



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board

Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021

4:00 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.

Present:

### Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Neil Gough (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Nicky Massey	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Andy Neely	University Representative (substitute)

### Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in Attendance:

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

### Attending at the discretion of the Vice-Chairperson:

Mayor James Palmer	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
--------------------	--

### Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Debbie Bondi	Interim Smart Cambridge Programme Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Gemma Schroeder	Project Manager Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport and Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Executive Board Membership

It was confirmed that following the resignation of the Chairperson, the meeting would be chaired by the Vice-Chairperson, with a new Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to be elected at the next Executive Board meeting following the Annual Meetings of the three constituent councils.

The Vice-Chairperson welcomed Councillor Nicky Massey, who had replaced Councillor Lewis Herbert as the Cambridge City Council representative on the Executive Board, observing that she was the first female voting member on the Board. The Vice-Chairperson paid tribute to Councillor Herbert for his long-standing service to the GCP and noted that he would remain as the Cambridge City Council substitute representative.

The Vice-Chairperson also welcomed Councillor Ian Bates, who had replaced Councillor Roger Hickford as the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Executive Board. The Vice-Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor Hickford for his long-standing service to both the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

Mayor Palmer expressed concern about the GCP's governance process following the resignation of the Chairperson. It was confirmed that the GCP operated within the provisions of its constitution and had policies in place to deal with questions of compliance to the code of conduct. It was also observed that voting members of the Executive Board were democratically elected representatives nominated by the constituent councils.

## 2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Phil Allmendinger, with Andy Neely attending as the substitute University representative.

## 3. Declarations of Interest

Andy Neely declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report (agenda item 8) due to his involvement with Cambridge&.

## 4. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the addition of Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly) and Mayor James Palmer to the list of those present at the meeting, and the Vice-Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

## 5. Public Questions

The Vice-Chairperson informed the Executive Board that six public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in Appendix A of the minutes.

It was noted that all six questions related to agenda item 7 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy).

## 6. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

## 7. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

Six public questions were received from Mal Schofield, James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present & Future), David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), Vincent Poole, Nicholas Knight and Edward Leigh (on behalf of Smarter Cambridge Transport). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Following an introduction by the Transport Director, the Head of Transport and Strategy presented the report, which brought together a comprehensive package of measures aimed at supporting a sustainable recovery from Covid-19 by making additional progress towards achieving the GCP's goals of increasing use of sustainable modes of transport, reducing congestion, improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions. The report had been updated in response to the Joint Assembly's request for speedier action, while attention was drawn to the joint working with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and other partners in developing the proposals, which aligned well with the emerging CPCA Climate Commission's recommendations, as well as the national bus strategy published by the government on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

Proposals to support sustainable transport included incentivising use of public transport while investing in its post-pandemic economic recovery. Proposals to promote active travel included identifying and overcoming missing links in local walking and cycling infrastructure, identifying a road network hierarchy in order to reallocate road space, and developing an integrated parking strategy. It was acknowledged that such measures would particularly affect residents and visitors with disabilities and the Executive Board was assured that consideration was being given to minimise or mitigate the impact.

Acknowledging that a change of approach would be needed in order to meet the net zero commitments made by the GCP's constituent councils, it was proposed to move

to a zero-emission bus fleet by 2025 and to implement Euro 6 vehicles in the meantime. It was emphasised that the report sought to establish momentum and milestones of an overall package, with specific decisions and spending to be made further down the line.

Confirming that the Joint Assembly had broadly supported the report's recommendations, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted that members had expressed concern over the speed of the GCP's interventions and actions in the face of the lifting of lockdown restrictions, although he acknowledged that the report had responded to these concerns. He emphasised the need to identify a revenue generating source in order to continue to support recovery, particularly with regard to bus services, and conveyed overwhelming and enthusiastic support for the cycling network proposals, despite concerns over priorities and missing links. He argued that while there had been support for localised demand management schemes, they would need to be aligned to an integrated parking strategy, observing that simply displacing vehicles from one area to another would fail to resolve underlying issues.

