



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on  
Wednesday, 22 November 2017 at 4.00 p.m.

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:**

Cllr Francis Burkitt (Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (Vice Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Phil Allmendinger	University of Cambridge
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Local Enterprise Partnership

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in Attendance:**

Councillor Kevin Price (Joint Assembly Chairperson)  
Councillor Tim Bick

### **Officers/advisors:**

Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council South Cambridgeshire District Council
Niamh Matthews	Cambridgeshire County Council Greater Cambridge Partnership
Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Tunstall	Interim Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Victoria Wallace	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## **1. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest other than those already recorded on the Members' Declaration of Interest form.

## **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

## **4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

12 public questions had been submitted, 8 of which were accepted for the meeting as they related to reports on the agenda. The Executive Board **RECEIVED** and responded to these public questions as part of agenda items 7 and 9. The questions and answers are included as an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Tim Bick, member of the GCP Joint Assembly, addressed the Executive Board

under this item. He expressed concern that the GCP had lost sight of its original aspiration to transform public transport access and that the GCP was not serious about deterring use of private vehicles in the city. He asked when demand management would be grasped and when would it be opened up to properly informed public debate. In response to this, Executive Board members made the following points:

- The feedback that came out of the 'Big Conversation' consultation would be considered.
- A package of measures was needed to reduce the number of cars and diesel vehicles coming into the city to tackle congestion and air pollution.
- The Board was still committed to reducing traffic in the city by 10% based on 2011 levels.
- It was premature to say what the consultants Steer Davis Gleave, who were conducting the rapid mass transit options appraisal, would recommend.
- It was advised that business could not deal with sudden changes so a planned approach was needed to enable businesses to adapt while still carrying out their business.
- Intelligent congestion charging could perhaps form part of a coherent transport strategy, to generate an income stream to improve public transport and sustain this in order to get more people to use public transport rather than their cars.
- The Chairman advised that full congestion charging was deeply unpopular with some residents, particularly those living outside the City, and that two South Cambridgeshire District Council resolutions against this had been passed. Public buy-in was needed for whatever was taken forward, which took time.
- The Executive Board advised that the City Access Strategy was to be discussed at its meeting in March 2018, with public debate starting then.

## 5. OVERVIEW FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** a report from the Chairman of the GCP Joint Assembly, which gave an overview of discussions from the meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly, held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2017. The Joint Assembly Chairman welcomed this approach to the Joint Assembly reporting to the Executive Board and hoped that it would continue. The Joint Assembly welcomed the recommendations being presented to the Executive Board, which reflected that the views of the Joint Assembly had been taken into account.

The Executive Board was informed that a meeting had been arranged to take place in early December, between the Chairperson of the Western Orbital LLF and the Executive Board Transport Portfolio Holder. This was to discuss the responses to the LLF resolutions made at both its September and November 2017 meetings.

## 6. A1307 THREE CAMPUSES TO CAMBRIDGE

Councillor Tony Orgee, Chairman of the A1307 Local Liaison Forum (LLF), updated the Executive Board on the work of the LLF:

- Five workshops had taken place to develop options for the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge corridor. 200 ideas had come forward which were grouped into 40 proposals. Three of the workshops looked at specific sections of the A1307.
- The three strategies set out in the officer report to the Executive Board had been developed by the LLF and had been presented at its meeting in September 2017. Councillor Orgee explained that all three strategies were identical between Fourwentways and Haverhill. The LLF agreed that all three strategies should be consulted on. Councillor Orgee emphasised that this did not mean that LLF members supported all three schemes.

- Councillor Orgee urged that the work on the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge corridor should not be seen in isolation from the other work of the GCP and that the work of the GCP should not be seen in isolation from the work of other organisations, such as the Combined Authority and the Chamber of Commerce in Haverhill.
- Once consultation was over, the LLF urged that work on the uncontentious section which was common to all three strategies be progressed with as quickly as possible.
- Councillor Orgee supported the removal of the park and ride sites from the consultation.

The Executive Board Chairman noted and thanked Councillor Orgee for his update and thanked the LLF on behalf of the Executive Board for their work.

The title of the project was discussed. The Executive Board Chairman proposed the name 'Cambridge South East Transport Study', which the LLF Chairman supported. The Executive Board asked the LLF to endorse the proposed new title.

The GCP Interim Director of Transport presented the report and the three strategies detailed within it. He drew the Board's attention to the cost implications of the three strategies. Strategy 2 and 3 were similar in cost however Strategy 1 was circa £145 million, but was more future proof than the other two strategies.

