Include measures to accelerate the uptake of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles, particularly in the bus and commercial fleets;
 - Support delivery of the vision of the Making Space for People project, identifying opportunities to re-allocate highway space for public realm that is safer, healthier and more conducive to walking and cycling, including an assessment of road changes in central Cambridge;
 - Be developed in the context of the Board principles for city access agreed at the June 2019 meeting, and the recommendations from the Citizens' Assembly; and
 - Consider specific impacts and mitigations in the context of each package, and potential phasing; and
- (d) Agree to prioritise and implement the measures set out at paragraph 12.4 of the report, to support the uptake of sustainable travel options, following a short report for Executive Board and Joint Assembly members assessing the costs and benefits of these and proposing a prioritised programme of measures that is consistent with a longer-term strategy encouraging more journeys to be undertaken by public transport, walking and cycling.

8. GREENWAYS

A public question was invited from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response is set out in **Appendix A**.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which provided an update on the development of the Greenways Programme, a proposed prioritisation process for the twelve projects and outline budgets for the Waterbeach and Fulbourn schemes. He informed members that in response to the Executive Board and Joint Assembly's concerns over the size of the project, the schemes had been divided into manageable groups in order to provide greater certainty around timescales of delivery. The proposed order in Appendix 1 of the report was indicative of the order in which they would be considered by the Executive Board.

While discussing the report, Executive Board members:

- Expressed concern that the Waterbeach Greenway would duplicate the Better Public Transport: Waterbeach to North East Cambridge Project. The Director of Transport assured members that given the significant levels of growth in the Waterbeach area, the GCP wished to create as many opportunities for sustainable transport to and from Cambridge as possible. It was confirmed that the two routes would be in different areas, although no decisions had been made on either location.

- Expressed eagerness for the schemes to progress as quickly as possible, although it was acknowledged that delivery was made more complicated by issues of land ownership. It was agreed that considering the schemes separately would accelerate overall progress.
- Observed that the routes would be used by horse riders as well as cyclists and pedestrians, and therefore their needs should be taken into consideration. The Director of Transport acknowledged the suggestion and informed the Executive Board that discussions had been held with the British Horse Society.

On conclusion of the debate, the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the progress made in developing the Greenways, working with local communities and stakeholders to date;
- (b) Support the proposed prioritisation process, and the principle of bringing a small number of Greenways to each of the next three Board meetings, to ensure thorough scrutiny and debate;
- (c) Approve an outline budget for the Waterbeach scheme of £8m;
- (d) Approve an outline budget for the Fulbourn scheme of £6m;
- (e) Approve the use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers to secure the necessary land, if required, should this not prove possible and/or timely through negotiation; and,
- (f) Note the outline milestones.

9. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Public questions were invited from Matthew Danish (on behalf of Camcycle) and Sam Davies. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which provided the Executive Board with an update on progress across the GCP programme. Attention was drawn to the fact that the target of 420 additional apprenticeships in the initial City Deal had been reached in July 2019, as detailed in section 8 of the report.

While discussing the report, members:

- Sought clarification on the basis for the proposed budgets for the Science Park to Waterbeach and Eastern Access projects, as indicated in the budget in Appendix 2 of the report. The Director of Transport explained that further work carried out in those corridors reflected a knowledge of costs of other projects, which had been used to establish the figures. The amounts had been added to the budget as part of the commitment to the schemes and would be established as the projects moved forwards.

- Suggested that 'West of Cambridge Package' was a vague term as used in the budget in Appendix 2 of the report and suggested an alternative name be sought.
- Queried why the 2020/21 budget included £25k for Energy, while the Future Years Budget included £25m. The Head of Strategy and Programme informed members that initial work looking at what interventions on the energy network would be necessary or available, suggested that there was a gap in funding of around £25m. Therefore it had been listed as a potential allocation in the Future Years Budget, but could not be confirmed until further investigatory work had been carried out.
- Clarified that the Future Years Budget was only indicative and that the Executive Board's approval was only being sought for the 2020/21 budget, with future spending being dependent on the results of the Gateway Review. Members requested greater clarity in future budget papers and also for greater involvement in the budget setting process.
- Welcomed the funding provided for the Housing First units modular construction, highlighting the importance of increasing the amount of housing available for homeless people to move in to.
- Expressed concern over the lack of progress with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) Transport Needs Review given the significant level of funding from the GCP. One member suggested that more pressure should be put on the companies involved to work together and make a greater commitment towards progress. Another noted that a CBC Strategy Group and a CBC Programme Board had been established to oversee delivery of move the project forward. It was also noted that a recruitment process was ongoing to replace the departed Chief Executive of the Cambridge University Health Partners. The Director of Transport drew members' attention to the status of short term CBC interventions as laid out in Appendix 1 of the report. The Chief Executive assured the Executive Board that both the GCP and the Biomedical Campus were aware of the challenges and were working together on addressing identified priorities. Members requested an update in the subsequent edition of the Quarterly Performance Report.