While considering the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the Joint Assembly's call for more immediate action, noting the risk of people resuming travel by car unless the public transport options were safe, affordable and practical. It was also argued that positive behavioural changes that had occurred as a result of Covid-19, such as increased walking and cycling, would not necessarily be sustainable unless mechanisms to support and promote them were implemented.
- Recognised that in order to develop a strategy for supporting public transport in the future, there was a need for greater clarity on the timescales for the government reducing or removing the financial support currently being provided to public transport operators. It was suggested that the GCP should write to the government to establish whether it could develop a future strategy while the subsidies continued to be provided. The Transport Director highlighted the poor state of the bus network and observed that there was no guarantee that the previous level of service would return when the subsidies ended, noting there was no timeline in place. He also informed the Executive Board that the Department for Transport was currently discouraging expansion to bus networks, with the focus instead being on the resumption of services.
- Supported the conversion of the bus fleet to Euro 6 buses but questioned whether the process could be completed in a shorter timeframe.
- Suggested that the GCP could encourage the County Council to improve pavements across the region in order to promote walking and cycling, although it was acknowledged that the Council had recently included an additional £20m in its 2021/22 budget to be spent on footpath maintenance over the next four years.
- Supported the proposed measures for the cycling network but argued that £20m of additional funding would not be sufficient to resolve all the missing links that had been identified within and between schemes.

- Acknowledged the issue of future funding that had been raised by the Joint Assembly, noting the importance of keeping projects and schemes running once they had been completed. Members considered whether immediate action was even possible without an agreement on future resources, or whether the priority should be to encourage people to use public transport again, with future revenue concerns dependent on that initial objective. It was requested that a report considering the issues of long-term funding be presented at a forthcoming meeting.
- Expressed concern over the number of accident hotspots in the region and argued that road safety needed to be addressed in order to further encourage cycling and walking.
- Welcomed the joint working between the GCP and the CPCA on supporting the public transport recovery across the region, although Mayor Palmer emphasised that the CPCA would be responsible for any government funding applications and spending for the bus sector, such as the Bus Service Operators Grant.
- Noted that an ongoing demand-led bus trial in Huntingdonshire was addressing transport provision issues that were prevalent in rural areas.
- Argued that the GCP should give greater attention and consideration to people who travel into Greater Cambridge from outside the region, particularly rural areas.
- Observed that transport issues were often connected to wider concerns, such as rural areas with poor internet connections unable to support people working from home, therefore requiring them to commute to work instead.
- Acknowledged the possibility of franchising public transport in the future, although the Transport Director noted that this was not an option in the short term.
- Identified a need to demonstrate how a travel hub was more than a large car park by drawing attention to the onward travel connections, storage facilities, access, facilities, etc. It was also suggested that a checklist could be developed to include primary and secondary elements to be considered during the assessment of proposals for travel hubs.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Agree to support a significant uplift in use of sustainable transport as part of a green recovery, through:
  - Continuing to deliver projects in the next three months which enhance sustainable transport options, including maintaining the existing experimental active travel schemes and delivering a second phase of schemes, finalising a freight pilot, expanding the electric bus pilot, increasing cycle parking, co-funding an e-cargo bike pilot and rolling out new playstreets;

- Committing to a further £20m prioritised package of cycling improvements, addressing missing links in the cycle network, as part of the GCP's wider cycle network programme;
- Delivering enhancements to existing Park&Ride and future travel hubs, including:
  - providing £1.3m of funding for the expansion of the Babraham site;
  - expanding secure cycle parking, responding to additional demand in the next 3-6 months;
  - agreeing and adopting the travel hub design principles at Appendix 2 to guide the development of future sites, ensuring these are flexible, modern, multi-modal interchanges; and
  - Providing EV charging facilities at all park & ride/interchange sites;
- Incentivising use of public transport, when it transitions from central government support, by delivering a package based on the outlined 'future bus concept' including lengthening operating hours and increasing bus frequencies, and progressed in discussion with CPCA and operators.

(b) Agree to prioritise road space for sustainable transport and make it a more competitive choice, by discouraging car use through:

- Delivering the smart traffic signals pilot using the latest technology, including artificial intelligence, to ease congestion and reduce vehicle idling, starting this month;
- Developing, with the County Council, a revised network hierarchy for Cambridge that prioritises sustainable modes of transport by the autumn;
- Continuing to support the development of the Cambridge city centre Supplementary Planning Document to enhance the public realm and reallocate roadspace to sustainable modes;
- Implementing a programme of road-space reallocation to deliver a revised hierarchy, building on schemes delivered through the active travel fund;
- Developing and implementing an integrated parking strategy by the autumn, with the City and County Councils, to more effectively manage the use of on and off street parking to reduce congestion on the network; and
- Funding the delivery of civil parking enforcement in South Cambridgeshire to tackle local parking problems.

