

**GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly  
Thursday 4th June 2020  
2:00 p.m. – 7:40 p.m.

PRESENT:

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

Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Davey (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Sargeant	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Dr Andy Williams	Business Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative
Dr John Wells	University Representative

**Officers**

Jo Baker	Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Simon Manville	Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Andrew Munro	Project Manager (GCP)
Richard Preston	Project Manager (GCP)
Paul Rawlinson	Project Manager (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Tim Watkins	Project Manager (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## **1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

It was proposed by Councillor Davey, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha and resolved unanimously that Councillor Bick be elected Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the municipal year 2020/21.

As the outgoing Joint Assembly Chairperson, Councillor Wotherspoon expressed his gratitude to Councillor Bick for his support as Vice-Chairperson.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillors Nethsingha and Sargeant to the Joint Assembly, expressed thanks to Councillors Massey and John Williams, whom they had replaced, and paid tribute to the work carried out by Councillor Wotherspoon during his tenure as Chairperson.

The Chairperson drew attention to the recent announcement made by the Government that the GCP had passed its Gateway Review and would receive up to a further £400m in funding. He praised the work of the GCP's officers, in particular the Chief Executive, and commented that the GCP provided the leadership, change and progress necessary to deliver the high quality and sustainable transport strategy required by the area.

The Chief Executive acknowledged the achievement of passing the review and paid tribute to the vital role of the Joint Assembly in providing constructive criticism and discussion throughout the process. She informed members that the GCP would be increasingly progressing from the planning stage to delivery over the next five years.

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

It was proposed by Councillor Bick, seconded by Councillor Sargeant and resolved unanimously that Councillor Davey be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the municipal year 2020/21.

## **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Jo Sainsbury.

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the GCP Quarterly Performance Report (agenda item 9) due to his involvement with 'Cambridge&', as well as his employment at Marshall of Cambridge.

Dr Andy Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Performance Report (agenda item 9) due to his involvement with 'Cambridge&'. Dr Williams also declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (agenda item 13), due to his employment at AstraZeneca.

## **5. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 30th January 2020, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

With reference to minute 10, Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge, (third paragraph on page 11 of the agenda pack) it was suggested that the GCP's response to the Information Commissioner's Office's findings could be appended to the minutes. The Chief Executive undertook to ensure that the response had been published and circulated but informed the Joint Assembly that it would be inappropriate to append to the minutes as it had not featured in the meeting itself.

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that 11 public questions had been submitted and 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 1 question related to agenda item 9 (GCP Quarterly Performance Report), 4 questions related to agenda item 10 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery), 1 question related to agenda item 13 (Cambridge South East Transport Scheme) and the remaining 5 questions related to agenda item 14 (Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project). The Chairperson informed members that public speakers had been offered the choice of either presenting their question themselves or having it read out by an officer.

## **7. PETITIONS**

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

## **8. IMPACT OF AND RESPONSE TO COVID-19**

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented the report, which included details of a potential review of the GCP's programme in light of Covid-19, provided an overview of work commissioned to look at the likely impact of Covid-19 on the local economy, and detailed the potential impact of Covid-19 on the GCP's current programme.

Members were informed that a review of the Investment Strategy had previously been planned following the completion of the Gateway Review and it would therefore be possible to combine that with the proposed review of the effects of Covid-19. A draft version of the report commissioned to Hatch Regeneris on the impacts of Covid-19 on the local economy had been submitted to the GCP and the Head of Strategy and Programme undertook to provide the Joint Assembly and Executive Board with feedback once officers had reviewed the report. While significant delays to projects across the GCP's programme were not expected, it was noted that issues such as loss of workforce or disruption to supply chains could potentially have isolated impacts. Projects were therefore constantly under review.

The Joint Assembly was informed that since the report had been published, work on the Modern Methods Units mentioned in section 5.1 of the report had finished and they would shortly be ready for occupation. A formal launch would take place on 12th June 2020, with residents to move in shortly after.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposal for a review in light of Covid-19 and questioned how it might affect previously made decisions. The Head of Strategy and Programme argued that the review should have a refined scope to establish whether the current programme was still fit for purpose, and that any subsequent review of previous decisions would likely require the initial review to have established that infrastructure was no longer important for local economic growth.
- Suggested that the Chisholm Trail would play a large part in changing people's travel habits and requested an update on the project's progress. The Head of Strategy and Programme commented that the following item included an update.
- Requested close monitoring of the temporary measures that would be put in place by the GCP and the County Council, in order to identify the successful ones that could be made permanent. Members were assured that temporary measures were being monitored and that officers would collate the data to construct an evidence base from which the continuation of selected measures could be decided.
- Expressed concern that staff had been furloughed by the manufacturers of the autonomous vehicles being used in the Smart trials and requested an update on whether they had returned to work, and if so, how significantly the timetable would be affected. The Head of Strategy and Programme undertook to provide an update to members.
- Paid tribute to the work carried out by the Business Task and Finish Group in supporting local authorities during the current crisis.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposal for a review.

## **9. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT**

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

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme and which included the rationale behind the proposal for a future investment review. Attention was drawn to the progress of Cambridge&, as detailed in section 25 of the report. Members were informed that the company was in its second phase of development and in discussion with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) on how it could be involved in the growth service for which the CPCA was holding a procurement process. A further £50k investment was being sought from the GCP in order to advance the initial organisational set up, and emphasis was given to the time critical nature of its development given the intense efforts that would be required to recover from the effects of Covid-19.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposal for a review in order to respond effectively to Covid-19 and having successfully passed the Gateway Review. It was suggested that the review should not be entirely focussed on the effects of Covid-19, given that it was hard to predict how its impact might evolve.
- Expressed concern over the challenges that would be faced by young people starting their working life following Covid-19, suggesting that while it had previously been difficult to find businesses willing to take on apprentices in some areas, it would now be even harder, while there could also be an increase in demand. Members enquired whether the GCP was in discussions with apprenticeship providers in order to ensure that there were opportunities available as soon as it was feasible. The Head of Strategy and Programme informed members that discussions over the issue had been initiated ten weeks earlier and were ongoing, noting that the GCP Skills Working Group would consider the matter at a forthcoming meeting.
- Observed that a number of the Smart Places projects in the table in section 9, as well as Transport projects in the table in Section 20 of the report, were marked as complete and clarified that projects would continue to be monitored and reported on, specifically relating to their roll out, level of usage and level of success. With regard to the completed Greenways Initiatives, the Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that in future reports the Greenways Initiatives would be split up in accordance with the delivery timelines for individual projects that had gone through the decision-making process, noting the desire for the projects to be progress as quickly as possible.
- Expressed concern that while progress had been made on digital wayfinding for getting to and around the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), improvements also needed to be made to the physical infrastructure, such as signs at bus stops. The Head of Strategy and Programme undertook to investigate the issue.
- Sought clarification on the alternative sources of funding to alleviate overspend against Cross-City Cycle Improvements, as mentioned in section 21.2 of the report. One member noted that while EU funding had been obtained previously, such resources would no longer be available. The Transport Director informed members that discussions were being held with Highways England and Network Rail, along with other potential sources, and that further information would be provided once established.
- Observed that the Cambridge Southeast Transport Study had target and forecast completion dates for 2024 in the table in section 20 of the report, while section 5.11 of agenda item 13 (Cambridge South East Transport Scheme) stated that the target completion date was 2025. One member queried how the GCP would integrate the scheme with the development of Cambridge South Station and the ongoing construction works around the CBC, given that the different projects were likely to impact on one another. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns and confirmed that the target date was 2024. The GCP was waiting for confirmation of the Cambridge South Station route alignment, but the Transport Director assured members that the projects would work together as a whole.

- Suggested that there should be more in depth analysis, including cost/benefit analysis, of the requested investment for Cambridge, given that it was a request for public funds. It was noted that the working group had primarily supported funding as it was considered important to retain a stake and a significant role in the initiative for public sector bodies that were involved in transport planning strategies. The Head of Strategy and Programme acknowledged the concern and undertook to make further information available, including the business case.
- Noted that a number of working group meetings had been cancelled or postponed recently and that it would be beneficial, particularly for new members of the Joint Assembly, to ensure that the groups resumed their previous levels of work.
- Observed that the section of the report on Resident Parking Schemes (section 21.17) did not mention that the County Council had suspended the implementation and introduction of new schemes for 12 months, suggesting that this would be likely to have an impact on finances. One member noted the popularity of schemes that had already been implemented in Cambridge and expressed disappointment that there would be no new schemes for 12 months. While unable to speak on behalf of the County Council, the Transport Director confirmed the temporary suspension and informed members that further clarification would be provided to the Executive Board on whether those schemes already in the system would be taken forward.

