



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Thursday 27th June 2019

4:00 p.m. – 6:40 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

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

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in attendance

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
--	-------------------------------

Officers

Peter Blake	Director of Transport (GCP)
Chris Malyon	Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Andrew Munro	Project Manager (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

It was proposed by Councillor Herbert and resolved by majority that Councillor Van de Weyer be elected Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board for the coming year.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON

It was proposed by Councillor Herbert, seconded by the Chairperson and resolved unanimously that Councillor Bates be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the coming year.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Claire Ruskin.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 20th March 2019, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that six public questions had been submitted and accepted, although one of these questions had been subsequently withdrawn. It was agreed that the questioners would be called to address the Board at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in **Appendix A** of the minutes.

7. FEEDBACK FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 6th June 2019.

Referring to the Joint Assembly's concern about poor air quality in the City, Councillor Wotherspoon commented on a recent meeting of the Cambridge Area Bus Users Group which had taken place since the Joint Assembly met. At the meeting Stagecoach had stated that it was working to reduce its emissions from its bus fleet and promised a major announcement in September. He also reported that both Stagecoach and the representative from Ascendal (which incorporates Whippet) both said that the biggest

challenge to running a reliable and frequent bus services in this area was congestion in Cambridge city. Councillor Wotherspoon suggested the Executive Board should bear this in mind when considering the City Access proposals.

8. CITY ACCESS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS

Robin Pellew was invited to ask a public question on behalf of Stacey Weiser, the details of which are set out in **Appendix A** to the minutes, along with a summary of the response.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained the findings from Choices for Better Journeys, a public engagement exercise established to determine people's views on the City Access project's aims to secure a step-change in public transport, reduce congestion and improve air quality in and around Cambridge. Over 5,000 had responded and this provided a wealth of data reflecting people's views on the challenges and potential solutions. Referring to comments made by the Joint Assembly about public transport, he stressed that the GCP was working with the Combined Authority and its consultants to produce a public transport network that was capable of dealing with the growth being experienced in the area. Road space needed to be opened up in order to accommodate the level of growth, as there was no point in expanding public transport services to sit in queues of traffic. He also drew attention to the fact that air quality and climate change were key measures although this had not been part of the original City Deal.

Councillor Bates proposed the following amendment to the recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor Herbert for the purpose of allowing the amendment to be discussed:

In recommendation (c) delete the words 'public transport and demand management' and in recommendation (d) delete the words 'and demand management'.

He also referred to background information tabled at the meeting [subsequently published on line] in support of his proposal.

While discussing the amendment, members:

- Noted the importance of engagement with the public and other bodies and highlighted the fact that there had already been extensive consultation on this topic. Responses to Choices for Better Journeys indicated there was support for introducing a pollution charge. City Access would also be the subject of ongoing public debate, including that by the proposed Citizens' Assembly.
- Recognised the need to ease congestion before public transport could be significantly improved. While it was right to say that air pollution was heavily generated by buses, coaches and taxis, the biggest contributor was congestion. One of the fundamental threats was that congestion had a detrimental impact on public transport which led to people being disinclined to use it. Unless congestion was addressed it would be impossible to have a decent bus service. It was important to acknowledge that congestion impacted not just on motorists, but also had an impact on cyclists, pedestrians and residents.

- Acknowledged the suggestions covered in the supporting document and agreed that they should form part of the emerging package of measures to be investigated and considered, noting that some of them were already under consideration. However, one member emphasised that the principles included in the report were evidence-based, while the suggestions put forward in the amendment's supporting document were not backed up by such evidence, nor was there an indication of how they would be funded.
- Considered the importance of the words 'public transport' and 'demand management' that the amendment proposed to remove from the recommendations, with one member suggesting that their removal would send the wrong signal when there was a need for urgent progress to be made. It was emphasised that retaining the original wording did not rule out pursuing other initiatives. One member suggested that there were three critical elements to be progressed concurrently – an intervention to cut congestion; fast public transport routes; and a demand management public transport transformation.
- Noted that the original recommendations could be revised at a later date if it was considered necessary or desirable, whereas removing options from the table at an early stage could prove restrictive. It was also argued that the results of the public engagement exercise indicated a clear mandate to consider a wide range of options.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board of a written proposal from Claire Ruskin to add a comma to recommendation (c) between the words 'GCP's vision' and 'for public consultation', which was unanimously agreed to by members.