(c) Agree to work with bus operators, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, the County Council and City Council to reduce emissions by moving to zero emission services within the central area of Cambridge by 2025 and switch to Euro VI standards in the short term, including an appraisal of options which limit access to public transport vehicles, coaches, HGVs and taxis not meeting emissions criteria.

## 8. Quarterly Progress Report

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Attention was drawn to the new skills contract and the selection of Form the Future as the

preferred bidder, as detailed in section 9 of the report. Highlighting the outstanding performance of Form the Future throughout the course of the current contract, it was noted that the new arrangement would include an element of flexibility that would allow for an annual assessment of the broader situation and environment in order to refocus efforts if required. It was noted that the GCP was working closely with the CPCA's Business Growth Service.

While considering the report, the Executive Board:

- Paid tribute to the fact that the GCP had significantly exceeded the required 420 additional Level 2 and Level 3 apprenticeships in areas aligned to the Greater Cambridge growth sectors in the first five years of the City Deal. It was emphasised that the achievement was particularly impressive given changes to the apprenticeship levy and the difficulty in persuading companies to take on people with potential.
- Established that a wide range of issues and sectors had been discussed with Form the Future for specific targeting via apprenticeships, such as green recovery and care leavers.
- Observed that despite the Digital Wayfinding and ICP Development projects being labelled with green RAG statuses, sections 11.3 and 11.4 of the report suggested that they had encountered serious problems, although the Head of Strategy and Programme confirmed that both projects remained on track.
- Clarified that the map on the Wayfinding totem outside Cambridge railway station was currently only in English, following the removal of a touch screen that offered different languages, and the Project Manager Smart Cambridge undertook to investigate whether the language options could be reinstated.
- Expressed concern that following confirmation from officers at the Joint Assembly meeting that there would not be a reduction in Resident Parking Scheme funding as a result of the proposed incorporation of the unspent element of the Residents Parking Implementation budget into the City Centre Access budget, it had been suggested at the County Council Highways and Transport Committee meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021 that the GCP was no longer supporting the schemes. It was confirmed that this suggestion had been corrected at the meeting with an affirmation of the GCP's continued support for the schemes.
- Argued that multi-car ownership contributed to the parking shortage in Cambridge and suggested that it should be considered as part of the integrated parking strategy.
- Expressed concern that the GCP would not have sufficient senior project management capacity for the level of increase in workload, although the Chief Executive assured the Executive Board that capacity was being increased, while the procurement exercise for the strategic partnering arrangement was also being repeated.

- Confirmed that the request of £600k for the Histon Road project was the only additional funding being proposed for any of the projects as part of the budget.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note progress across the GCP programme;
- (b) Approve the preferred bidder for the GCP's new skills service, as outlined in section 9 of the report; and
- (c) Approve the multi-year budget strategy outlined in section 17 of the report, including the detailed GCP budgets for 2021/22, noting that the budget strategy will continue to be updated annually.

## 9. Electricity Grid Reinforcement: Update and Next Steps

Following an introduction by the Chief Executive, the Interim Smart Cambridge Programme Manager presented the report, which contained a proposed programme framework for electricity grid reinforcement and three options that had been identified to deliver the required infrastructure. Noting that further research was required before a decision could be made on which option would be the most appropriate, she drew attention to the request for £200k of the £25m that had been allocated towards energy grid reinforcement as part of the Future Investment Strategy, in order to develop the project's next stages and a business case, which would be presented later in 2021.

Emphasising that electricity grid capacity constraints represented a barrier to growth and the delivery of homes and jobs in the region, the Chief Executive noted that utility providers were restricted to operating reactively to confirmed demand and that this was problematic in the high-growth Greater Cambridge area. While suggesting there was support for change in this method of working at a national level, she observed that any such change would not be realised within the timeframe during which the issue in Greater Cambridge would become critical.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board acknowledged that in order to achieve the required shifts in the production and consumption of electricity, it would first be necessary to reconfigure electricity transmission and distribution grids to accommodate shifts in generational demand patterns. However, while supporting such efforts on a local level, it was argued that the issue was indicative of a wider problem in the regulatory frameworks that governed the electricity industry. Noting that such a responsibility should not lie with the GCP and that a short-term focus on immediate demand was not conducive to net-zero carbon ambitions, the GCP was encouraged to highlight the issue to Ofgen and the government.