On conclusion of the debate, the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note progress across the GCP programme;
- (b) Approve a proposal to part-fund a pilot Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) project to provide six temporary housing units for homeless residents at a cost of £70k, as set out in sections 7 and 10 of the report;
- (c) Note the CBC Transport Study and agree to continue working with campus to support delivery of the action plan, as set out in section 22 of the report;
- (d) Approve a proposal to continue to allocate to Cambridgeshire County Council, 50% (£531,000) of the lost annual income resulting from the removal of the £1 parking charge at Park and Ride sites in the GCP area from 1st April 2020, and to review this before the end of 2020/21, as set out in section 23 of the report;
- (e) Delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Board, the authority to approve the specialist legal services required to support the powers and

consenting processes associated with major transport scheme approval, as set out in section 24 of the report; and

(f) Approve the proposed 2020/21 Budget, as set out in section 28 of the report.

10. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that in light of a letter received from the Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, the GCP was seeking to clarify the situation regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge project. It had therefore been decided to defer consideration of the project to a future meeting.

The Chairperson noted that 20 public questions had been submitted relating to agenda item 10 and those who had submitted the questions would be invited to present them when the item was considered at a future meeting.

11. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: WATERBEACH TO NORTH CAMBRIDGE

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained the background and rationale for the Better Public Transport project running from Waterbeach to North East Cambridge, as well as an update on the technical work and engagement to date and the proposed programme going forward. He also advised members that the project would be considered again in greater detail at its meeting on 25th June 2020.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Clarified that there were two stages of consultations, with the first stage forming part of the Strategic Outline Business Case and focusing on basic principles. The second stage formed part of the development of the Outline Business Case and would consider route options. It was noted that members of the public who participated in the consultation stages would benefit from a clear outline of how the project would proceed and what would be involved during each consultation stage. The Director of Transport acknowledged the observation and highlighted the pre-consultation talks as part of the process aimed at improving the understanding and effectiveness of consultations.
- Sought clarification on whether a start point and end point of the route would be decided by the first consultation. The Director of Transport confirmed that there would be greater clarity on the issues but no decision would have been made and that a detailed route alignment would only follow the ruling out of various options. He highlighted the southern area of the Waterbeach to North Cambridge route as likely to be the most problematic section of the scheme, given the need to ensure a coherent public transport, walking and cycling offer.
- Suggested connecting the route to the already existing busway running from St Ives to Cambridge and queried whether that busway would benefit from an upgrade as a result. The Director of Transport acknowledged the suggestion and indicated that the location of the Milton Park and Ride site was also being taken into consideration, although it was not possible to make commitments until the Outline Business Case had been produced.

- Identified a need for the different local authorities to work together and ensure there was no confusion over the objectives of the various projects.
- Emphasised the importance of the project to help alleviate the transport issues around the A14 and A10. It was recalled that the A10 transport study had identified public transport as the highest scoring cost-benefit improvement possibility for the corridor.

On conclusion of the debate the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the work to date and to consider the next stage of work including the Consultation and Engagement Strategy;
- (b) Endorse plans for further informal public and stakeholder engagement in early 2020 to inform the Options Appraisal Report (OAR) stage; and
- (c) Note that a further report on the scheme will be considered in June setting out proposals for formal public consultation in Summer 2020 to inform the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) which will allow a preferred set of measures to be presented for approval.

12. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: EASTERN ACCESS PROJECT

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained the background and rationale for the Better Public Transport project on the access corridor in to East Cambridge, as well as an update on the technical work and engagement to date and the proposed programme going forward. It was noted that the strategic planning perspective on the eastern side of the city was less defined than other points of access to the city, which made it a more complex project. The consultation phase of the scheme had been slightly delayed in order for it to follow the Waterbeach to North East Cambridge project's consultation stage but also to ensure that it aligned as much as possible with the Local Plan process.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Noted the importance of ensuring open and clear communication on the project in anticipation of opposition to proposed routes.
- Argued that the eastern rail route could be improved so as to provide better access to the city on a service that was currently overladen and working to capacity.