While discussing the report, members:

- Praised the work carried out during the public engagement exercise, as well as in the production of the report. Particular appreciation was reserved for the fact that it did not just cover the area falling under the GCP's remit, but also the rest of Cambridgeshire and even neighbouring counties. It represented an evidence-based report which gave a clear public mandate to develop a range of options and come back with detailed proposals for careful consideration.
- Suggested that the impact of heavy congestion holding up traffic entering the city was counter-productive to attempts to encourage commuters to use public transport.
- Noted that Cambridge was the only city in the country in which cycling represented the most popular form of transport for short journeys, while acknowledging there was also an increasing willingness for longer journeys to be carried out on bicycles.
- Acknowledged the importance of Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) in the longer term, subject to getting the funding right. This was a continuing source of dialogue between the GCP and the Combined Authority. It was noted that when City Access had been discussed with the Mayor he had supported the consultation and the principle of demand management.
- Considered the importance of an effective and reliable transport system for those who were not able or did not wish to use private vehicles, noting this was especially

important given that many people lived outside the city centre due to high housing costs. It was also noted that the opinions of those who worked in the city should be taken into consideration and not only the opinions of residents.

- Recognised that although there was widespread support for the CAM project, it would not be fully implemented for over ten years and plans needed to be made on a shorter timescale than this, especially considering the clean air targets already established for 2021. At the same time, it was suggested that contingency plans should be considered in the event of CAM not progressing and that it would be ideal for details of the funding of CAM to be released within a year.
- Proposed developing a relationship with schools in order to establish a programme that aligned with school holiday periods.
- Noted the importance of establishing the sequence of interventions that would be made, how they interacted with each other and what their impact would be, both on an individual and collective basis. Members sought and received confirmation that the measures contained in the supporting document put forward by Councillor Bates would be considered alongside other emerging proposals.

On conclusion of the debate the Chairperson put the recommendations to the vote.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- a) Note the findings of the recent public engagement and the support for the GCP's vision to improve transport and tackle congestion across the Greater Cambridge area;
- b) Agree that air quality and climate change are key considerations in the development of a final strategy, alongside tackling congestion;
- c) Agree to develop a package of public transport and demand management measures to deliver the GCP's vision, for public consultation;
- d) Agree the key principles upon which the transport and demand management package will be based, as outlined in the report; and
- e) Note the successful bid for funding through the Government's 'Innovation in Democracy' programme to deliver a Citizens' Assembly looking at City Access, which would meet in the early Autumn before making recommendations to the Executive Board in December.

9. WEST OF CAMBRIDGE PACKAGE – CAMBRIDGE SOUTH WEST TRAVEL HUB

Councillor Martin Harris, Tim Arnold and Peter Hayde were invited to ask their public questions. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided in **Appendix A** of the minutes. It was noted that a fourth question from Edward Leigh had been withdrawn as he was unable to attend the meeting. The Chairperson referred to written representations sent to Executive Board members by Trumpington Residents Association and Smarter Cambridge Transport.

The Director of Transport presented the report which provided an update on the progress of the West of Cambridge Package following public consultation and additional work. He stressed that this was not the final decision on the scheme as the next step the Executive Board was being asked to approve was the preparation and submission of a planning application. The report aimed to address the challenge of congestion, particularly on the gyratory, and the forecast increase in demand for park and ride and travel hub space in the area. Attention was drawn to the responses to the recent public consultation in section 6 of the report, which indicated strong support for improving walking and cycling options in the area, with over 70% of responses supporting development of this site and using the existing infrastructure in place.

However, while there was broad support for the scheme there were also entirely legitimate concerns about what the impact would be on local communities and local environments. The Director of Transport emphasised that this was something officers would continue to work on when developing detailed design work. It was important not just to mitigate the potential impacts of the scheme, but to ensure that local residents benefitted from it in terms of enjoying access to the travel hub and the facilities it would provide.