The Chairperson noted that the Joint Assembly had identified the issue of apprenticeships to receive particular emphasis when considered by the Executive Board.

#### **10. PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS AND CITY ACCESS STRATEGY: UPDATE AND SUPPORT FOR COVID-19 RECOVERY**

Public questions were invited from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle), Jim Chisholm, Lucy Edgeley (on behalf of the Arbury Road East Residents' Association) and the Storey's Way Residents' Association. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Transport Director and Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which provided an update on the City Access project, including how it could support Covid-19 recovery work, building on the short term measures that had been identified by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in February 2020. Members were provided with some more up-to-date data to that which was included in the report, which indicated that the large drop in car journeys was beginning to rise again, with an increase of 28% since the previous week. The cycling figures were more complicated to analyse, as sensors deployed along commuter routes had seen a drop and then a rise as more people had been cycling for leisure and recreational purposes. Although footfall in the city centre had decreased massively, numbers had begun to increase since 10th May 2020. Benefits from these reductions included improved air quality along with faster and more reliable journeys on public transport, while also providing test conditions for some of the ideas that the GCP had been considering regarding lowering traffic levels.

Attention was drawn to the three proposed priority areas for immediate investment and implementation detailed in section 3 of the report, which were creating space for pedestrians and cyclists, providing transport support for people and businesses to recover,

and public transport recovery. The Head of Transport Strategy emphasised that potential long-term changes to travel behaviour were still being analysed and future reports would provide further analysis once it had been carried out.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that vehicles were travelling at a greater speed as a result of there being fewer vehicles on the road. The Transport Director acknowledged the concern, which he noted was a problem on a national level.
- Raised concerns that the usual consultation processes were not being followed with regard to road closures and sought clarification on whether residents would be able to ensure their removal in the future. While recognising the benefits of extensive engagement, it was acknowledged that such processes took time and immediate action was necessary. It was emphasised by the Transport Director that local communities would be consulted before any temporary measures were made permanent.
- Clarified that road closures would be controlled by cameras to ensure their effectiveness and suggested that residents living in the surrounding area to any closure should be permitted access. The Transport Director suggested that it was unlikely that residents would be permitted access due to the complex processes that such exemptions would involve.
- Expressed concern that most pavements in Cambridge were not wide enough to allow for the social distancing required by Government guidance, with pedestrians often forced to step on to the road or cycle lane in order to maintain the necessary distance. Shared-use paths, such as the route from Milton Park and Ride to the city centre, were identified as particularly problematic given that bicycles and pedestrians shared the same spaces. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns and informed the Joint Assembly that they were being addressed by the County Council as widely and as quickly as possible, noting that it was a difficult issue to resolve, especially given the context of a constantly evolving situation.
- Observed that reallocation of road space to cycling and walking was also necessary in towns and villages outside Cambridge, and sought assurances that the improvements would not be restricted to Cambridge.
- Acknowledged that the current reduction in levels of road usage, while beneficial on many levels, was unsustainable in the long-term given that it was predicated on a large number of people either not working or working from alternative locations. One Member queried whether analysis had been carried out on how the changes would impact businesses, such as shops, in the city centre, and it was observed that planning should take into account the fact that people would eventually return to work and road space would again become more restricted. The Head of Transport Strategy informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP was in extensive discussions with the business community regarding their needs and establishing how active transport could be encouraged and made safer, noting that some business had already established their own plans. Different sectors, such as manufacturing and office-based work, presented different needs, while some businesses would be able to implement changes to working patterns, such as staggered shifts.

- Queried whether disability groups had been consulted on the proposed measures. The Project Manager noted that it was difficult to carry out the usual level of engagement with disability groups, but he assured members that they would be contacted to ensure that they had the appropriate information. He noted that some of the proposed schemes implicitly restricted access to Blue Badge Bays and stated that the GCP was sensitive to the issue and addressing the problems when they arose.
- Welcomed the reduction in nitrogen dioxide levels that had been identified particularly in areas with a higher proportion of bus traffic and queried whether the piloting of electric buses could be expanded to further increase the benefits. The Transport Director noted the enthusiasm shown by companies in rolling out the pilot but informed the Joint Assembly that while they were dependent on financial support from the Government, priority was being given to re-establishing the services that members of the public relied on.
- Observed that the Government was currently advising people to avoid using public transport where possible and that this situation was likely to endure for a number of months. While acknowledging the difficulty in predicting long-term impacts, one member suggested that this had consequences for GCP's general policy of encouraging people to use public transport. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns and argued that the challenges were unprecedented and that there was a lot of uncertainty and speculation over the long-term effects of Covid-19. He argued that any future scenario would require good public transport, both in Cambridge and anywhere else.
- Identified the safety of cyclists and pedestrians as a major concern, especially given the high number of new and inexperienced cyclists sharing the roads with vehicles, with one member highlighting the dangers faced by cyclists in rural areas. It was suggested that the safety of cyclists should be considered as a guiding principle throughout the GCP's work.
- Welcomed plans to increase vegetation clearance on footways and cycleways, although it was observed that such clearances needed to be performed on a regular basis and not just once
- Sought clarification on the rationale for how the prioritisation of measures had been established. The Project Manager informed members that a lot of the schemes that had been selected were schemes that had been considered for many years and were in locations where there had already been debate about the need to reduce traffic levels. He emphasised that the list was a starting point and that further schemes could be added if they were considered appropriate. The Head of Transport Strategy indicated that the overall strategy was to create a network that would develop and incorporate wider routes.
- Suggested that sections of cycleways were in need of resurfacing, as their current state served as a deterrent to many cyclists.
- Argued that ward and parish councillors should be consulted on where measures would be most effective in their area. The Project Manager informed the Joint Assembly that he planned to meet councillors from all the areas that would be affected by the schemes, in order to allow them to help shape the proposals. The Head of Transport



Strategy noted that the County Council was leading the compilation of the list of schemes and therefore local councillors would be engaged with by the local authority.

- Noted that a lot of people working in major employment sites in Cambridge came from outside the natural cycling area and therefore needed to either drive or take public transport to reach their place of work. One member noted that some people drove to Park and Ride sites before continuing in to the city centre on bikes and suggested that secure, overnight bike storage at Park and Ride sites would encourage such behaviour, as it would allow them to leave the bike overnight, rather than take it home in the car each day. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and noted that the importance of providing secure bike storage was growing with the increase in usage of more expensive eBikes.
- Observed that the discussion on the City Access Strategy at the previous Joint Assembly meeting on 30th January 2020 had concluded with the understanding that a report beginning to develop the long-term strategy would be presented at the meeting on 4th June 2020. While acknowledging that Covid-19 had disrupted many areas of the GCP's work and beyond, it was argued that a long-term strategy still needed to be developed. One member suggested that the next steps set out in the report were too vague and that an item should be added to the Forward Plan.
- Sought an update on the situation regarding proposals for congestion charging. The Transport Director confirmed that they would be included in the discussions and considerations that would be held over the coming months.

## **11. RESPONSE TO CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Joint Assembly received a report which set out the GCP's proposed response to the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly's recommendations on reducing congestion, improving air quality and providing better public transport in Greater Cambridge. The Head of Transport Strategy emphasised that the long-term plans being developed by the GCP would incorporate the feedback that had been provided by the Citizens' Assembly. She also highlighted that a 'one-year on' report would be brought to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board later in the year to provide an update on the response and to coincide with the next stage of the City Access Strategy.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the wide range of opportunities for engagement with decision-making bodies that were available to the public in Greater Cambridge.
- Suggested that the nature of congestion and the use of physical space had changed and would continue to evolve as a result of Covid-19, creating a situation that was different to that which originally led to the Citizens' Assembly's recommendations. It was noted that the previous reports on the agenda that addressed the effects of Covid-19 had not made any reference to the Citizens' Assembly's recommendations and one member proposed that all future reports could include information on how they would affect the recommendations. The Head of Transport Strategy agreed to consider the proposal.