The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note and comment on progress made in developing the proposals for electricity grid reinforcement;
- (b) Note the problematic operation of the electricity market, and lobby for change whilst continuing to work on the project due to the likely timescales for any change in the operating environment;
- (c) Support an application to UK Power Networks as the local electricity Distribution Network Operator, as outlined in Section 6 of the report;
- (d) Support initial market testing to explore the interest in and capabilities of market operators as outlined in paragraph 6.3 of the report; and
- (e) Approve additional funding of £200k to support this work.

## 10. Chisholm Trail Project: Implication for Future GCP Project Management Arrangements

The Transport Director presented the report, which detailed the implications of the delivery problems faced by the Chisholm Trail scheme on the GCP's future project management arrangements. Noting that the Executive Board had requested the report at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020 after agreeing to provide additional funding to secure delivery of the Chisholm Trail and Abbey-Chesterton Bridge project, he highlighted that the GCP was looking to increase self-delivery of its projects and resolve issues related to capacity.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board acknowledged the importance of the report in seeking to avoid further overspends that led to funding in other areas of the GCP programme being reduced.

The Executive Board resolved to:

Note the proposed changes to future GCP project management arrangements.

## 11. Date of Future Meetings

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was due be held on Thursday 1st July 2021, with the start time to be confirmed.

Chairperson  
1<sup>st</sup> July 2021

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

Questioner	Question	Answer
Mal Schofield	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvement and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>3.1 “The Joint Assembly asks the Board to apply a bolder vision and speed up implementation, to get in place actions that can make a difference in relation to the 22nd June trigger point and in particular focussing on alternatives to this being a car-based recovery.”</p> <p>There is little evidence supporting a "car-based recovery", although the psychology of "social distancing" demands an urgent strategic review of travel behaviour and the certainty of a switch of working time from "office to home". See Harvard Business Review article, reference below *</p> <p>Present forecasts show that peak traffic flows in the UK, will be permanently lower irrespective of a return to higher economic growth.</p> <p>Question: what are the key infrastructure elements of the Board's "bolder" vision of the Cambridge TTWA 2022 -2030?</p> <p>Examples: a fully operational Girton interchange to eliminate traffic delays at the A1303:Madingley Rd/M11 junction; East/West Rail to a new station at the BMC; High density "green" housing at Cambridge North East.</p> <p>* HBR December 2020</p> <p>The most visible effect of the shift to WFH is a large decline in time spent commuting (41 minutes/day). ----- In our new WFH reality, no matter what shape it ultimately takes, organizations will need to actively help maintain a healthy separation between work and personal lives. ----- Curiously, this may involve virtually recreating the forced breaks between work and life that came with the now-bygone commute. In other words: the commute is dead! Long live the commute!</p>	<p>There are a range of views and evidence on the risk of a car-based recovery – this week’s National Bus Strategy demonstrates government believes there is a risk and is looking to local places to take action to address this as part of the recovery.</p> <p>The key infrastructure elements of the GCP’s vision are set out at figure 1 in section 7 of the report.</p>

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

<p>James Littlewood, Chief Executive Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvement and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>CambridgePPF is deeply concerned that the Travel Hubs report, as written, has set no meaningful boundaries on what may be built on sensitive greenfield sites, especially on sites within the Cambridge/South Cambridgeshire green belt. The wording used in the report, with minor variations, is:</p> <p>“Where travel hub sites are located in the Green Belt, planning policy and requirements are likely to restrict the choice of components to those which can be clearly identified as “local transport infrastructure”.</p> <p>and</p> <p>“Consideration must be given to the location of the travel hub site – where the site is in a sensitive location or green belt, the size and materials used must be appropriate to the surroundings.”</p> <p>This wording provides no specific limits or guidance, and therefore provides no reassurance that GCP will take seriously the need to choose travel hub sites and sizes that minimise their environmental, ecological, aesthetic and heritage impacts.</p> <p>That is especially the case for what were referred to previously as ‘Park &amp; Rides’, with up to 2,000 car parking spaces. Cambridge PPF has seen no evidence to date – including in the planning application for the Park &amp; Ride at Hauxton – that the benefits are sufficiently great to warrant the deep and permanent damage these will have on the landscape. The strategy of GCP and the Combined Authority to provide greatly improved active and public transport infrastructure and services throughout the region has much higher environmental and social benefit at lower monetary and environmental cost.</p>	<p>The Travel Hub design principles are based on policy set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan to shift forwards from the Park&amp;Ride approach and create multi-modal hubs that are better integrated with their communities. The Local Transport Plan was subject to stakeholder and public consultation.</p> <p>The guidance considers what facilities may be appropriate at different types of site. Each proposed hub will be consulted on individually as part of scheme development.</p>
---	--	---