The following points of clarification were provided:

- Strategy 2 did not reference mode shift while the other two strategies did.
- The Executive Board was informed that the economic benefit of the £145 million spend on Strategy 1, was estimated to be £280-320 million.
- Environmental surveys would look at the presence of any protected species and ecologies. These surveys could only be carried out at certain times of the year and could not be carried out during the Spring and Summer. The survey data would then allow an environmental impact assessment to be carried out by specialists in environmental assessment.
- The public consultation would present the modelling of journey time savings clearly.

The report was discussed and debated, with the Executive Board making the following points:

- Members advised that Addenbrooke's Hospital needed to be closely engaged with and that views of staff on the Biomedical Campus needed to be taken into account.
- The Biomedical Campus' masterplan exercise needed to be factored in.
- Cost/benefit of the strategies and value for money needed to be detailed in the consultation and this made clear for the public to understand.
- The Vice Chairman advised that early investment was needed once consultation had been completed and a decision made following this.
- The Vice Chairman expressed support for leaving the option of light rail open. He was keen for more people in the area to commute by rail and for the GCP to contribute to the rail study. He had hoped for more commitment from central government to Cambridge South station than had been announced in the Autumn budget statement.
- The scheme needed to fit in with the strategy for the whole of the south of Cambridge.
- Mark Reeve supported all three strategies being consulted on provided the Board was reassured that all the options were deliverable. He questioned the cost/benefit of Strategy 1 and was sceptical of its economic benefit.
- The Chairman pointed out that one of the advantages of Strategy 1 was that it was

on an old railway line. He advised that the National Infrastructure report referred to land value capture and suggested that developer contributions could have a part in funding schemes such as this.

- The Chambers of Commerce in Haverhill and Suffolk should be engaged with as part of the consultation, as well as the relevant MPs.

The recommendations in the report were discussed. Members were advised that following discussions between the Chairman and GCP Interim Chief Executive and the release of new national documents, a new recommendation (iv) and new recommendation (v) were proposed. The wording of these was circulated to the Executive Board and members of the public at the meeting. The Interim Chief Executive explained the reasons for proposing these new recommendations which reflected the views of the Joint Assembly and the GCP's close working with the Combined Authority. All members agreed to the inclusion of these additional recommendations and a vote was taken on all recommendations:

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- i. Note the revised options and strategies resulting from the work with the Local Liaison Forum (LLF).
- ii. Note the increased cost of the strategies, more than the £39m previously estimated, as a result of additional options.
- iii. Approve the withdrawal of existing park and ride proposals at Babraham Village and Wild Country Organics pending new larger sites being identified.
- iv. Public consultation on the three strategies subject to Strategy 1 being considered as an off-road public transport corridor; with the most appropriate mode being the subject of further consideration and consultation at a later stage of scheme development following the outcome of this consultation.
- v. Consultation to aim to begin in February 2018 following discussion with the Mayor and Combined Authority on the content of the consultation.
- vi. Delegate authority to the Transport Director to approve public consultation materials in conjunction with the Chair and the Transport Portfolio Holder.
- vii. Approve environmental surveys to be carried out starting in January 2018 to meet seasonal windows for species.
- viii. Authorise officers to progress the design and planning of lower cost works within the public highway not requiring consents for early delivery, subject to consultation.
- ix. To rename the project 'Cambridge South East Transport Study' and ask the Local Liaison Forum to endorse this.

## 7. WESTERN ORBITAL

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Western Orbital Local Liaison Forum, was invited to address the Executive Board. She brought the following points to their attention:

1. **Process** – the LLF requested that more time be given between the publication of end stage reports and the timing of the subsequent Joint Assembly meeting so that it could better feed its recommendations, concerns and suggestions into the decision-making process. The timing structure made it difficult for the Joint Assembly to take account of the LLF's views and consequently the LLF did not

believe that its views, recommendations and suggestions were given adequate consideration. The LLF Chairman explained the considerable amount of work that needed to be done by the LLF in the time between reports being published and Joint Assembly meetings taking place. This had been particularly difficult for the LLF in September 2017 with a large number of documents to consider in 12 days between publication of the Joint Assembly papers and the subsequent meeting. The LLF therefore asked that the Executive Board recommend that an extra week be given between the publication of relevant end stage reports and the timing of the subsequent Joint Assembly meeting, to enable the LLF to carry out its relevant business within a reasonable timescale before the meeting.