- Suggested that a report once a year failed to match the Citizens' Assembly's request for regular updates or its call to be brave, bold and take action. One member recalled the Joint Assembly's concerns that the recommendations from the Citizens' Assembly would eventually be put aside. The Head of Transport Strategy noted that the recommendations were intrinsically linked to all areas of the GCP's programme and that when the next report was brought forward it would need to incorporate the evidence-base that had been established following analysis of the effects of Covid-19.
- Proposed that the response from the GCP to the Citizens' Assembly could include additional reference to the outcome of the Joint Assembly discussion at its last meeting and the Executive Board's subsequent decision, in order to help to crystallise the fact that a direction had been set at that point.
- Clarified that the navy blue line on the table on page 89 of the agenda corresponded to increased parking charges.

The Chairperson concluded that there was general support from the Joint Assembly for the response.

## **12. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN – CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTONOMOUS METRO (CAM) SUB-STRATEGY**

Councillor Lina Nieto, County Councillor for Hardwick, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the importance for different organisations with transport responsibilities to work together under a clear and logical transport plan, she sought clarification on the level of consultation that the GCP had carried out with other bodies on proposed schemes. She also enquired as to what steps the Joint Assembly had taken to ensure a robust governance procedure around decision-making and consultations were in place in relation to schemes between the GCP and CPCA. The Transport Director identified the Joint Assembly as a key feature of the robust governance procedures in place, noting that the GCP worked extensively with local partners to ensure that it conformed to the Local Plan. The Chairperson drew attention to a recent open letter that had been published by the Executive Board which addressed the relationships and collaboration issues that Councillor Nieto had raised.

The Transport Director presented the report, which outlined the CPCA's CAM Sub-Strategy and reviewed how it might impact decisions on GCP projects. He emphasised that the GCP had taken steps to ensure its schemes complied with the Local Transport Plan, noting that this continued to be the case following the consultation on the Sub-Strategy. Therefore, the GCP was proposing to continue with its planned schemes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed frustration and concerns over the current uncertainties about whether the schemes were compliant with the Local Transport Plan, and sought clarification on potential consequences, such as judicial reviews or inquiries, along with the level of risk associated to the costs of such legal proceedings. The Transport Director noted that the GCP was obligated to demonstrate compliance and conformity with the Local Transport Plan, and as schemes progressed, their compliance would ultimately be assessed by a

planning inspector. He confirmed to the Joint Assembly that the GCP was confident that their schemes complied with the Local Transport Plan.

- Suggested it would be beneficial for CPCA officers to attend a Joint Assembly meeting in order to provide clarity on the CPCA's concerns. The Chief Executive informed members that extensive joint working had taken place between the two organisations over previous years, although she noted that they had largely been curtailed since February 2020. While officers continued to meet and liaise on a technical level, she emphasised that the GCP would welcome a resumption of meetings at a senior officer level.
- Observed that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review, on which the Local Industrial Strategy was based, had included a recommendation that had been accepted by all parties, which stated that the GCP provided a ready-made solution for meeting the needs of the Greater Cambridge economy. One member emphasised that the business community across Cambridgeshire continued to support that recommendation.
- Noted that every mayoral combined authority except for the CPCA had received a portion of £4.2b funding for urban transport, and argued that the GCP was being held back by the unfunded CAM scheme to the detriment of short term schemes that had been identified by the business community as critical to future economic growth.
- Requested clarification from the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough on how the schemes in question needed to be changed in order to comply with the Local Transport Plan.
- Suggested that a change to the working relationship between the GCP and the CPCA, along with a joint meeting, would be beneficial.
- Expressed disappointment that the disagreements between the GCP and the CPCA were not being addressed through discussions, noting that the open letter from the Executive Board had emphasised the repeated attempts on behalf of the GCP to improve collaboration and align its schemes.

### **13. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT SCHEME**

Tony Orgee, Chairperson of the Cambridge South East Transport Local Liaison Forum (LLF), attended the meeting to present feedback from the LLF virtual meeting held on 1st June 2020. While sharing the concerns that had been expressed at the meeting, Mr Orgee emphasised the request for local communities, representatives and stakeholders to be involved throughout the scheme's development and beyond.

A public question was invited from John Latham. The question and a summary of the response is provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

Councillor Amanda Taylor, County Councillor for Queens Edith's Division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. While welcoming the GCP's principles of improving active travel infrastructure and road safety, she argued that the proposals fell short of such objectives due to the cancellation of one of the Phase 1 schemes to construct an underpass close to the Gog Magog Hills and Wandlebury Country Park on the A1307. Highlighting the danger

currently faced by those crossing the road in the area, particularly those crossing to reach the bus stop for services in to Cambridge, she informed the Joint Assembly that the scheme's cancellation, which had been announced without prior consultation, was a cause of surprise. Expressing concern over the lack of evidence for the decision, she questioned why the LLF and other stakeholders had not been consulted before the scheme had been cancelled, and requested that the GCP review the decision and reconvene the LLF in order to establish dialogue with the public. The Transport Director acknowledged the lack of consultation and committed to holding consultations with all affected stakeholders, emphasising that final decisions would not be made until this had occurred.

The Joint Assembly received a report that included details of objections received in response to two Phase 1 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that were required for the previously agreed short term programme of works, and a review of the technical work and public consultation undertaken to date contributing to the production of the Outline Business Case (OBC) for Phase 2 of the scheme. Attention was drawn to an error in section 3.3 of the report, as the proposed west bound bus lane on approach to the B1052 (Scheme 14) would deliver a 2 minute saving in journey time, leading to a revised benefit to cost ratio of 1.68, as opposed to the 34 minute saving and benefit to cost ratio of 4.5 that was included in the report. The Project Manager highlighted that the CPCA Board had agreed at a Board meeting on 31st October 2018 that the GCP should progress with the scheme as an essential first phase of developing proposals for the CAM, and that the GCP had continued to work closely with the CPCA since that decision.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Highlighted the correction that had been made and the subsequent change to the benefit to cost ratio, noting that it represented a significant divergence.
- Noted representations received by Joint Assembly members in relation to this and other items. One member expressed concern that documents that had been circulated to Joint Assembly members were not all published online in a uniform and transparent way.
- Acknowledged concerns raised by the LLF about the consultation process and sought clarification on whether the further consultations announced by the Transport Director would be held before the Executive Board was asked to approve the Outline Business Case and endorse the route alignment and travel hub location on 25th June 2020. It was suggested that consultation timelines needed to be clearer in the future in order to ensure transparency. The Transport Director noted that the concerns related to the consultation process concerned the detailed design of Phase 1 schemes, as opposed to the overall Phase 2 project, and confirmed that the GCP would reengage with affected stakeholders and groups about the detailed design, particularly in relation to the A1307 underpass.
- Observed that there would be thousands of people crossing the A1307 around the CBC every day once Cambridge South Station opened, and when added to the high number of cyclists in the area, there would be significant challenges in the area. The Transport Director acknowledged the concern and informed the Joint Assembly that discussions were being held with Network Rail and the CPCA regarding the CAM proposals, in order to ensure that the scheme did not create more problems than it solved. The Project Manager also noted that a working group had been established with CBC

representatives, Addenbrookes Hospital, East West Rail and Network Rail to discuss in detail how the proposals interfaced with the potential Cambridge South Station and the subsequent need for access to the station, where stops would be and how passengers would access them and move on to their destinations around the CBC.

- Sought clarification on whether the benefit to cost ratios reflected the fact that Cambridge South Station had funding in place. The Project Manager informed the Joint Assembly that the Department of Transport prohibited the inclusion of schemes that had not reached a stage of full commitment when establishing benefit to cost ratios.
- Expressed concern about the onward transport connections from Babraham Park and Ride, arguing that it attracted cars too far in to the city without providing links to either the CBC or the busway. The Transport Director recognised the challenges faced by the Park and Ride site and acknowledged that action needed to be taken to overcome the profound implications of the scheme's delivery in 2024, but he informed the Joint Assembly that it was too early to present proposals and that they would come to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at a later date.
- Expressed support for efforts to enhance the Ninewells area, noting that it was important to not let that part of the scheme disappear through a lack of detail.
- Acknowledged the concerns about road safety for pedestrians in the Gog Magog Hills and Wandlebury Country Park area.
- Enquired as to the position of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mayor specifically in relation to the Cambridge South East Transport scheme. The Transport Director noted that technical issues had been discussed with CPCA officers, although a formal response on the report had not been provided to the GCP.
- Sought clarification on how environmental impacts and mitigation measures had been incorporated when establishing benefit to cost ratios. Acknowledging the importance of considering the environmental impacts, the Transport Director emphasised that the formal environmental impact assessment process would begin once the route alignment had been established, although he noted that an appraisal report had started the process and had been published online.
- Observed that there had been significant attempts to ensure that the route passed through Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford in order to provide the villages with access, and clarification was sought on their predicted level of use in the Outline Business Case. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that the route had been considered extensively but had been rejected as part of the preferred route alignment for various reasons, including a failure to meet key objectives, profound cost implications, local impacts and the necessity to demolish private properties. It was also suggested that by increasing demand in Shelford, there would be a subsequent decrease in demand further back on the line due to the longer journey times resulting from reduced speeds.
- Suggested that South Cambridge Station would attract traffic that would be going on to London, and queried whether such an assumption had been included in the scheme.