While considering the report, the Executive Board:

- Noted that the figures used in the report were based on current data and queried whether projections on future data were available, given that there were still firms moving into the Biomedical Campus and sections of Papworth Hospital were still to be opened. The Director of Transport recalled the Biomedical Campus report discussed at the last meeting, which included reference to the projections for the wider campus site. The projections included in this report concentrated on the gyratory in question.
- Acknowledged that the junction was already overloaded and that the Trumpington Park and Ride would not be able to provide sufficient space for the predicted growth in traffic numbers, but expressed concern over the tendency to promote Park and Ride schemes as a solution to traffic problems. It was suggested that the Executive Board should not be focussed on making things easier for cars and that instead alternative public transport schemes should be developed, while current ones should be improved.
- Clarified that the majority of users of the scheme would come from north-bound traffic on the M11, with the intention being to improve traffic flow by minimising the number of vehicles that were either forced or chose to circulate the gyratory in order to reach the best placed travel hub.
- Noted the cost benefit of using the agricultural crossing, an existing crossing over the M11, for public transport, walking and cycling. This would provide a segregated system to separate public transport, pedestrians and cyclists from motor vehicles and avoid them having to use the gyratory. It was noted that there were concerns about the use of the agricultural crossing and potential impact on the environment. In response to this officers were looking to see if there was a way of creating significant additional capacity at the junction to incorporate all traffic, however work to date had not found a solution.
- Requested a breakdown of the costs of the various elements of the scheme, primarily the cost of the main travel hub and estimated cost of providing the agricultural crossing. It was suggested that this information should be included in public statements, to

increase transparency and understanding of the high cost. The Director of Transport agreed to provide members with this information, but added that the advantage of using the existing infrastructure such as the agricultural crossing was that it kept costs down. In response to a further question he confirmed that the £30m quoted in paragraph 8.1 covered the cost of building a travel hub, improvement to the gyratory and connecting slip roads to the south bound A10 towards Foxton and Trumpington Road.

- Established that Highways England had been consulted extensively on the scheme, were broadly supportive of the principle behind the project and GCP was working closely with Highways England design consultants on how this could be delivered.
- Clarified that the construction stage would be carried out in a phased delivery programme.
- Expressed concern over the challenge of managing two park and ride sites close to each other and the detrimental effects on traffic flow that could arise from drivers travelling around the roundabout deciding which site to use. Officers acknowledged the concerns and noted that such confusion already existed when the current Park and Ride site was full. Emphasis would be placed on ensuring that suitable signage was installed, alongside effective traffic management, to alleviate the problem.
- Acknowledged that traffic issues, and therefore the quality of life and air quality, could be worsened in communities along the A10 to the west of the proposed development and that mitigating these potential problems was of great importance. There was concern that this was necessary as a result of a failure to effectively plan for the expansion of the Biomedical Campus.
- Noted that the site should be referred to as a Travel Hub, as opposed to a Park and Ride, and that attention should particularly be given to provision for cycling and walking. It was reiterated that the scheme should also be considered as part of a larger strategy to reduce congestion and that there was a large amount of crucial work going on alongside these proposals.
- Acknowledged the challenge from Smarter Cambridge Transport and others questioning whether this travel hub was needed and where it fit within the broad strategy. It was however suggested there was a clear need as this junction was already overloaded and the existing Trumpington Park and Ride site was no longer able to meet demand. It was important to consider the proposals in the context of the broad strategy of improving main public transport routes, interception and reduction of connection, and note this proposal would help address the transport challenge. It was however accepted that local communities had concerns but further measures would be required to address this.

Councillor Herbert proposed the following amendment to recommendation (c):

Add the words 'and further work' after 'local communities'.

It was resolved unanimously to approve the amendment.

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

- a) Note the findings of the recent public consultation;
- b) Endorse the recommendation to develop a new site and associated infrastructure necessary for access to the site west of the M11;
- c) Approve the preparation and submission of a planning application for the recommended scheme at the new site to the West of the M11 and associated access infrastructure, including continued dialogue with local communities and further work to mitigate the local impacts of the scheme.
- d) Approve the negotiation of land and rights required for the early delivery of the scheme including Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders as appropriate; and
- e) Agree that the Trumpington Road / Hauxton Road improvements be removed from the project scope to form a separate, new project.

10. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT SCHEME

Tony Orgee, Chairperson of the Cambridge and South East Transport Study Local Liaison Forum (LLF) attended the meeting to report on the outcome of the LLF workshop held on 7th May 2019 and the public LLF meeting held on 4th June 2019. The LLF had provided feedback on the proposals and although there had been differences in opinion on the various options, engagement had been good. The LLF welcomed the ongoing engagement with elected representatives and stakeholders and asked that this should continue. A matter of ongoing concern was the great deal of confusion that existed about the relationship between and responsibilities of the various bodies involved in addressing development, transport and congestion in the Greater Cambridge area. It had been suggested that it would be helpful if an explanatory note was produced. The Director of Transport undertook to provide this.

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

The Director of Transport presented the report which provided the Executive Board with an update on progress of Phase 1 of the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme, along with plans for the next public consultation phase.

In discussing the report and the route options detailed within it, the Executive Board:

- Praised the work carried out by the LLF and expressed strong support and encouragement for its continued involvement in the scheme.
- Established that there would be further information on the impact on wildlife and habitats, along with other environmental concerns, in the consultation stage and subsequent report.
- Noted that the main variations between the various options were based upon the alternative proposed sites of the potential travel hub.

- Sought clarification over why the scheme did not connect to the train lines to London or other key transport links. Officers acknowledged that it was still being determined how best to connect to the local network, while noting that future work, including such connections, was still under consideration, although all three proposed sites would be able to incorporate any future changes.
- Acknowledged that a high level of planning had been involved in how the indicative route would circulate the communities that it passed, as well as how it connected to them via strategically placed bus stops.
- Expressed concern over the road layout of the Biomedical Campus and suggested ongoing engagement with representatives from the Campus (both users and those that manage the site) and other large employers along the indicative route, in order to develop a cohesive and holistic strategy. Officers assured the Executive Board that interested parties had been consulted and that they had expressed their support for the scheme. It was confirmed that as consultation progressed it would include details of how the proposed routes would connect with the Campus.
- Noted the large number of cycle paths in the area and the importance of engaging with their users throughout the design and consultation process.

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

- a) Note the progress on delivering the Phase 1 works;
- b) Note the further work undertaken to date on identifying potential route alignments and travel hub locations for the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme;
- c) Agree to undertake public consultation on the shortlisted routes and sites in the Autumn as shown in **Appendix A**: figures 2-9; and
- d) Receive a report in early 2020 outlining the response to the consultation, Outline Business Case and final proposals for the scheme.

11. CAMBRIDGESHIRE RAIL CORRIDOR STUDY

The Director of Transport presented the report on the Cambridgeshire Rail Corridor Study, an assessment by Network Rail of forecast growth across the local rail network over the next 15 and 25 years and an assessment of the potential service and infrastructure improvements that would be required to help support it. Attention was drawn to the fact that the study assumed that Cambridge South station would be built, but this was not yet guaranteed. It was important to continue applying pressure to secure a firm commitment for this scheme.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Expressed concern over the pressure put on Cambridge Central train station and the need for improvements, including the planned second access on the east side. It was acknowledged that the rapid growth from 5 million to 12 million users would inevitably continue, especially with more connecting trips to and from Cambridge North as a result

of developments around the northern station. The GCP should continue to press for improvements not only inside the station, but also in the surrounding area.

- Welcomed plans by the train operating companies, assisted by Government and Network Rail funding, to improve secure cycle parking at the station. This facilitated more use of the train network.
- Argued that improvements to the Newmarket train line were of great importance now and could not wait until 2043, as suggested in the report. The capacity and quality of the service both needed improvements in order to reduce the number of car journeys connecting Cambridgeshire to Suffolk and Norfolk. Similar improvements that had been made to the line connecting Cambridge to Ely, and the subsequent growth in users, were put forward as evidence of what could be achieved.
- Registered support for a further focus on the capacity of Cambridge Central Station. While members noted Network Rail's view on the route out to Suffolk, they indicated that they would continue to press for work to be done on it.
- Noted the frustration expressed by the Joint Assembly that the report suggested Network Rail did not appear to have any aspiration to increase rail mode share. There was also concern that while the report started off by considering the two growth scenarios, many of the scenarios were based on the extremely conservative one. This gave an unrealistic perspective on predicted growth in passenger numbers.
- Sought clarification on how the Executive Board could continue to be involved in the process and champion and influence ongoing improvements and it was agreed that updates would be included in future Quarterly Progress Reports.
- Observed that many trains still did not stop at Cambridge North train station and that further engagement was required to provide encouragement on this issue.
- Sought clarification on the respective roles of the Combined Authority and Network Rail. The Combined Authority was the strategic transport authority and would set the policy direction. Network Rail delivered improvements on a scheme-by-scheme basis, and therefore the lead authority for each project depended on the scheme in question. It was suggested that further traction might be gained if one authority acted across the whole area, although it was noted that if the Combined Authority were to undertake such a role, it would need to be performed in conjunction with the other local authorities.