2. **The park and ride at junction 11** – The LLF believed more information was needed and more options needed to be put forward to them in order to provide a considered response. The LLF queried why other locations around junction 11 had been rejected. The LLF acknowledged the importance of adequate park and ride provision near junction 11 of the M11 however had serious reservations about both the potential expansion of Trumpington park and ride and the potential development of a new park and ride on the Hauxton side of the M11. Regarding the potential expansion of the Trumpington park and ride, the LLF was concerned about visual impact on the local community, the impact on the local network if it was significantly expanded, what would happen during construction and the value for money per new parking space. Regarding the potential for a new park and ride site at Hauxton, the LLF was concerned about the impact of this on Hauxton and Harston villages, the effect on traffic through these already congested villages, access to the new site and further erosion of the green belt buffer between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire villages. The LLF had passed a resolution at its 17 June 2017 meeting that the new park and ride should be sited before congestion began and as a general principal that new transport infrastructure should not be allowed to urbanise villages surrounding the city or unduly damage the city's greenbelt.

The LLF requested the following:

- a. Following the meeting with Councillor Bates which had been arranged for early December, a written response to the questions the LLF asked of the GCP at its 11 September 2017 meeting.
  - b. A written response to the LLF's additional concerns about each of the proposed sites, voiced at its meeting on 31 October 2017.
  - c. Further potential sites to be brought forward together with an explanation as to why other sites around junction 11 had been rejected.
  - d. That officers provided data and modelling on the impact of the new Cambridge South rail station and the potential effect of increased parking provision further south along the A10 for example at Foxton station, in relation to the number of parking spaces projected to be needed around the M11 in 2031.
  - e. Where commuters were travelling to in addition to where they were coming from to be considered to enable informed community feedback to be given on the required size and location of park and ride provision at junction 11.
3. **Connectivity at junction 13-** The LLF did not believe that it was sensible to decide the alignment of the Cambourne to Cambridge busway first. The LLF had passed a resolution, believing that connectivity of a Western Orbital bus service to Cambourne to Cambridge services was of key importance. End to end journey times and journey quality from west of Cambridge settlements to key employment sites such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, were a critical factor in judging the benefit of these schemes, to allow proper evaluation of cost/benefit ratio. The LLF requested that robust end-to-end journey metrics to destinations such as the Biomedical Campus, Science Park and city centre was published as soon as possible to enable respondents to the A428 consultation to make informed

responses.

In response to the LLF's concerns, the Interim Transport Director advised that all the issues raised by the LLF Chairman, would be addressed at the meeting that had been organised to take place in early December with the Executive Board's Transport Portfolio Holder.

Members of the public were invited to ask their questions (see appendix A). A written response would be provided to Sunanda Billur who had been unable to attend the meeting.

The Interim Transport Director presented the report which summarized the technical work carried out on assessing future demand for park and ride spaces at junction 11 of the M11 and a park and cycle facility at junction 12 of the M11. It also considered the issues associated with access to expanded park and ride facilities and the interaction with the local and strategic road network.

The Executive Board was informed that:

- The economic justification for a park and cycle facility at junction 12 could not be seen however following the feedback from the Joint Assembly which at its November 2017 meeting had expressed disappointment that park and cycle was not being taken forward, potential sites for an experimental park and cycle were being looked into. These were sites with existing parking facilities that could be used during the week. The owner of a potential site for this on Barton Road, had approached the GCP. This would be brought back to the Executive Board for a decision to be made at a future meeting.
- The Hauxton side of the M11 was being considered for a potential new park and ride site as this was as per the County Council's local transport plan which had been adopted by the Mayor. This identified the west of the M11 as the preferred site. The County Council had not pre-determined the site and although officers considered this to offer the best strategic fit, it was open to debate and discussion through the consultation forum, the first meeting of which would take place before Christmas 2017. The east side of the M11 was not being considered; this was not in the local transport plan.
- A consultation group would be set up to include all parish councils in the area and the local members.
- The full outline business case would detail the likely cost of the scheme, cost/benefit analysis, access to the site, its potential environmental impact and mitigations and feasibility of the scheme. Full environmental impact assessment would be carried out at the next stage. Subject to approval of an outline business case, public consultation would be carried out which would include all information regarding all potential options, the implications of these and the costs of these.
- Regarding car access to the site, one possibility was a new slip road off the M11 (northbound) going under the A10 and into the site. A potential option for buses to enter/exit may be via the agricultural bridge. Any public consultation would clearly set out the possible car/bus entry/exit.
- Meetings would take place with all parish councils with facilitated workshops as required.
- If the Executive Board decided that an outline business case was to be carried out, this would be brought to the Executive Board for consideration in March 2018.
- The agricultural bridge could take the weight of traffic; this had been checked with Highways England.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- i. Proceed with a full outline business case for a new park and ride site west of junction 11 of the M11 and associated access/bus priority measures North West, as outlined in appendix 1 of the report. The Park and Ride site to be based on the emerging Travel Hub concept.
- ii. Not proceed with park and cycle at junction 12 of the M11 for the reasons given in the report but **AGREED** to the identification of a pilot park and cycle scheme which has the potential to be expanded if successful.
- iii. Remove the remit for junction 11 from the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum and approve the setting up of a site specific consultation group.