The Chairperson noted that the Joint Assembly had not commented on the TROs that the Executive Board would be required to resolve, and that no objections had been raised to the proposed route alignment or travel hub location.

#### **14. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT**

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the Cambourne to Cambridge LLF, attended the meeting to present feedback from the LLF virtual meeting held on 2nd June 2020. She summarised three main areas of concern expressed at the meeting, including the impact on the communities and environment along the route, the design and value for money of the scheme, and the timing of the project. The Joint Assembly was informed that the following resolutions had been agreed at the meeting:

- The LLF opposes a premature decision on the current Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme. It is unfit for purpose, anachronistic and environmentally damaging, and is now out of step with emerging proposals for East West Rail and CAM.
- The LLF recommends a pause until:
- The Mayor's CAM consultation has concluded and his proposed route suitable for autonomous vehicles, MRT and adaptable into a Metro is published; and
- The location of a new east west rail station in Cambourne is confirmed and the business case for a busway reworked in light of its impact. This is a multibillion pound scheme that needs to be thoroughly understood first.
- In the meantime, the LLS supports the development of interim, high-quality bus priority measures and/or improved services on existing infrastructure that can support the Local Plan and provide immediate transport benefits to key employment locations whilst the bigger picture falls into place.

Councillor Markus Gehring, City Councillor for the Newnham Ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Noting that he had been campaigning on the issue for five years, he expressed concern over how residents and local councillors had been treated by the GCP. Noting that the three constituent councils had all declared a climate emergency, he argued that the most environmentally damaging route had been chosen from the options and that the environmental impact assessment was being carried out too late in the development process. The Transport Director emphasised that environmental impacts had been considered throughout the process so far and would continue with the formal environmental impact assessment and subsequent published environmental statement. He highlighted the fact that the sustainable transport corridor was promoting public transport, cycling and walking as attractive alternatives to travelling by car, as part of the GCP's objectives to tackle congestion, air quality and climate change.

Councillor Grenville Chamberlain, South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Hardwick Ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Drawing attention to the area between Hardwick and Madingley roundabout, he noted that it was home to about 3000 trees and a wide variety of wildlife, including yellowhammers, a protected species. He argued that the minimal time-savings that would result from the project did not justify the cost or damage to the local environment and community. The Transport Director assured the Joint Assembly that all efforts would be made to minimise the environmental impact and observed that there were 160 semi-mature and mature trees in the area described. He also highlighted that the GCP had proposed to introduce and repair the noise barrier, despite the fact that the buses would have minimal noise impact.

Public questions were invited from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle), Charles D'Oyly, Alastair Burford, Dr Marilyn Treacy and Carolyn Postgate. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which reviewed the technical work and public consultation that had been undertaken in the development of the Outline Business Case. It was noted that the report had been considered at the previous Joint Assembly meeting, although it had not subsequently been considered by the Executive Board. The proposals within the report had also been updated following the publication of the CPCA's CAM Sub-Strategy consultation and early analysis of the impact of Covid-19. Attention was drawn to the two main changes in the proposals, which were related to the route alignment in Cambourne and the eastern end of the scheme. Noting that confirmation on the final train station location in Cambourne and route alignment by East West Rail would not be for a further 12-18 months, he emphasised that the current preferred route in Cambourne followed existing routes in order to ensure maximum flexibility to fit in with the final East West Rail scheme. The Joint Assembly was informed that although the overall project complied with the CAM Sub-Strategy, the Adams Road section of the route had not met the Sub-Strategy's default positions for segregated routes and the complimenting of walking and cycling. Following further consultation, the proposed route alignment had reverted to the Rifle Range proposal.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Commented that on Figure 20 of the report, the A1303 was incorrectly labelled as the A1307. The Transport Director recognised the error and undertook to correct the label in the Executive Board's report.
- Noted representations received by Joint Assembly members in relation to this item. One member repeated her concern that documents that had been circulated to Joint Assembly members were not all published online in a uniform and transparent way.
- Expressed disappointment that issues that had been discussed at the previous meeting around environment and process had not been changed. The Transport Director assured the Joint Assembly that the GCP strictly followed statutory processes and confirmed that the environmental impact assessment would be carried out in the next stage.
- Welcomed the realignment from Adams Road to the Rifle Range given the importance of Adams Road as a cycle route in to the city centre, although one member observed that the Rifle Range section of the route had originally been rejected due to various difficulties that it presented, including the presence of farm vehicles on the same route. It was suggested that there were multiple alternatives for farm vehicles in the area.
- Acknowledged the ongoing disagreements over certain aspects of the scheme and the fact that many questions remained unresolved, but recognised the necessity for a solution to alleviate the problems along the route.
- Queried whether the proposals to remove parking facilities along Adams Road could continue to be carried out despite the realignment of the route. The Transport Director noted that the Comberton Greenway was intended to connect to Adams Road, thereby providing a mechanism with which to potentially continue such proposals.

- Argued that the alternative northern routes that were considered earlier in the development process were inappropriate and failed to consider some of the key objectives requested by local communities, such as the route passing through Eddington.
- Sought clarification on how significantly the Full Business Case needed to be affected by issues such as East West Rail and the effects of Covid-19 before alternative routes were once again considered, noting that there were no alternative routes with which comparisons could be made. The Transport Director observed that most major projects experienced policy or circumstantial changes during their development. These impacts were quantified as soon as it was possible, although it was noted that full impacts such as the location of Cambourne train station and the effects of Covid-19 could not be determined until later dates, although such issues were tracked at each stage of the process.
- Queried the deliverability risk around a legal challenge, given that the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough opposed the scheme, and how this could impact the timescale and financing of the project. The Transport Director clarified that the local transport authority was the CPCA as opposed to the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and that it was the GCP's responsibility to demonstrate conformity to the Local Transport Plan. He argued that every project had a deliverability risk that it could be challenged and informed members that he was unable to provide a percentage, as it was a task for the planning inspectorate.
- Requested that the Executive Board be provided with greater detail on the environmental impacts before making a decision. It was also suggested that the Executive Board should secure watertight commitments on issues such as mitigation. While acknowledging that the environmental impact assessment had still not been carried out, the Project Manager assured the Joint Assembly that extensive environmental appraisals had been performed and details published online.
- Sought greater clarification on the potential impacts of the final location of Cambourne train station on the scheme. One member also suggested that it would be helpful to see how assumptions in the original business case had been affected by the East West Rail confirmation. The Transport Director acknowledged that the impact would be profound and that the GCP was holding extensive discussions with East West Rail, although he observed that its impact would not be felt until at least 2030. He informed the Joint Assembly that one of the reasons for the Cambourne corridor being selected in the final train route alignment was due to its compatibility with the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.
- Noted that AstraZeneca had withdrawn funding for an on road bus route from Cambourne to the CBC due to the route's lack of popularity. It was argued that passengers were averse to using such services because they did not overcome the problem of congestion, whereas off road bus services had proven extremely popular.
- Argued that Cambourne residents were in desperate need of a transport connection to Cambridge, with extended discussions being a cause of continued frustration to them.
- Highlighted the interaction of the scheme with the City Access Strategy and the importance in ensuring the two were aligned and worked together, noting that the



Cambourne to Cambridge scheme would not be successful if the City Access Strategy failed to alleviate congestion at the eastern end of the route.

- Acknowledged the difficulties in assessing medium and long term impacts of Covid-19 but queried whether the current drastic reduction in the number of people using public transport had been represented in the business case.