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

- a) Note the findings of the study;
- b) Support the rail industry and work with other partners to develop deliverable proposals for implementing the conclusions of the study; and
- c) Reaffirm the importance of the Cambridge South Station scheme to delivery of the Partnership's vision of a world class public transport network as the most important rail enhancement scheme in the Greater Cambridge area.

12. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which provided the Executive Board with an update on progress across the GCP programme, including specific reference to the Mill Road bridge closure, the CAM and potential investment into Project Spring.

Councillor Bates proposed the following amendment to recommendation (c), which was seconded by Councillor Herbert for the purpose of allowing the amendment to be discussed:

Delete '£300k' and replace with '£500k'.

While discussing the amendment, members:

- Considered whether raising the maximum financial contribution would serve as a message of support for the CAM, as well as an acknowledgment of the Combined Authority's willingness to work in partnership with the GCP.
- Noted that maintaining the original figure of £300k would not restrict the GCP from providing further funds in the future if deemed necessary or desirable. There was a need for evidence based expenditure and while there was support for developing a strong business case, it was not yet clear what the Combined Authority's plans were.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board reviewed the forward plan and items for discussion at the next and future meetings.

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

- a) Note the progress across the GCP programme;
- b) Note the update on Traffic Flow and Air Quality Monitoring during the Mill Road bridge closure, as set out in section 13;
- c) Approve a financial contribution towards the cost of the CAM Outline Business Case with the GCP contribution being limited to 10% of the total cost, up to a maximum of £300k and subject to securing agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding between the Combined Authority and GCP, as set out in section 17; and
- d) Approve an investment of £25k to support the first phase of Project Spring, as set out in section 20.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting would be held at 4:00 p.m. on 3rd October 2019, at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.

Chairperson
3rd October 2019

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

No	Questioner	Question	Answer
1.	Stacey Weiser on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future (asked on her behalf by Robin Pellew)	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: City Access and Public Transport Improvements</p> <p>The Board paper for Agenda 8 stresses the increasing urgency of tackling the effect of air pollution in Cambridge. Paragraph 3.7 contains the alarming statistic that each year air pollution contributes to 106 premature deaths in Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>In response to one of our previous questions, the GCP Executive has said that any potential road charging, including a pollution charge, would be introduced only when improved alternatives to the car were in place. We can see from the various GCP project updates that such alternatives will not be in place until 4 or 5 years' time at the earliest. We are assuming that this is why the GCP Assembly discussion on 6 June concluded that "we need to move very cautiously and slowly" over the introduction of demand management.</p> <p>It would be grossly irresponsible to wait 4 or 5 years to tackle air pollution, so what CambridgePPF wants to know is what the GCP intends to do in the interim? For example, we note that nearly 50% of air pollution is caused by diesel buses, when we know that electric buses are a viable alternative. Surely the Board must recognise the urgency of starting now to plan the introduction of a Low Emission Zone covering the central area of the city?</p>	<p>The question does not accurately reflect the Joint Assembly discussion. At the meeting a range of views were expressed, which ranged from 'we need to consider carefully how to proceed' to 'we need to get on with it and do something as soon as possible'.</p> <p>The comprehensive City Access and Public Transport Improvements report brings to life what the key challenges are around congestion, air quality and climate issues faced by the Greater Cambridge area. The paper does not suggest waiting 4/5 years before making doing anything. What it does do is reflect that we need to address this in a number of ways. We need to promote public transport and that needs to be reliable in order for people to use it. We need to bring forward a comprehensive package of measures. The paper seeks to set out the nature of the problem locally, technical and engagement work to date, and a series of next steps.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership is already engaging in an electric bus pilot with Stagecoach, has invested heavily in electric charging across the Greater Cambridge area and we are looking at how our power infrastructure can be improved.</p>
2.	Niall O'Byrne, Chair Harston	<p>Agenda Item No. 9: West of Cambridge Package – Cambridge South West Travel Hub</p>	