On conclusion of the debate the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the work to date and approve the proposed Consultation and Engagement Strategy based on:
 - (i) Further informal public and stakeholder engagement in early 2020 to inform the Options Appraisal Report (OAR) stage; and

(ii) Formal public consultation in the Autumn 2020 to inform the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) which will allow a preferred set of measures to be presented for approval; and

(b) Note that a further report on the scheme will be brought to the June meeting setting out the options appraisal and detailed proposals for formal public consultation.

13. WHITTLESFORD STATION TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

The Director of Transport presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on the outcomes of a public consultation exercise regarding the Whittlesford Travel Hub and considered the next steps in delivering the proposed transport infrastructure. Members' attention was drawn to a change from the report presented to the Joint Assembly on 30th January 2020, which followed an intervention from the County Council on the issue of decriminalised parking in South Cambridgeshire, which would be taken on by the two statutory authorities.

The Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote and the Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the responses from the public consultation; and
- (b) Support a draft delivery plan for the Whittlesford Station Transport Investment Strategy (WSTIS), shown in Appendix 1 of the report, as a basis for further engagement with key stakeholders.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting would be held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday 25th June 2020, at the Guildhall, Cambridge.

Chairperson
25th June 2020

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

No	Questioner	Question	Answer
1	David Stoughton	<p>Agenda Item 6: Report of Citizens’ Assembly</p> <p>Specifically I’d like to ask whether, in the light of recent research, the criteria informing decisions are incomplete and understate the urgency of reducing pollution to protect citizens’ health. I attach a summary of recent research by Kings College London showing that hospital admissions increase during periods of peak pollution that, along with similar results shown in studies in the USA, demonstrate that it is the peaks in pollution not the mean that causes most damage to health.</p> <p>Link: Kings College Research</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing the report from Kings College, London, which has been published and circulated to Executive Board members. This study adds to the evidence for the impact of pollution on public health and the need to address air quality issues.</p> <p>Last June, the Executive Board formally agreed that improving air quality should be a key consideration in developing the final city access strategy, and the Citizens’ Assembly specifically considered air quality issues as part of their deliberations.</p> <p>The Board will be discussing a paper setting out the potential impacts of different interventions on air quality later this afternoon. This suggests some immediate actions to support the uptake of public transport, as well as developing packages with options for the Board’s consideration at their next meeting in June.</p>
2	Vincent Poole Arbury Road East Residents Association	<p>Agenda Item 7: City Access Strategy</p> <p>The question is being asked on behalf of the Arbury Road East Residents Association, which is constituted of households living on Arbury Road and its tributaries, between the Cambridge North Academy and Milton Road.</p> <p>We live along a neighbourhood road that has become a rat-run. Cars either sit and queue, poisoning the air, or they speed well in excess of the 20mph limit. The on-going Histon Road works are poised to make the situation much, much worse as inbound traffic ignores the signed diversion route and races down Arbury Road only to get stuck at the Milton Road traffic signals.</p> <p>We welcome the findings of the City Access Strategy and the Joint Assembly recommendations regarding it. In particular, paragraph 12.4 recommends “Piloting further road closures, both in the city centre and on local roads.” and “A pilot community closure scheme could be developed</p>	<p>The issues raised by the Arbury Road Residents Association emphasise the nature of the problems set out in the report, and the importance of exploring solutions to these in both the short and long term, considering both the road itself and the network as a whole.</p> <p>The Board paper recommends proceeding with short term measures such as piloting closures. Officers have previously spoken to the Arbury Road East Residents Association about a possible future scheme for the area, and would welcome continuing to work with them to explore options further.</p>