## **15. MADINGLEY ROAD WALKING AND CYCLE PROJECT**

The Transport Director presented the report, which contained the results of consultations that had been held on the Madingley Road cycling and walking project, as well as the recommended preferred option that would be considered by the Executive Board. The Joint Assembly was informed that extensive consultations had been held and broad support expressed for both options that had been put forward, although option 2 received a slightly higher level of support due to having a greater impact. The Transport Director noted that the GCP was working with the University of Cambridge to acquire some land that would facilitate the project, with deliverability planned for 2022.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the wide level of support received for the scheme.
- Suggested that the current speeding problems on Madingley Road could be addressed by including traffic slowing as one of the key aims of the project. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and assured the Joint Assembly that it would be considered along with other road safety issues, although he observed that it was specifically a cycling and walking scheme, as opposed to a wider traffic scheme.
- Sought clarification on how the project would interlink with other cycle-related projects, such as the eBikes scheme. The Transport Director recognised that the extending network of longer distance cycleways, including the Greenways routes, meant that eBikes were becoming an increasingly attractive option for people travelling in and out of the city and it was important to accommodate them, particularly if one of the effects of Covid-19 was an increase in their popularity.
- Suggested linking Grange Road, Madingley Road, Burrell's Walk and West Road access, as well as Adams Road and the Rifle Range, which would benefit cyclists travelling to and from the centre of the city and reduce cycle traffic at the Westminster College roundabout. It was observed that cycle schemes were also intended to encourage new cyclists, as well as improving the situation for current cyclists, and one member suggested that removing the need to negotiate the busy Westminster College roundabout would provide an incentive for new cyclists. The Transport Director sympathised with the suggestion to provide alternative routes to cyclists that would avoid the Westminster College and assured the Joint Assembly that it would be considered during the development stage of the project.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly had suggested improvements could be made to the recommended preferred route rather than indicating any disagreement to the choice of the preferred route itself.

## 16. FOXTON TRAVEL HUB

The Transport Director presented the report, which included an update on progress made on the Foxton Travel Hub project and a proposal to progress to the preparation of a Full Business Case. He acknowledged that support for the scheme was not universal and informed the Joint Assembly that the local community needed to be convinced of the scheme's benefits, such as the resulting improvements to the walking and cycling options in the area, and the connection to the Melbourn Greenway that residents would have access to.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Clarified that further consultation with the local community was not sought over the selection of the travel hub location, but rather over the project as a whole. The Transport Director noted that while the impact on commuters using the A10 was well established, greater emphasis was required on the benefits to the local community, including the environmental improvements and mitigations.
- Considered whether primary focus should be given to the benefits to the local community when the main users of the travel hub would be from outside the local community.
- Argued that the level crossing already provided significant disruption and that this would be increased by the travel hub. Acknowledging that it was not under the control or responsibility of the GCP, one member argued that the rail authority should be pressured to resolve the issue with either a tunnel or a bridge. It was suggested that the level crossing was unpopular with the local community and that replacing it would receive huge local support. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP had already considered the issue and established that it was a strategic highway issue, which had led the CPCA to look at taking it forward with Network Rail.
- Observed that the project had been introduced in partnership with the Cambridge South West travel hub and that there was a danger of the Cambridge South West travel hub being used by commuters travelling in to Cambridge and the Foxton travel hub primarily by those travelling to London. One member argued that Foxton should not be turned in to a car park for people commuting in to London and that the GCP ought to benefit the Cambridge economy rather than that of any other city.
- Suggested that given the nature of the road, there should be a pedestrian bridge or subway crossing the A10, rather than a traffic light system. The Transport Director confirmed that the project would involve some local traffic management arrangements, such as speed restrictions.
- Acknowledged the southern option as the more sensible option, emphasising that conflict with the local community should be avoided.

Summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion of the report, the Chairperson inferred endorsement for the southern site option and explicit support for further dialogue with the local community.

## **17. GREENWAYS: MELBOURN, COMBERTON AND ST IVES**

The Director of Transport presented the report, which provided an update on the development of the Greenways programme and outline budgets for the Melbourn, Comberton and St Ives schemes. The Joint Assembly was informed that discussions were ongoing with Camcycle and local residents regarding Adams Road, and Hertfordshire County Council regarding the bridge at the western end of the Melbourn Greenway, which had received offers of financial support.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that cyclists often opted for a more direct route than the established cycleway when it was possible, and queried how they could be encouraged to follow the established route, while also making the more direct route safer. Examples were given of sections of the Melbourn Greenway that diverted north of the M11/A10 junction either side of the A10, and also a right-angled turn in the route to the north of Hauxton. The Project Manager informed the Joint Assembly that the Melbourn Greenway's alignment would be amended as part of the Cambridge South West Travel Hub proposals, making it a more direct route. He also noted that the area north of Hauxton had proved troublesome due to concerns raised by the Wildlife Trust, although it was suggested that further consideration could lead to a resolution.
- Praised the work carried out by the GCP to overcome significant challenges to the widening of footpaths on the Comberton Greenway.
- Observed that the Comberton Greenway ended at Comberton College and therefore greater attention should be given to the safety of young cyclists on the section of the route that passed through the narrow streets of Comberton, in order to promote active transport to children travelling from surrounding villages such as Coton, Hardwick, Barton and Grantchester. The Project Manager acknowledged the concerns and noted that Local Highway Improvement schemes were seeking speed restrictions in the centre of Comberton.
- Suggested that the Comberton Greenway, the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and the current footpath were an excessive number of alignments within a short distance of one another. The Project Manager informed the Joint Assembly that the proposed route offered a good connection towards Comberton College from Coton and that it had received support throughout the consultation phase. The Transport Director confirmed that tarmac had not been established as the surface material for that section of the route.
- Expressed frustration over delays to the St Ives Greenway due to negotiations with land owners.
- Requested that work on the St Ives Greenway coincide with other construction works in Cottenham, including house-building, pavement modification and a roundabout expansion, in order to avoid disruption. The Project Manager agreed to attend a meeting of the community liaison group to ensure such considerations were discussed.

- Noted that the proposals for cycleway routes did not provide sufficient space for the social distancing advised by the Government, with a suggestion that future schemes should include such considerations.
- Sought clarifications on plans to resolve flooding issues around the Swavesey section of the St Ives Greenway. The Project Manager informed the Joint Assembly that proposals for resolving the flooding issues were being developed.
- Expressed concern over the safety of cyclists on cycleways when passing through the countryside late at night. The Project Manager suggested that an increase in the number of cyclists would provide greater security but encouraged members to submit proposals for consideration.

#### **18. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday 10th September 2020 and that the meeting dates for 2021 had been announced as follows:

- 2:00 pm Wednesday 24th February 2021
- 2:00 pm Thursday 3rd June 2021
- 2:00 pm Thursday 9th September 2021
- 2:00 pm Thursday 18th November 2021

Chairperson  
10th September 2020

Listed by Subject

	Questioner	Question	Answer
1	Matthew Danish (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)	<p><b>Item 9: GCP Quarterly Progress Report</b></p> <p>With the arrival of the Abbey-Chesterton bridge and more people beginning to try cycling while in lockdown, there is huge anticipation in the area for the completion of the Chisholm Trail. It is one of the things Camcycle is asked about most. We congratulate the GCP and its partners for their work on the project and for continuing to safely maintain progress over the last few months.</p> <p>The transport progress report lists Phase 1 of the trail as being on schedule for completion in 2020. If this is the case, could we have answers to the following questions?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When will Phase 1 be fully open for use by people cycling and walking?</li> <li>2. When will the jetty connection under the railway bridge on National Cycle Network route 51 reopen?</li> <li>3. When is work on the Newmarket Road underpass scheduled?</li> <li>4. When will the path-widening on Coldham's Common take place?</li> <li>5. Will there be occasions when the underpass of the railway on Coldham's Common be closed?</li> </ol>	<p>As identified by the questioner, Phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail has progressed throughout the Coronavirus 'lockdown' period. However, progress has slowed due ongoing availability issues with respect to materials and staff, as a knock-on effect of Covid-19.. Due to these factors and particularly given the period of uncertainty we currently face, the current programme is only indicative.</p> <p>In answer to the questions presented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Phase 1 is currently scheduled to be fully open in 2021.</li> <li>2) We are hopeful that the jetty connection can be re-opened in autumn 2020.</li> <li>3) The Newmarket Road underpass installation is currently scheduled for spring 2021.</li> <li>4) We are currently working with our contractors and the programme for Coldham's Common. Once this exercise has been completed, we will be in a position to update.</li> <li>5) There are no plans to close the underpass beneath the railway on Coldham's Common.</li> </ol>
2	Jim Chisholm	<p><b>Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for COVID 19 Recovery</b></p> <p>For Item 10 para 3.6(page 74) of the Agenda there is a proposal to yet further *RESTRICT* cycling on Burleigh and Fitzroy Streets.</p> <p>Although these are valuable shopping streets they are also important through routes for those walking and cycling to schools, work and shops.</p> <p>There is no easy way to improve alternative routes.</p> <p>This area was studied in 2003 as part of a Transport Research</p>	<p>The measures under consideration for Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street pedestrian zone are not intended to extend the current restriction on cycling but to focus on the tightening of existing motor vehicle exemptions, by time of day, to ensure that traffic levels are kept to an absolute minimum during periods of the greatest pedestrian activity.</p> <p>It is recognised that the area would benefit from changes to enhance the environment for pedestrians and cyclists through an improved street layout design based on design guidance and</p>