## 8. HISTON ROAD

Councillor Mike Todd-Jones, Chairman of the Histon Road Local Liaison Forum, was invited to speak. He gave an overview of the LLF's resolutions which were detailed in the appendix to the officer report for this agenda item, and thanked officers for their support of the process from which these had resulted. The LLF was supportive of a holistic approach to the redesign of junctions along Histon Road and recognised the capacity and physical constraints of the road in terms of what could be achieved.

Referring to this agenda item, Phil Allmendinger informed the Board that he was a resident of Gilbert Road.

The Interim Director of Transport presented the report, which was discussed by the Executive Board who raised the following points:

- The Executive Board acknowledged the concern expressed by the Joint Assembly regarding Histon Road.
- The Executive Board was informed that following preliminary analysis of the scheme, the cost/benefit ratio was positive. Officers were confident that improvements to public transport along the road could be made while maintaining cycling provision.
- A final concept design would be developed and consulted on in June or July 2018. The Chairman asked for the public consultation to be launched before summer 2018 if possible.
- Executive Board members indicated support for the proposals and recognised that there was not the space along Histon Road for an uncontested major intervention.
- Executive Board members supported the improvement of cycling infrastructure on Histon Road, advising that this was a major cycleway across the city to the guided busway but that it was a dangerous cycle route in its current format due to the width constraints of the road.
- The proposals offered benefits for local residents as well as significant benefits for the wider transport network.
- There were four schools around Histon Road, with children using the roads leading to it. Concern was expressed for the safety of these children cycling, as well as for commuters. The LLF was encouraged to engage strongly with these schools.
- It was felt that parking needed to be addressed in the southern part of the road.
- The Executive Board thanked the LLF for their work.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- i. To note the Histon Road Local Liaison Forum resolutions set out in Appendix 2 of the report and agree the responses set out therein and the resultant actions set out

in Section 4.

- ii. That officers should work up and model a revised concept design for Histon Road that aimed to provide bus priority through softer measures and which went further to provide improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, to be brought back for Board approval in March 2018.
- iii. To note the next steps in project delivery set out in paragraph 6.1 of the report.

## 9. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Chairman invited Edward Leigh, Dr Ashley Easter, Sambor Czarnawski-Iliev, Cllr Susan van de Ven and Dr Michael Prior-Jones to ask their questions. Details of the questions and a summary of the answers given are set out in Appendix A to the minutes. Dr Easter was not present at the meeting so would receive a written response to his question.

The final section of the A10 Cambridge to Royston cycleway was discussed:

- Clarity was needed regarding what Hertfordshire County Council was prepared to contribute to the project to complete the cycleway, with joint working required between Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire County Councils to deliver this.
- The Executive Board was informed that the remaining part of the cycleway crossed the A505 and required a path to reach the A505 and a bridge to cross it to be delivered at the same time. Hertfordshire County Council had carried out a feasibility study for a new bridge and had said they would commit to lifetime maintenance of a bridge once constructed.
- A business case needed to be presented by officers to the Executive Board before a decision could be made. The Executive Board's Transport Portfolio Holder suggested a joint outline business case be developed by Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire County Councils.
- The Interim Chief Executive advised that as the GCP was already over committed on tranche 1 funding, this project could not be delivered as part of this. It was advised that a business case be developed for the GCP's consideration for its future investment strategy.
- The Executive Board was advised that the Local Enterprise Partnership was supportive of greenways and other cycling schemes and that this project was an opportunity to allow expansion and growth of the area by enabling skills to be brought into it through the use of a cycleway.

The Interim Chief Executive presented the quarterly progress report and informed the Board that central government had confirmed an accelerated timeline for the delivery of Cambridge South Station.