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>to offer communities the opportunity to come forward with proposals for local roads, for example ‘play streets’, ‘pocket parks’ or closures around schools”</p> <p>Here we are! We know from the recent survey* conducted by the Arbury Road East Residents Association that those who live on the road are ready and willing to try pilot schemes, test ideas and participate in workshops to develop proposals that would stop the rat-running, reduce pollution and bring our community together once again. You will receive our eager support for exploring serious options. Will the Executive Board support part C of the recommendations, and then add Arbury Road (east) to the list of immediate intervention sites to address issues of congestion, air quality and carbon emissions?</p> <p>Link: https://arera.org.uk/2020-01-22-survery-results/</p>	
3	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p>Item 7: City Access</p> <p>We thank those involved for the research conducted on the City Access project. It’s clear that both scientific evidence and public opinion support the goal of switching a significant number of journeys in and around Cambridge to walking, cycling and public transport. It’s also clear that this needs to be done to address issues of congestion, air quality and climate change and to deliver an economically thriving region of healthy, happy people.</p> <p>We strongly support the cycling proposals included in the list of short-term interventions including plans to build more cycle infrastructure, improve junctions, trial car-free days, develop a lease scheme for e-bikes and cargo cycles, improve and increase cycle parking and work with schools and businesses to increase levels of cycling.</p> <p>We also strongly support the piloting of further modal filters and community streets; these measures are essential to the growth of cycling in the area for all ages and abilities. However, we believe the implementation of these should not depend on the resources of local</p>	<p>The report recommends that the Board prioritise and implement some immediate actions, as well as developing packages for consideration at their meeting in June. These packages would consider the issues set out in the paper in the round, looking at how a significant shift to sustainable transport can be achieved. The work would consider phasing and implementation, including how – building on the Citizens’ Assembly and Choices for Better Journeys – the GCP will continue to engage people.</p>

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>communities and would like to ask the GCP to develop a coordinated plan of modal filters that makes transport work for the whole city and could be supported by additional demand management measures if needed.</p> <p>Finally, we call for bold and timely action. Around us, other UK cities are taking the lead. London, York, Bristol, Birmingham, Brighton and Oxford: when will Cambridge join the list? In Europe, Paris has grown cycling by 54% in just one year and Ghent’s circulation plan led to 25% of residents switching away from driving.</p> <p>So, we’d like to ask the Greater Cambridge Executive Board when they will begin to improve city access and how they will communicate the plans in a way that engages people in a city-wide transformation rather than focusing on street-by-street changes?</p>	
4	Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The summary from the Joint Assembly’s deliberations neatly encapsulates where we are at: <i>“The evidence presented to members provided a compelling case to do something, although it was not yet clear what that something was.” [p.24].</i></p> <p>GCP is trapped in a vicious circle: it requires a recurring revenue stream to support a large expansion of bus services, but lacks the political consensus and popular trust to introduce a congestion charge to raise that revenue. There is a way out though. Officers have concluded that a Workplace Parking Levy is insufficiently effective to consider implementing, yet it has only been appraised as a stand-alone intervention or in combination with increased public parking charges in the city.</p> <p>Why not instead consider it as a first step towards introducing a flexible road charging scheme? It can be introduced more quickly than road charging, as the scale of engagement and negotiation required is more manageable; it can be phased in gradually as the overheads are low; any businesses likely to be adversely affected can be offered a rebate,</p>	<p>The paper collates and summarises the weight of evidence, technical and analytical work undertaken to date to inform the emerging city access strategy. This work has been accompanied by wide ranging public and stakeholder engagement. Building on this, the recommendations propose continuing this evidence-led approach through developing and analysing packages of measures, rather than jumping a single solution.</p>