Listed by Subject

		<p>Laboratory Study of "Cycling In Vehicle Restricted Streets". {TRL 583} I believe little has changed in the street layout since that report.</p> <p>Please can I ask if officers have read the relevant sections of this freely available report?'</p> <p>All the street furniture is right down the centre of the street.</p> <p>The significant problem with the layout here is that, for even those cycling at a 'reasonable' pace, there is a clear conflict with those exiting from shop doorways, as there is virtually zero 'inter-visibility' between those on cycles and users exiting shops.</p> <p>I suggest:</p> <p>Would not moving sideways the street furniture (seats, cycle parking etc) such that there is a clear route for walking and cycling through in the centre of these streets, yet leaving a width adjacent to shop frontages for those using the shops on foot, or even just window shopping?</p> <p>Google Earth suggest a total street width with a minimum of around 11m {2m footway, seats, 4m 'street' with access for emergency vehicles, cycle parking, 2m footway?}</p> <p>Then cycling could be permitted 24/7, and pedestrian conflict much reduced.</p>	<p>research such as the TRL report but this would be better addressed through a longer term project developed through engagement with relevant stakeholders.</p>
3	Lucy Edgeley, Vice Chair, Arbury Road East Residents Association	<p><b>Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for COVID 19 Recovery</b></p> <p>Arbury Road is a residential street with terraced homes close to narrow pavements in the easternmost section, and the 20mph speed limit is routinely flouted. It is an important link in the county cycle route network but the GCP installation of cycle lanes on the western part left a gap in cycle provision at the east end which remains dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists - especially acute when social distancing for Covid-19. The Histon Road project works</p>	<p>Supporting cycling and walking is an important part of supporting a safe and sustainable recovery from Covid-19 in both the short and longer term. Increasing levels of active travel will help us to avoid a return to the levels of congestion and air pollution seen previously. The County Council is leading work to prioritise cycling and walking schemes, and has asked GCP to deliver those that may offer long-term benefits. We welcome the suggestion of a</p>

Listed by Subject

		<p>are expected to flush additional cars down our street creating even more hazardous conditions and worsening air quality.</p> <p>Agenda item 10 paras 3.5 and 3.6 says that the GCP is supporting work to identify measures to create more space for pedestrians and cyclists in response to Covid-19, however Arbury Road does not appear on the list.</p> <p>The Department for Transport expects councils to use pop-up and temporary interventions to create environments that are safe for walking and cycling. They expect measures like 'point closures' to be used to create low-traffic filtered neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Our recent survey* shows that a large majority of those who live on the road are ready and willing to try experimental or temporary schemes that would stop rat-running, reduce air pollution and improve community health. A point closure between Leys Road and the Cambridge North Academy on Arbury Road would achieve that.</p> <p>Will the Joint Assembly resolve to add Arbury Road, with description 'prohibit through movements between Cambridge North Academy and Leys Road', to the list of schemes prioritised for implementation to enable and encourage more walking and cycling between West and East Cambridge?</p>	<p>scheme on Arbury Road, and will discuss this with the County Council as part of their work prioritising measures to be taken forward.</p>
4	Storey's Way Residents Association	<p><b>Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for COVID 19 Recovery</b></p> <p>We understand that there are proposals for the temporary prohibition of through traffic on Storey's Way and other roads in Cambridge in order to support pandemic cycling and walking plans. We understood these to be temporary measures. In February, funds were allocated to Storey's Way from the Integrated Transport Block Funding for the independent review of traffic control measures on Storey's Way. This was in order to ensure that the views and complex needs of the many stakeholders on the street are taken into account. The process was intended to be resident led and independent but was put on hold as a result of COVID-19. We</p>	<p>The report suggests that all the identified schemes – including Storey's Way – are taken forward on an experimental basis. Gathering feedback and data during the trial period is a key part of the process, and this can then be used, along with the outcomes from the independent review of traffic control measures, to inform decision making on permanent measures by the County Council.</p>

Listed by Subject

		would ask that it is noted that any temporary measures are not translated into anything permanent without this consultation taking place. We look forward to clarity on the details of the temporary closure and, in particular with the necessity of avoiding danger to pedestrians and cyclists, about the way in which traffic will be prevented from turning into the blocked road.	
5	Matthew Danish (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)	<p><b>Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for COVID 19 Recovery</b></p> <p>The government has asked councils to implement rapid and low-cost measures that reallocate road space from motor traffic to active travel. They have emphasised the usage of interventions like modal filters and temporary barriers to create safe routes.</p> <p>Camcycle strongly supports proposals across Cambridgeshire for road space reallocation to provide more space for active travel and restarting the economy. The measures are urgently needed to respond to the pandemic, enable distancing in public spaces and keep air pollution levels low.</p> <p>We have been working with campaigns from across the county, and we have received over 150 suggestions submitted by members of the public. When we arranged these ideas on a map, we saw that a safe active travel network could rapidly be built within the Greater Cambridge area and beyond. The government has provided some money to get started, and contingently offered additional money.</p> <p>In addition, the GCP has proposed to begin some works by mid-July, but that is not soon enough to qualify for the DfT's programme nor meet the impending need as schools return and businesses re-open.</p> <p>Therefore, we ask the Joint Assembly how they will</p> <p>(a) work together and have a joined-up strategy with the County Council and the Combined Authority to accelerate the delivery of modal filters and temporary pop-up protected lanes?</p> <p>(b) augment the government's programme by rapidly delivering a transformative network of pop-up active travel routes across the</p>	<p>Supporting cycling and walking is an important part of supporting a safe and sustainable recovery from Covid-19 in both the short and longer term. Increasing levels of active travel will help us to avoid a return to the levels of congestion and air pollution seen previously.</p> <p>CamCycle has made a positive contribution to this work through the Spaces to Breathe campaign and the suggestions that have been made for temporary cycling and walking enhancements.</p> <p>The County Council is leading work to prioritise schemes for implementation, and the GCP is supporting this work by delivering schemes on their behalf that may offer longer-term benefits. The schemes published in the paper make up an initial list, to which further suggestions will be added. The ambition is to create a network, including routes for people coming in from outside the city, including from park&amp;ride sites.</p> <p>The GCP measures are being taken forward on an experimental basis and some of these will be quick to deploy, whereas others are more complex, requiring more design work and sourcing of enforcement equipment. These measures will be funded through the city access project rather than from the DfT grant, as they build on previous work, and free up the new funding for other schemes.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to work with CamCycle and others on these proposals.</p>