Cambridge South Station was discussed by the Board:

- The Vice Chairman expressed disappointment at the lack of clarity from central government regarding East/West rail and expressed concern regarding their commitment to the delivery of Cambridge South Station.
- The Interim Chief Executive informed the Board of central government's announcement regarding Cambridge South Station and advised that there was commitment to deliver this. The Board was informed that the Department of Transport would lead on the development phase of Cambridge South Station. A legal agreement was to be signed regarding how the GCP was working with the Department of Transport to deliver it.
- The GCP's Transport Portfolio Holder advised that clarity was needed regarding

whether Cambridge South Station sat separately from East/West rail and that one organisation should deliver Cambridge South Station. The Interim Chief Executive advised that the development phase would provide clarity regarding this.

The Park and Ride Subsidy was discussed:

- The Interim Transport Director informed the Board that since the County Council had introduced the park and ride parking charge, usage of the park and ride had dropped by 14%.
- The Board was informed that the £10 overnight parking charge would remain, to deter long-stay parking.
- Board members expressed support for the proposal however the Vice Chairman advised that this should not be an open ended commitment and should be limited to three years. The Vice Chairman proposed the recommendation be amended to specify a three year timescale to enable funding to be reviewed. This proposal was discussed by Board members and advice was sought from Cambridgeshire County Council's Director of Finance. The Board was advised that regardless of whether the recommendation was amended to specify a timescale, the GCP would review all resources and funding allocations before moving into phase two at the end of 2021.

The Vice Chairman proposed the recommendation be amended to:

'Agree to allocate 50% (£531k) of the lost annual income resulting from the removal of the £1 parking charge at Park and Ride sites in the GCP area, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018, and review this at the end of tranche 1.'

A vote was taken on the proposed amendment; and all Executive Board members voted in favour of this, which became the substantive recommendation.

The Girton Interchange was discussed:

- In relation to this, the Transport Portfolio Holder informed the Board that he was chairman of the central section of East/West rail.
- The Board was informed that the Transport Portfolio Holder would be attending an Oxford to Cambridge stakeholder group meeting, on 15 December 2017.

The Cambridgeshire Rail Study was discussed:

- The Board was informed that a £300,000 study had been commissioned with Network Rail. The study covered the area stretching between Stansted North junction, Ely, Chippenham and Meldreth.
- The Vice Chairman expressed concern regarding the capacity of these lines to accommodate additional stations, advising that Network Rail had been found to be resistant to new stations. The Interim Transport Director advised that additional stations would be considered.
- The Transport Portfolio Holder expressed support for the recommendation however was concerned regarding the sufficiency of the area to be studied, advising that Bury St Edmunds and Norwich should be included.
- The Executive Board asked the Interim Transport Director to seek clarification from the Department of Transport regarding the geographical area and additional stations.

The Vice Chairman would raise the role of rural exception sites in South Cambridgeshire in relation to the provision of affordable housing, at his next Housing Portfolio Holder meeting.

The Vice Chairman requested fuller financial analysis in March 2018 regarding core funding from the government.

A financial monitoring update would be circulated to Executive Board members and added

to the agenda for the next meeting.

The Board was informed that electric vehicle charging points would be installed between 2018 and 2022. The Interim Chief Executive would clarify how many were to be installed and by when.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- i. To ask Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire County Councils to undertake a joint study for the completion of the final stretch of the A10 Cambridge to Royston pedestrian and cycle route, to feed into the GCP's future investment strategy prioritisation process.
- ii. To make up to £1.75M contribution to the development phase of Cambridge South Station, with up to £8.25M from other national and local partners.
- iii. To allocate 50% (£531,000) of the lost annual income resulting from the removal of the £1 parking charge at park and ride sites in the GCP area, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 and to review this at the end of 2019/2020.
- iv. To commission a feasibility study into upgrading the Girton Interchange and to allocate up to £100,000 towards the cost of the study.
- v. To make a £50,000 contribution to a feasibility study into rail capacity in Cambridgeshire, in partnership with Network Rail, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority.
- vi. That new financial pressures would be built into the budget.

## 10. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Mark Reeve informed the Board that this would be his last public GCP meeting as he was standing down as Chairman of the Local Enterprise Partnership on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The LEP Board meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> December will consider his replacement. The Executive Board thanked Mark for his valuable contributions to it representing the business community, which had been gratefully received.

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2018 in the Council Chamber at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.