	Parish Council.	<p>1. At £24,500 per parking place, this project is poor value for money. Had the decision been taken to provide on-site parking for the workers at the new Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus, firms moving there would have been obliged to fund construction of on-site parking for their workforce – perhaps multi-storey parking as at Addenbrookes Hospital. Instead, publicly funded parking at the new Hauxton P & R is to be provided for corporate, well financed firms such as AstraZeneca. How can this major subvention from the 'public purse' for private industry be justified?</p> <p>2. Is this new P & R to be permanent? Or is it, as the Mayor seems to have directed, a temporary infrastructure?</p> <p>3. If it is to be temporary, please answer the following questions:</p> <p>a. When will it be decommissioned?</p> <p>b. How much will the decommissioning cost?</p> <p>c. Will the land be returned to its present Green Belt condition?</p> <p>4. Hauxton P & R will require additional traffic lights on the A10. Northbound traffic on the M11, exiting at Junction 11, will enter the new P & R by crossing the north bound flow of traffic on the A10 at a traffic lights controlled crossing point. What measures are</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) through the City Deal is seeking to develop a sustainable transport network for Greater Cambridge that deals with the problems we face today, not based on earlier decisions taken some time ago. The problem being faced today is significant growth on the network that is predicted to increase in traffic levels in the area (and across Greater Cambridge generally) between 20% and 30% between now and 2031. Traffic levels in the area (and across Greater Cambridge generally) are projected to increase significantly by 2031 - do nothing is therefore not an option.</p> <p>The Cambridge South West Travel Hub is part of a package of projects designed to deal with this predicted growth. What we are not talking about is a conventional park and ride site where you drove to it and get on a bus. What we are seeking to do is to promote other public transport and accessible transport options such as walking and cycling. We therefore need to work with local communities to enhance the walking and cycling networks in the area. We need to encourage people coming into the greater Cambridge area to look at the last few miles of their journey into the City and complete this by public transport, cycling or on foot.</p> <p>Cambridge South West Travel Hub part of a package of projects delivering that sustainable transport network – the need for the scheme was further demonstrated by the recent Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) travel report.</p> <p>Referring to costs, the initial consultation costs were for the travel hub site for the facilities and for parking and cycling arrangements. What we are proposing here are improvements to the slip roads, the gyrators and in particular improvements to the traffic signalling</p>
--	-----------------	--	---

		<p>therefore planned to prevent tailbacks on the A10 into Hauxton and Harston? How will the traffic lights be sequenced to avoid queuing on the M11?</p> <p>It should be noted that, currently, the A10 north from the junction of London Road and the High Street in Harston has a traffic flow of over 20,000 vehicles on an average 24 hour working day. This is forecast to increase by 30-40% in the period out to the end of the current Local Plan in 2031.</p>	<p>that will deliver benefits to the local area. That is why the costs have increased over the period and have been fully captured in line with Government Treasury Green Book requirements, including optimism bias and risk allocations.</p> <p>With reference to the temporary nature of the site, we are obliged to be cognisant of the Mayor's view that park and ride sites need to be temporary in nature. This has limited the scope of the proposals, such as the provision of a tunnel under the A10 which is clearly not of a temporary nature. That said, the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) Business Case, recently accepted by the Combined Authority, clearly has a travel hub in this part of the network.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the emerging CAM Metro proposal includes a Travel Hub node in this location linking to that network. There are therefore no plans to decommission this site if it gets approval, so there will be no costs associated with doing that.</p> <p>The issue of local traffic problems and how we can manage and mitigate this is an important one. The proposals at the moment do not include a fully optimised traffic signals system. That is already in train; we have already commenced a review of traffic signals across the entire Greater Cambridge area and have completed that audit. We know what works and what doesn't work and for all the schemes we are proposing we are looking at improving the traffic signals in the area. So, we are still looking to reduce the overall number of traffic signals as part of this scheme and they will all be connected to the wider traffic signal network; being optimised to ensure smoother traffic flows. Plans will deliver additional capacity in the area, so the gyratory, the key block on this route, will be improved.</p>
--	--	--	--