4<sup>th</sup> June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

Listed by Subject

		<p>entire region taking into account the suggestions we received from the public over the past few weeks?</p> <p>(c) protect the health and safety of communities in neighbourhoods and villages from a potential influx of motorised journeys due to loss of public transport capacity?</p> <p>(d) help put together a traffic-reducing circulation plan that opens up space for people, such as the one successfully implemented in Ghent?</p> <p>See also: Appendix 1: Background Information</p>	
6	Cllr Lina Nieto	<p><b>Item 12: Local Transport Plan – Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) Sub-Strategy</b></p> <p>What steps has the Joint Assembly taken to make sure that there is a clear and robust governance procedure around the decision making process and consultation of any scheme between the Combined Authority and the GCP?</p> <p>What steps has the Joint Assembly taken to make sure that, within the various schemes being proposed by the GCP, key organisations such as East West Rail are being consulted and that they are working closely together in order to reassure residents that there is a coordinated, aligned, reasonable and logical transport strategy for South Cambridgeshire and that public money will not be wasted by implementing any of the recommended schemes, specially the Cambourne to Cambridge busway?</p>	<p>The County Council has delegated powers to the GCP to deliver transport schemes as part of the City Deal.</p> <p>Those schemes should conform to the adopted CPCA Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP explicitly outlines the phased delivery of the CAM and with GCP leading the early phases linked to local plan requirement.</p> <p>Decisions on the route sit with the GCP Executive Board as the delivery body.</p> <p>The GCP has and will continue an ongoing dialogue with the CPCA and East West Rail (EWR) to ensure alignment with the CAM proposals and emerging EWR route and station location proposals.</p>
7	John Latham	<p><b>Item No 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>I am the Vice Chairman of the Trustees of Hobson's Conduit.</p> <p>It is pleasing to see the positive affirmation that you have made in relation to Nine Wells :-</p> <p>Nine Wells Nature Reserve: The scheme would create opportunities</p>	<p>The Environmental Appraisal Report makes proper recognition of the value of the Nine Wells Nature reserve and this will be further considered in the detailed EIA if the scheme progresses to that stage.</p> <p>I will asked that the project team to contact the Trustee's directly regarding the suggested errors in the report.</p>

Listed by Subject

	<p>to enhance the setting of the Nine Wells Nature Reserve and improve access by better signposts and links with shared-use paths. The route past Nine Wells Nature Reserve provides an opportunity to buy the land immediately next to the reserve up to the existing shared-use path. This area could be returned to a more natural state that complemented the habitat in the nature reserve.</p> <p>The Trustees welcome this intention which could fit very well with our vision for Nine Wells and the nationally important Hobson's Brook and Conduit which flow from it.</p> <p>However, I can find no mention of Nine Wells in the paper for Item 13.</p> <p>In the Environmental Appraisal Report (Appendix G) there are a number of references to both Nine Wells and Hobson's Brook and Conduit, but there are also a number of factual errors in the Environmental Appraisal Report.</p> <p>Of the five nationally designated sites mentioned in that report, four are over 1 km away but the fifth, Nine Wells, is a mere 80 metres away.</p> <p>Self evidently, uniquely among such nationally designated sites, Nine Wells will suffer a major impact from the scheme both during construction and subsequently.</p> <p>I should like to know how and when will this Environmental Appraisal Report be discussed and corrections made and shortcomings addressed?</p> <p>When can the Trustees can expect a formal discussion with your project team, about what mitigation steps you propose to take in relation to Nine Wells and Hobson's Brook?</p> <p>What proposals are you now able to make to engage directly with the Trustees of Hobson's Conduit?</p>	<p>If approved to proceed, the next phase of work will include a detailed environmental impact assessment (EIA) of the preferred scheme. The EIA process will address the potential impacts on the area in more detail as the design is developed further as well as including specific mitigation measures in the design.</p> <p>During the EIA process the relevant stakeholders (including the Trustees of the Hobsons Conduit) will be consulted to see if there are opportunities to improve the conduit that may benefit the ecology as well.</p> <p>There are no specific mitigation measures proposed at this time, other than the opportunities (as recognised in the question) for acquiring land as part of the scheme, and using this to create more habitat around the reserve.</p> <p>Development of more detailed mitigation would be carried out during the EIA stage with the development of the design.</p>
--	--	---

Listed by Subject

8	Cllr Markus Gehring	<p><b>Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>Why is it legitimate to ignore the significant environmental impact on cutting through the West Fields when we are in a climate emergency for which we should use existing roads better not build new roads?</p>	<p>Environmental impacts are not being ignored.</p> <p>Understanding and mitigating wherever possible against environmental impacts has been a key part of planning up to this point and that will continue to be the case going forward – particularly as we go through the formal Environmental Impact Assessment process.</p> <p>GCP's transport sustainable corridor schemes are designed to offer an attractive alternative to the private car, utilising travel hubs to encourage park and ride journeys and end-to-end walking and cycling to create a continuous link to the city from growing villages and towns and to create additional capacity for growing numbers of cyclists.</p>
9	Cllr Grenville Chamberlain	<p><b>Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>GCP proposals include the construction of a transport corridor alongside the northern edge of St Neots Road in Hardwick creating 8 lanes of traffic in front of residents' homes.</p> <p>The distance between the Hardwick and Madingley roundabouts is 1.8 miles and this space is presently home to around 3000 trees and a wide variety of wildlife providing a green barrier between the houses and the busy A428 trunk road.</p> <p>A vehicle travelling at 50mph along a segregated route will take 2minutes and 10 seconds to travel that distance whilst a similar vehicle travelling along St Neots Road at 40mph will take just 30 seconds longer whilst passengers will have to wait up to 10 minutes for a connecting service when the vehicle reaches its destination at Grange Road, Cambridge.</p> <p><b>The cost of this construction will run into several million pounds with little or no real benefit but a great deal of damage to the</b></p>	<p>At Hardwick the C2C scheme will add two lanes carrying public transport vehicles, and an improved route for walking, cycling, and other non-motorised users.</p> <p>Every effort will be made to replant in areas where trees and vegetation must be removed. For most of this section there will be some combination of planting, noise barriers, and variation in levels - this will not be a single block of eight lanes of tarmac.</p> <p>Vegetation would be lost along the narrowest point over a distance of approximately 1 mile where there are around 160 semi-mature or mature trees, as well as some newer saplings. In all only around 15 are mature trees.</p> <p>At a scheme level there is a commitment to plant significant additional trees and the GCP is committed to ensuring a net biodiversity gain, so the ecological value of the area overall would be increased. In some areas where biodiversity is relatively low (e.g. agricultural land) mitigation proposals include features to</p>

Listed by Subject

		<p><b>residents of St Neots Road. How can GCP justify the spending of such a large sum whilst destroying such a large number of trees and wildlife habitat for such minute journey time saving?</b></p>	<p>enhance biodiversity through the installation of flower meadows or community orchards.</p> <p>We continue to work with local communities to address concerns and limit impacts wherever possible. For example, on St Neots Road, the prime source of noise pollution is the A428 and the current noise barrier is in a state of disrepair. Although noise impacts of the C2C scheme are expected to be negligible in light of the relatively low vehicle movements (10 per hour each way) and intention to use electric vehicles at the earliest opportunity, the GCP has committed to install a new noise barrier to tackle existing noise and we are exploring means to soften the visual impact by breaking up the corridor with low hedges where this is practical.</p>
10	Charles D'Oyly	<p><b>Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>Given the acknowledged hazards that Adams Road presents currently for cyclists and pedestrians, will the GCP support improvements to Adams Road, including funding? Assuming such support is given, by when will the GCP to commit to a timetable for such improvements?</p> <p>Will the GCP guarantee continued consultation and engagement with local residents and stake-holders?</p>	<p>We have listened to concerns raised regarding current cycling safety on Adams Road and will continue dialogue with stakeholders on this matter.</p> <p>A meeting between North Newnham Residents Association (NNRA) and the Greenways project team, as well as some other key stakeholders, is planned for the 9th of June and proposals will be considered and taken forward by the Greenways project.</p> <p>GCP will be pleased to continue dialogue with North Newnham Residents Association about local improvements which might be taken forward through the wider GCP programme.</p>
11	Alasdair Burford	<p><b>Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the Executive Board Pack presented in December 2018. The pack contained an Interim Report which detailed 'Environmental Constraints' of the proposed route from Madingley Mulch to the Rifle Range.</p> <p>On p35 of the Report, it states 'in addition to previous reports, the</p>	<p>The options appraisal process considered environmental constraints and highlighted areas where there are potential adverse impacts, as highlighted.</p> <p>The decision on a preferred route is based on multi-criteria analysis and not just on environmental factors. The decision making process and the scoring of the options is presented the</p>