---

**The Meeting ended at 7.25 p.m.**

---

**Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**

No.	Questioner	Question	Response
7a	Janet Lockwood	<p>I agree with the need to persuade as many people as possible to use public transport rather than private car to Cambridge destinations.</p> <p>Please would the Board consider changing its basic plan from bus to the more sustainable train where-ever possible? - that is, away from Park and Ride sites near the City to rail stations further out?</p> <p>It is clear from the Assembly vote that opinion is completely divided over Recommendation 1. Before preparing a Full Outline business case for 2000 new Park and Ride spaces near junction 11 for which there is no site without significant harm - please would the Board investigate other options, particularly rail which I think is a late starter in these studies?</p>	<p>Parking at rail stations and park and ride have different constrains as rail parking can only be located at rail stations where as the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) Park and Ride Guidance Note (18th February 2016) states that 'Sites should ideally be located on or adjacent to the strategic road network or on radial routes'.</p> <p>However, the GCP also has a paper planned on the development of the level crossing bypass scheme at Foxton that could also provide additional car parking within its scope. This paper is expected to be received at the February 2018 Executive Board.</p> <p>For clarity the Joint Assembly vote was more about the location of the site, i.e. expanding the existing Trumpington site or a new site at Hauxton. There was unanimous support for the provision of additional park and ride capacity.</p>
7b	Jane Ward, Chair of Hauxton Parish Council	<p>I am most concerned that there has been insufficient modelling of the traffic flow along the A10 from Foxton through Harston to junction 11 of the M11. In particular has a survey been done of the peak time A10 traffic through Harston to the junction 11 roundabout? Has modelling been done to show the effects on the A10 when the new Hauxton Meadows exit opens? Have the possible impacts on this traffic by a new P&amp;R been assessed?</p> <p>I believe all these will have a severely detrimental impact on the flow of traffic along the A10 through Harston, plus, there is a great chance that commuters living in Barrington and Haslingfield may also decide to make use of this P&amp;R rather than the Madingley P&amp;R attracting even more traffic along the A10.</p> <p>Please would the Board not rush into making a hasty decision and consider all the above points?</p>	<p>Modelling has been undertaken in terms of P&amp;R impacts including Local Plan sites and existing development sites. This modelling has considered the impacts on the A10 of a future P&amp;R at J11 west including the impacts of a new access point on the A10 close to the existing M11 junction.</p> <p>This modelling is being shared with Highways England to gain their views. The modelling demonstrates that congestion will be a concern in 2031 based on current growth projections and modelling assumptions for housing and jobs and that P&amp;R will form a key part of mitigating that issue.</p> <p>The direct marginal impact of the P&amp;R itself on congestion along the corridor is not significant and any impact must be weighed against the overall impact of congestion on key destinations if vehicles are not intercepted en-route.</p> <p>A stakeholder group involving all the affected Parish Councils together with local councillors is to be formed. This will enable full involvement in the development process. The first meeting of this</p>

Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017

			group will be held by the end of this year.
7c	Sunanda Billur	<p>My name is Sunanda and working in Addenbrokes hospital. My question: is there any direct transportation from Cambourne to Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's or Rosie Hospital)? Please note that Papworth is going to move to Biomedical Campus. So many people from Cambourne and surrounding village people will work in the hospital and have their appointments. Direct Bus facility will be more beneficial to all. So, everyone no need to take the car. Please consider the request and do the needful.</p>	<p>The GCP has 2 projects that cover this geographical area, the Cambourne to Cambridge better busways and the Western Orbital. The 2 projects combine in study area to cover a public transport route from Cambourne to the CBC site. Currently the Cambourne to Cambridge better busways has an interface where options for an ongoing bus service from Cambourne to CBC could either run on the M11 or off line to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride where further off line infrastructure runs directly to the CBC site.</p> <p>In addition exploratory discussions are currently underway with CBC stakeholders regarding the possibility of some additional bus provision.</p>
9a	Edward Leigh	<p>Park &amp; Ride parking charges The Economy &amp; Environment Committee received a report from officers in February 2017 that set out clearly why forfeiting £1.2m/year of income is inadvisable. The £0.53m/year with which the Board could decide to compensate the County Council will not create any new bus services; it will not extend services that currently end too early; it will not increase the frequency of any services; and it will not make bus services more affordable. So, I ask the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where is the analysis showing that removing the P&amp;R parking charge is a more cost effective use of public funds than, say, subsidising extensions to P&amp;R and rural bus services?</li> <li>2. Where is the social impact analysis – in particular recognising that P&amp;R competes with rural bus services, on which our poorest and least able citizens depend?</li> <li>3. By how much is peak-time traffic forecast to reduce as a result of this intervention, (at one and two sigma confidence levels)?</li> <li>4. For how many years is GCP proposing to</li> </ol>	<p>1) The £1 parking charge at Park and Ride sites was introduced in 2014 as part of a range of proposals in the County Council's Business Plan for that year. Following the implementation of the charge, there was an immediate drop in usage of the services by around 14% and there was considerable public criticism over the difficulty of using the ticket machines and the charge itself. So although there may well have been some other factors at work, it does seem quite clear that use of the park and ride fell as a direct consequence of the charge. It was expected that passengers would return to the system over time, but in fact there has been a further decline in usage since the charge came in.</p> <p>2) Park and Ride is a really important part of the mix of access to Cambridge City. It still carries in excess of 3m passengers every year and is as important for commuters as it is for shoppers. This will become increasingly the case as further Residents Parking Zones are introduced, limiting the opportunities for on street parking, and congestion continues to be a problem in Cambridge.</p> <p>3) It is therefore really important that as these measures come in there is a real and attractive alternative for commuters and shoppers to access Cambridge. It is for that reason that the County Council and GCP are jointly proposing to remove the</p>

Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017

		<p>subsidise parking at more than £0.5m/year? Why is this not stated in the background paper?</p> <p>5. Will the Board confirm whether overnight parking will still be charged at £10/night?</p> <p>6. How confident is the Board that this decision will withstand judicial review?</p>	<p>charge, a move which is expected to be near universally welcomed as it will also simplify the process of travel by removing the need to enter car registration numbers to the ticket machines. There has been no detailed analysis of the impact of the reduction in the charge, but suffice to say, given that the introduction itself resulted in a loss of patronage, it is a fair assumption that as the system becomes easier and typically up to 25% cheaper to use, passengers will return, thus reducing congestion and pollution on the streets of Cambridge.</p> <p>4) In terms of the detail of this question, the proposal is for an ongoing joint cover of the costs of park and ride between the County Council and GCP although clearly for GCP, that depends on the ongoing funding being secured from Government which is expected.</p> <p>5) The £10 overnight charge will remain as it is necessary to ensure that the sites are not used for long stay free parking given the vital role they play in access and the economy of the Greater Cambridge area.</p> <p>6) If we follow correct procedure and process as we believe that we are and hope to continue to do so, then we will withstand any external scrutiny including judicial review.</p>
9b	Dr Ashley Easter	<p>I am a former resident of Cambridge, now living in Royston, and I cycle between the two frequently as well as to my place of work in Melbourn (AstraZeneca, in future at Addenbrooke's). This last June on the A10 near Melbourn (where there is no cycleway) I was struck by a car, luckily escaping with only moderate injuries.</p> <p>After the accident, whilst using the excellent cycleway from Melbourn to reach my Physio in Cambridge, it struck me that despite the hard work by a number of councillors, volunteers and local bodies, as well as detailed plans being in place,</p>	<p>Firstly thank you to everyone for submitting their questions, and for coming to the meeting today, particularly to Sambor for the survey work he has undertaken amongst fellow students.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have each funded various sections of the Cambridge to Melbourn A10 cycle route, and this is now well used and well received. As the questioners point out it is possible to extend the route further south to the town of Royston.</p> <p>A new foot and cycle bridge over the A505 would be needed, estimated at £2m. One side would land in Hertfordshire. Planning consent and one small plot of land would be required. To reach the</p>

Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017

		<p>commitment for the final stretch was still uncertain.</p> <p>Please can the Greater Cambridge Partnership do everything in their power to complete the Cambridgeshire part of the A10 cycleway scheme, extending the existing cycleway from Melbourn to Royston, before anyone is more seriously hurt?</p>	<p>bridge, a new path on the east side of the A10 would be required. This would be wholly in Cambridgeshire, and would cost around £1m to deliver.</p> <p>Delivering the path in isolation without a bridge would not realistically be possible on safety grounds, as people would be encouraged to use the new path only to find that there was no way of safely crossing the A505. The two scheme elements should be delivered together, though it is possible that different funding bodies could fund different elements.</p> <p>In terms of funding, Hertfordshire County Council (Herts CC) have funded a feasibility study on a new A505 bridge, as well as committing to lifetime maintenance costs of the bridge, which they estimate at £500,000. GCP officers have discussed the project with Herts CC further, and Herts CC have confirmed that linking Royston with Melbourn for non-motorised users is not a high priority to them, and they feel that their feasibility study and offer of maintenance is as much as they are prepared to offer.</p> <p>Royston lies geographically in two Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas (Hertfordshire LEP and Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP). LEPs are able to bid for local Growth Deals and have access to funding for capital projects.</p> <p>I understand that Royston Town Council have committed £30,000 towards the project, and four individual businesses have each indicated that they would also contribute £30,000 each.</p> <p>Royston is a town (15,781 population) and Melbourn a large village (population 4,725), both with a range of employment sites, educational establishments, leisure facilities, shops and services, for which logically there are many reasons for people to want to make journeys between the two settlements by non-motorised means. Currently most of these journeys are done by car.</p> <p>The narrative of future usage and improved safety needs to be weighed up with the fairly significant cost of £3m to provide both a new path and bridge, and thus more work will be done on the</p>
--	--	---	--

**Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**

			business case, and further discussions with Herts CC. This will then allow an informed decision to be made to either fully or partly fund the scheme, or not to fund the scheme.
9c	Sambor Czarnawski-Iliev	<p>Hello all! I am Sambor, a Year 9 student from Melbourn Village College. Last May I got involved with the A10 cycling campaign, and began a survey which was completed by 62 students, to find out how much support there is for cycling to school.</p> <p>The results were pleasing, as you can see on the sheet we've given out. The survey also showed that the lack of a safe route for cyclists along the A10 between Royston and Melbourn hindered quite a few students from being able to cycle to school. I am here to ask for your support in funding that path. I would be delighted in also giving you a first-hand tour of the route.</p> <p>The College itself has dozens of students from Royston. This number has been increasing at an ever-faster rate over the last few years, and with the planned housing developments, it's bound to keep increasing. Most of the ones I know will be glad to use such a path.</p> <p>My whole family travels by bike, virtually all the time, virtually everywhere. A path like this will open up a much-needed link between Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire.</p>	Please see the answer for question 9b
9d	Cllr Susan van de Ven	<p>With a modest investment, the final link in the Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme could be quickly completed within the GCP Tranche 1 timeframe. The two-mile Melbourn-Royston link needs a path in Cambridgeshire and a bridge in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>This is a shovel-ready project that would deliver significant economic benefits, and make a</p>	Please see the answer for question 9b

**Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**

		<p>substantial contribution to reducing reliance on the private car for travel to key areas of employment in Cambridge and along the A10 corridor from Royston. It will maximise the benefits of the investments in this route already made by GCP. Because it has the potential to be delivered within the existing GCP funding period, it can demonstrate real progress on innovative, economically led schemes to Government.</p> <p>Today, I am here to ask for your support just for the path in Cambridgeshire. This has been costed at £1 million. While Cambridgeshire County Council has no funding to offer, the GCP is ideally placed to make this happen.</p> <p>You will want to know what’s happening on the Hertfordshire side for bridge funding. Following the LEP’s indication of support on a collaborative basis, Herts County and Royston Town Councils, local businesses including AstraZeneca, and many small private donations are coming together to create a funding package.</p> <p>That this overall effort has persisted for so long is really down to commuters who want to leave their cars at home. As the owner of Melbourn Science Park said to the GCP Board last year, this sustainable transport link will not only alleviate pressures on Science Park parking, but will allow the creation of more jobs.</p> <p>So, today we are asking the Board to get fully behind the project, by proposing that the GCP commit the necessary funds to complete the Cambridgeshire portion of the scheme.</p>	
9e	Dr Michael Prior-Jones	The Quarterly Report notes that the Shepreth to Melbourn section of the A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle route opened in March, and came in slightly under budget. I would like to thank the board for	Please see the answer for question 9b

**Executive Board Questions and Responses 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**

		<p>funding this part of the route, and ask them to seriously consider funding the proposed path from the south end of Melbourn to the A505. This would be as part of a package with a bridge over the A505 to Royston, with funding from several other agencies and private businesses. The total cost of the project is estimated at £2.5m.</p> <p>I work at a firm on the Melbourn Science Park. I have around 25 colleagues living in Royston, who make the two mile journey to work by car because it is not safe to cross the A505 - and there are plenty more working in the other businesses on the park. Our business is expanding and we are creating more jobs in Melbourn. The high cost of housing in Cambridge and South Cambs means that even young professionals on good salaries are struggling to buy homes in Cambridgeshire. More of our staff are choosing to live in Royston, where housing is fractionally cheaper, and the lack of safe routes to walk or cycle to work means that we are generating a lot of short-journey commute traffic and demand for car parking on our site.</p> <p>It reflects poorly on the structure of our local government institutions that the county boundary causes so many issues with the funding. I would urge the board to support this proposed scheme, and find ways to resolve the issues over the border with Hertfordshire, because it will help us create jobs, retain staff, and produce a better quality of life and health for both our staff and the wider community.</p>	
--	--	--	--

This page is left blank intentionally.