3.	Tim Arnold	<p>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</p> <p>The Park & Ride site at Hauxton will not come on stream until at least 2021 - somehow down from the 2023 figure stated in earlier rounds of proposals - and, at £55M, is significantly more expensive than the figures quoted in the 2018 public consultation (£4-12M). And, as high-profile cases such as the Ely Bypass and King's Dyke crossing show, these projects usually overrun and overspend significantly.</p> <p>Given that a 'temporary' Cambridge South Station is likely to appear in a similar timeframe - and with travel hubs at places like Foxton and Whittlesford now in the frame - isn't a Park & Ride at Hauxton a colossal waste of time and money which has been shown to be a disbenefit to both commuters and local communities?</p>	<p>The GCP aims to develop a sustainable transport network for Greater Cambridge that keeps people, business and ideas connected, as the area continues to grow; to make it easy to get into, out of, and around by public transport, bike and on foot.</p> <p>Referring to costs, the initial consultation costs were for the travel hub site for the facilities and for parking and cycling arrangements. What we are proposing here are improvements to the slip roads, the gyrators and in particular improvements to the traffic signalling that will deliver benefits to the local area. That is why the costs have increased over the period and have been fully captured in line with Government Treasury Green Book requirements, including optimism bias and risk allocations.</p> <p>The budget estimate is put together using DfT methodology and contains risk and optimism bias at standardised levels and this reflects in the budget calculations. The budget includes more than just the site itself and includes the site, access, improvements to Highways England infrastructure and slip roads.</p> <p>With reference to the temporary nature of the site, we are obliged to be cognisant of the Mayor's view that park and ride sites need to be temporary in nature. This has limited the scope of the proposals, such as the provision of a tunnel under the A10 which is clearly not of a temporary nature. That said, the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) Business Case, recently accepted by the Combined Authority, clearly has a travel hub in this part of the network. Nevertheless the emerging CAM Metro proposal includes a Travel Hub node in this location linking to that network.</p>

			<p>There are therefore no plans to decommission this site if it gets approval, so there will be no costs associated with doing that.</p> <p>The proposed “temporary” Cambridge South Station proposal has yet be progressed. At the moment there has been no progress on the temporary Cambridge South Station. GCP is a funding partner for the Cambridge South Station scheme and there is currently a timeframe with Network Rail for 2025 delivery subject to a final business case, securing the required funding and critically the rail possessions.</p> <p>On the environmental assessment, work is already being done on this and information has been included in the Outline Business Case. The recommendation is that this is taken forward to a planning application and the Planning Authority will want to see what environmental, noise reduction and other concerns have been raised by the scheme and what mitigation measures are planned.</p>
5.	Peter Hayde on behalf of Harston Residents Group	<p>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</p> <p>At the GCP Executive Board Meeting of 21st March 2018 Harston Residents Group expressed concern about the impact of a new Park and Ride site on traffic volume and air pollution in Harston. The decision of the Board was that further analysis should be undertaken for the Outline Business Case, including ; Traffic modelling along the A10 and M11 including air and noise pollution. It is disappointing to note in the Outline Business Case that none of this analysis has been undertaken in Harston. The Park & Ride option selected will include 2 additional signalized</p>	<p>The GCP aims to develop a sustainable transport network for Greater Cambridge that keeps people, business and ideas connected, as the area continues to grow; to make it easy to get into, out of, and around by public transport, bike and on foot.</p> <p>Traffic levels in the area (and across Greater Cambridge generally) are projected to increase significantly by 2031 – do nothing is therefore not an option.</p> <p>In terms of the transport modelling and the Outline Business Case undertaken this does cover the local area with the assessment going out as far as Royston.</p>