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>reviewable annually; and the revenue generated can be used to start the process of augmenting bus services. This will help rebuild trust and confidence in the GCP.</p> <p>Will the Board undertake to re-appraise a Workplace Parking Levy in this light?</p>	
5	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p>Item 8: Greenways</p> <p>We're pleased to see the proposals for the Greenways and the request for additional funding, and we hope the Executive Board will support these plans as the Greenways cannot arrive a minute too soon.</p> <p>Q1: In light of the climate emergency, we ask the Executive Board to consider what steps could be taken to speed up delivery of the Greenways sooner than the proposed date of late 2024?</p> <p>Q2: In another project, the GCP has proposed removing all car parking along Adams Road. Given that this is a desirable safety feature on its own, may we ask for the removal of parking and addition of cycling-friendly traffic-calming on Adams Road to be included as another 'quick win' project that can be implemented straight away to increase cycling safety on one of the busiest and most important cycle routes in Cambridge?</p> <p>Q3: With the relocation of the County Council offices and the Cycling Projects Team (and some members of the team leaving) what specific plans does the GCP have in place to ensure the Greenways and other cycling projects will be staffed by officers with experience in cycling projects and with the local knowledge required to design them?</p>	<p>Q1: The proposed programme for the delivery of the schemes is a realistic forecast which is based upon experience from previous similar schemes.</p> <p>The timescales for delivery of the Greenways depend heavily on how land negotiations progress. It is possible that land agreements will take less time and that the schemes could therefore be expedited but at this stage in the project we would prefer to be realistic.</p> <p>Q2: No further quick win schemes are currently being considered or proposed as part of the Greenways project. Proposals for the Comberton Greenway will be considered at the next Executive Board meeting in June 2020 and will include further detail about how the Greenway route and the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme will align in the vicinity of Adams Road.</p> <p>Q3: The GCP is in ongoing dialogue with the County Council regarding their proposed changes. Nevertheless, the GCP has committed to employing the appropriate expertise with the local knowledge to deliver cycling projects.</p>
6	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p>Item 9: Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>We notice that, on the transport delivery overview, the 'Links to Cambridge North Station and Science Park project' is marked as completed when on the ground this route is unfinished because the issues of Nuffield Road have not yet been addressed. Similarly, although we welcomed the</p>	<p>Q1: The planned Greenways project builds upon the cross-city cycling scheme to further improve cycling provision across Greater Cambridge.</p>

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>improvements to Arbury Road last year, we note that this is not yet a safe cycle route because the southeastern end of the road is still very dangerous for people cycling.</p> <p>Q1: Can the Executive Board confirm that there will be investment in a second phase of cross-city cycling projects to complete unfinished routes and link up safe sections of existing or proposed cycle routes? For example, addressing the gap in safe provision between the new section of Arbury Road and the proposed Milton Road cycleways?</p> <p>Q2: What were the results of the surveys that were undertaken in the areas of cross-city cycling schemes? Was there an uptake in people cycling? Do people feel that these routes are now safer to cycle on?</p> <p>Q3: Are all these schemes connected to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) process and a comprehensive plan for cycling networks across Greater Cambridge? When is the LCWIP consultation going to be launched?</p>	<p>The GCP’s 2019 Future Investment Strategy identifies the delivery of “further cycle projects to address gaps in the network” on a long-list of future projects, subject to further funding being made available following the Gateway Review. Investment in a second phase of cross-city cycling projects would therefore be considered by the Executive Board in such circumstances.</p> <p>Q2: The independent evaluation of the impact of three cross-city cycling schemes in summer 2019 included user surveys and cycle counts, to understand the impact to-date of the schemes across various metrics.</p> <p>It found that there was an increase in numbers of cyclists by 12% across the three routes around 1,500 more cycle trips per week for the period of the fieldwork.</p> <p>The independent evaluation also found that perceptions of safety along the routes have improved, with an average improvement of 24%.</p> <p>Q3: All schemes are connected to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) process;</p> <p>I understand that Cambridgeshire County Council intend to launch the LCWIP consultation in the spring.</p>
7	Sam Davies	<p>Item 9: Quarterly Progress Report (Section 22)</p> <p>As the Board will be aware, there is already significant public scepticism about the Biomedical Campus’s ability to manage its growth without significant further detrimental impacts on the residential communities in the south of the city.</p>	<p>The GCP recognises the economic and societal benefits that the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) brings but also the challenges it creates in terms of traffic and transportation.</p>

Appendix A - 19th February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

	<p>In March 2019, I asked this Board how the GCP proposed to convert the 47 short term interventions identified in the Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review into “distinct funded actions, with identified accountability and appropriate monitoring processes, delivered within an acceptable timeframe.”</p> <p>I note the statement in item 22.3 in today’s Board papers that work has only been undertaken on “around half” of the potential so-called ‘quick win’ measures; and the statement in 22.5 that CUHP will not even have finalised the plan for delivery of appropriate Campus-wide governance structures before March 2020.</p> <p>Hence, I am here today to ask this Board whether it is content with the progress that has been made in the intervening year; and whether it sympathises with residents’ frustration as they experience the intensifying negative externalities of the Campus’s growth.</p>	<p>This is why the GCP undertook the “Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review” presented to the GCP Executive Board last year - the first comprehensive study of this type undertaken for the CBC.</p> <p>We will continue to work constructively with campus partners to deliver on the actions identified in the study to address the challenges raised.</p> <p>Item 7 on the agenda also considers the wider options for tackling congestion across the GCP area.</p>
--	---	---