Listed by Subject

		<p>ongoing appraisal was informed by the following activities’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geophysical surveys for archaeology of 13 hectares of Farmland West of the M11 along pink and blue route options and of the route between West Cambridge and the former Rifle Range Track across the West;</li> <li>• Heritage Study on the Conservation Areas in West Cambridge and Coton shared with Historic England.</li> </ul> <p>On page 41 of the report, 3 significant constraints are highlighted;</p> <p>i) ‘Buried Archaeology’ - Waterworks site;</p> <p>ii) The wooded area on St Neots Road ‘Tree Preservation Order block &amp; Bat Roost potential’;</p> <p>iii) An area extending from the waterworks to beyond Crome Lea marked as ‘Brown Hare Activity’.</p> <p>Despite all of the above and the fact that the GCP has spent hundreds of thousands of pounds to make ‘informed decisions’, unbelievably the preferred route alignment still runs straight through the middle of each of the areas.</p> <p>In today's board report para 8.14 (page17) Environmental Impact gives no mention to these environmental issues. I therefore have the following questions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given that the previous surveys have already identified potential ‘significant’ issues, why does the proposed route alignment still plough through those ‘significant’ sites?</li> <li>2. If the surveys conducted as part of the final planning stage identify further ‘significant’ archaeology will the route alignment be revised and does the GCP undertake to consult on any new proposed route alignment?</li> <li>3. Given the uncertainty shouldn't these surveys take place now before any route alignment is given the green light?</li> </ol> <p>See also Appendix 2: Background Information</p>	<p>Business Case.</p> <p>The next step in the process is the formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the scheme. During the EIA there will also be further engagement with stakeholders and the public where the emerging design and proposals for mitigation are presented for comment.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement will document the final design including all mitigation measures to avoid or minimize the impacts, the Environmental Statement will part of the evidence put forward for final approval.</p> <p>The final decision and approval to proceed with construction of the scheme would be decided through a Transport and Works Act Order application. During this final approval process there is further opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the proposed final scheme design.</p>
--	--	--	---

Listed by Subject

12	Dr. Marilyn Treacy	<p><b>Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>I would like to ask this question at the 4th June J.A. meeting re the agenda item on C2C. This question is for each voting member to answer individually.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership are pushing ahead with the C2C busway which has an appalling BCR and a 'local BCR' fabricated on false premises. They are taking no account of the Mayor's statement that it is not CAM compliant, or of the effect of East West rail plans or the effect the recent pandemic will have on work and travel patterns. For many reasons the public are unlikely to wish to switch to travel on buses in the future. Are you confident to have it put on public record that you agree the GCP needs to make no adjustment to the BCR in the light of these factors?</p>	<p>In line with HM Treasury Green Book GCP will be expected to revisit the BCR for the Full Business Case which will be prepared before a final commitment to invest in the scheme. By that time it is likely to be clearer what the long-term implications of COVID-19 are. We will continue to work with partners to understand those impacts</p> <p>The scheme's Value for Money assessment takes into account the monetised impacts vs the scheme costs presented as a Benefit to Cost Ratio, as well as the findings from any qualitative and non-monetised assessments.</p> <p>Our schemes clearly align with the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan. We will continue our ongoing dialogue with the Combined Authority and with East West Rail to ensure our schemes continue to align with proposals as they come forward.</p>
13	Carolyn Postgate	<p><b>Agenda Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>The Officers have listened to the residents of Adams Road and the cyclists of Cambridge and have reverted to the Rife Range route.</p> <p>Why, then, are the justified objections of the villages of Hardwick and Coton completely ignored? These villages are both adversely affected by the proposed route; viable alternative routes have been proposed. Why stick to a route that serves no useful purpose?</p>	<p>There have been significant efforts to review alternative routes as proposed by stakeholders, including the Local Liaison Forum, through three public consultations over the past five years – all available and published online.</p> <p>This assessment shows that a route travelling off-road best meetings the scheme's objectives and meets CAM requirements for a segregated route.</p> <p>GCP's officers have and will continue to work to understand and address local concerns wherever possible.</p> <p>Examples of responding to stakeholder feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of travel hub sites during consultation of two alternative proposed locations proved to be fairly balanced, and, as such, reflecting strong stakeholder opposition and concern regarding the environmental impacts of a site on Madingley Hill, a site at Scotland</li> </ul>

Listed by Subject

			<p>Farm to the north of the A428 has been adopted for final proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We continue working with stakeholders to define a specific alignment running at least 40-50metres from the closest property in Coton and considering mitigation measures including bunding to minimise visual intrusion.</li> <li>• On St Neots Road in Hardwick, officers have committed to rebuild the current noise barrier with the A428 which is a prime source of existing noise and in a state of disrepair.</li> </ul>
14	Matthew Danish (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)	<p><b>Agenda Item 14: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b></p> <p>Camcycle welcomes the announcement that one of Cambridge's busiest cycling routes, Adams Road, will not be turned into a busway. We look forward to the GCP investing in this cycle route to make it better by removing car parking and converting Adams Road into a healthy street with measures to reduce car speeds while providing additional greenery, better pavements, and priority for cycling.</p> <p>We would like to point out that the proposed project still has numerous issues for cycling. How will city streets cope with the increased number of buses, east of Grange Road? How will these city junctions and roads, such as Pembroke Street, Silver Street and West Road, be made safe for cycling while also accommodating the large number of new bus movements? These issues must be resolved satisfactorily before committing large amounts of money to the project.</p> <p>In the meantime, in response to the pandemic, the GCP should be prioritising the reduction of private motor vehicle traffic and the rapid creation of a safe pop-up cycle route from Cambourne to Cambridge for key worker commutes and to free up space on the roads and public transport. How will the Joint Assembly and the GCP work together with the County Council and the Combined Authority to bring about a safe cycle route connecting Cambourne, Hardwick and Cambridge as quickly as possible?</p>	<p>We have listened to concerns raised regarding current cycling safety on Adams Road and will continue dialogue with stakeholders on this matter.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council, the CA and GCP are working closely to prioritize a long list of measures that are being considered as part of the response to Covid 19 and the Road Reallocation Programme. One of the measures under consideration is a cycle route connecting Cambourne to Cambridge and Cambridge Cycling Campaign are considered a key stakeholder in this process.</p> <p>In and around the city centre, building on the recommendations of the Greater Cambridge Citizen's Assembly, the GCP is developing measures to step-up sustainable transport connections running through Cambridge's historic heart.</p> <p>June's Executive Board will consider short-term measures developed by GCP's City Access project to create space and ramp up cycling and walking provision to get the city centre moving and support recovery from Covid-19.</p>

**Appendix 1: Background Information to Question 5 from Camcycle**

These are indicative examples of major improvements that could be rapidly delivered (further discussions with local stakeholders will help refine these):

Example 1: Cambourne - Hardwick - Maddingley Road P&R - Cambridge city centre, with potential end-to-end cycling times of 30-45 minutes for many people.

- \* Modal filter / bus gate on St Neots Road, just east of Broadway, near the Bourn Airfield.
- \* Modal filter / bus gate on St Neots Road, just west of Long Road, Hardwick.
- \* Pop-up pavement widening on the northern side of the A1303 between Cambridge Road (Coton) and Eddington Avenue.
- \* Localised pathway & dropped kerb repair at various points.

Example 2: Orchard Park busway to Cambridge city centre, protecting schools and communities along the way from road danger and pollution.

- \* Modal filter on Arbury Road near Cambridge North Academy.
- \* Modal filter / bus gate on Carlton Way near Arbury Primary.
- \* Modal filter on Scotland Road.
- \* Protected pop-up cycle lane / widened pavement on the Elizabeth Way bridge from St Andrew's Road, over the Elizabeth Way bridge, and around the corner to at least the Abbey Street crossing on Newmarket Road.
- \* Pop-up expanded pavements in Mitcham's Corner.
- \* Modal filter / bus gate on Victoria Avenue bridge.

Example 3: Safe active travel connections between the villages of Fowlmere, Melbourn, Shepreth and Barrington, as well as traffic calming within them.

- \* Modal filter on Mill Road, Fowlmere and 20mph speed limit along Long Lane.
- \* Modal filter on Frog End, Shepreth.
- \* Modal filter on Shepreth Road, Barrington.
- \* Modal filter on Orchard Road, Melbourn.
- \* Modal filter / bus gate on High Street, Melbourn.
- \* Set 20mph speed limits on all streets within villages, up to 40mph speed limit on country roads outside villages.

Example 4: Safer commutes to Addenbrooke's Hospital.

- \* Modal filter (bus gate if needed) on Nightingale Avenue.
- \* Double yellow lines and loading restrictions along Red Cross Lane and Greenlands, to stop anti-social parking behaviour here.
- \* Reprogram traffic signals on the Guided Busway at Francis Crick Avenue and Hobson Avenue to show the 'green man' phase by default.
- \* Upgrade the existing Worts' Causeway restriction to apply 24/7.



**Appendix 2: Background Information to Question 11 from Alasdair Burford**