		<p>junctions, for access and egress control, which will exacerbate congestion on the A10 back to and through Harston causing additional air pollution.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case does not include Harston in the impact area of the Park and Ride site.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case Environmental Appraisal is based on incomplete 2017 data gathered by South Cambs District Council inasmuch that there were no measurements recorded for July, October, November and December. Particulate and ozone levels are extrapolated from this incomplete data and generalized data for South Cambs area.</p> <p>The Executive Board has recommended that officers work with communities, the Joint Assembly commented on the potential impact on communities along the A10 and the need to mitigate that impact.</p> <p>The traffic volume has increased almost 20% in 3 years to 18800 daily in 2019 [GCP figure]. A further increase of 30-40% is forecast over the next years.</p> <p>The question is: What proposals are there for mitigation of the impact on communities along the A 10 ie Harston and when the proposals are being prepared will comprehensive monitoring of current air and noise pollution be undertaken?</p>	<p>Cambridge South West Travel Hub part of a package of projects delivering that sustainable transport network. Other parts of the package include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park and Rail facility at Foxton. • Cambridge South Station, in partnership with local and national partners. • City access & public transport improvements – paper on this agenda. • Part of the proposed mitigation for the site includes the optimisation with other traffic signals on the A10 to improve throughput and ease traffic flows on the A10 and through M11 J11 as referred to in question 1, part 4. <p>The challenge made on how to deal with local transport problems in the villages and local area is a fair one, but I would relate this to the wider network and the improvements we are planning to create. The Foxton park and rail site is targeted to deliver improvements to the A10. The Cambridge South Station will seek to deliver improvements on the A10. The report being considered by the Executive Board on City Access looking at how we access the City and what public transport network we have, not just around the City and its environs, but also in South Cambridgeshire and beyond, will contribute to dealing with problems on the A10 and other routes in. There is not a single solution to this.</p> <p>On the environmental assessment, work is already being done on this and information has been included in the Outline Business Case. The recommendation is that this is taken forward to a planning application and the Planning Authority will want to see what environmental, noise reduction and other concerns have been raised by the scheme and what mitigation measures are planned.</p>
--	--	--	---

6.	Archie Garden on behalf of Stapleford Parish Council	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>We are disappointed to see that the papers provided to this meeting do not identify the fact that an alternative route for the proposed transit corridor for Strategy One needs to be properly assessed, and ask that this be formally instructed. The alternative makes further use of the former “Sawston - Haverhill Railway line” route (ref: Ordnance Survey Map of Sawston). A route via the old railway line would link naturally with the rail proposals for the East/West Railway Strategy, and deliver services to many more residents of Sawston, Stapleford and the Shelfords than the proposals in the documents presented (Page 183- Appendix “A” in the papers). Additionally, the Strategy One proposals as outlined would have a devastating impact on the green belt as well as wildlife habitats (ref: Cambridge Wildlife Trust). Representatives of the Parish Council have been assured that the alternative route is being properly assessed. Further robust representation has been made via the Stapleford and Shelford Neighbourhood planning process.”</p>	<p>Many of the issues raised in the question will be explored in more depth as detailed proposals are worked up.</p> <p>The Sawston-Haverhill Railway line was originally examined in 2017/18. It was concluded that this was not viable given the lack of available space alongside the existing Cambridge-Liverpool St main line railway, particularly at Shelford Station that is located centrally within the village. The station is surrounded by residential and commercial development that precludes taking a new route that bypasses the station and platforms that abut the railway.</p> <p>The option has been re-assessed in more detail, and a similar conclusion has been drawn. There is significant Impact on existing rail infrastructure such as electrification, and need for high containment vehicle restraint barriers to protect the railway. It has greater impact on residential properties, including proximity to dwellings on Chaston Road. It has greater impact on business, including loss of parking at Mill Court. Much of the existing road infrastructure is not suitable for providing a high frequency segregated public transport service.</p> <p>It is accepted that the alternative would reduce impact on the Greenbelt, but the majority of the route would still be in the Greenbelt. It is not accepted that the impact on the Greenbelt would be devastating.</p> <p>The alternative route would be significantly more costly in terms of alterations to railway electrification, provision of high containment barriers, diversion of utilities, and alterations to existing roads.</p>
----	--	---	--

--	--	--	--