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>Our questions to the GCP Executive board are therefore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which organisations or individuals were invited to comment on drafts of this report?</li> <li>2. Why are officers recommending adoption of this report without public consultation?</li> <li>3. Why is there no meaningful distinction in the design guidance between large-scale Park &amp; Rides, and small-scale travel hubs serving individual and small groups of villages?</li> </ol>	
<p>David Stoughton for Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvement and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Walking as zero carbon active transport is referred to in many clauses especially in 7.4, and priority for pedestrians has been a consistent policy. At Living Streets we set out to research residents' perception of the walking infrastructure, especially as walking is one of the few ways to take exercise during this pandemic. So we're conducting a survey about the condition of local pavement across the city. I attach an interim report from that survey.</p> <p>Whilst most respondents express a degree of dissatisfaction with the condition of local pavements, we are most concerned about wheelchair users, parents with pushchairs and the elderly, especially those who require a companion by their side at all times. These users report pavement that are too narrow; obstructed by pavement parking, street furniture or other barriers; lack dropped kerbs, or are too slopping, rutted, or potholed for their use, especially after dark.</p> <p>Not only is this portion of the populace disadvantaged by the poor condition of pavements, they are forced back into cars even for local shopping, leisure or recreation. As pavements deteriorate further and traffic increases again the number of residents affected will increase. This threatens to undermine the active travel policy and adds unnecessarily to congestion and pollution. Whilst considerable progress</p>	<p>Maintenance of pavements is a County Council responsibility, and they recently allocated additional funding to this in their budget. We will share the interim survey report with relevant officers.</p> <p>The report proposes supporting the introduction of civil parking enforcement in South Cambridgeshire which will benefit walkers, cyclists and local communities.</p>

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>is being made on priority routes, much of the infrastructure for walking in the city is left to decay.</p> <p>Will the Greater Cambridge Partnership collaborate with councils to prioritise safe walking as an issue and find budget to repair or upgrade pavements, remove obstructions, and enforce parking restrictions, hedge cutting and bin collection?</p> <p>[Background information attached: Living Streets local street survey: exploring the findings from Phase 1 and 2]</p>	
<p>Vincent Poole Arbury Road resident</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvement and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>In relation to Agenda Item 7, City Access Strategy Recommendations, Part (b) ‘Agree to prioritise road space for sustainable transport and make it a more competitive choice, by discouraging car use through..’</p> <p>It is very encouraging to see all the hard work going on through the GCP Agenda and Reports, but I would contest that Cambridge is the cycling city that people imagine but rather a car drivers city and the people who cycle do so despite the cars.</p> <p>For most days of the week the East end of Arbury Road is choked with idling traffic waiting to turn on to Milton Road.</p> <p>Now as my children return to school, two on bicycles and one on foot, one still affected by long Covid symptoms there is traffic queuing as far as the eye can see from my house, the road effectively blocked for cyclists.</p> <p>We are being encouraged to take up active travel, but I worry about the quality of the air we breathe in, as well as the safety aspect. This is especially awful to see at school time, this road is heavily used for active travel by people of all ages. But at school times it is the parents with</p>	<p>The County Council is looking at Arbury Road as part of the government’s active travel programme and we will refer the question to them.</p>

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>young children and babies in trailers, or the children and students themselves who must either sit in the traffic queue and breathe in the fumes, retreat to the pavement or get off and wheel their bikes.</p> <p>The abrupt ending of the protective cycle lane just after North Cambridge Academy does a disservice to all the people who ride bikes as a method of travel. It really says, 'ok you're on your own now, good luck!'</p> <p>When will the Arbury Road cycle lanes be completed all the way down to Milton Road? It makes no sense as a safe cycling route otherwise and I have seen data to show that it is very heavily used by cyclists.</p>	
<p>Nicholas Knight</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvement and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Pursuant to Agenda Item 7, and the reference to various public consultation exercises undertaken therein, does the Chair accept that the GCP has a duty of care to ensure that all relevant information is provided to the public on a timely basis and that any communication with the public in the context of the public consultation exercises should be accurate and most importantly truthful at all times?</p>	<p>The GCP is committed to communicating with the public in an open and transparent way, and we adhere to Cambridgeshire County Council's consultation principles, which can be found on their website.</p>
<p>Edward Leigh Smarter Cambridge Transport</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Regarding the Travel Hub Design Principles report produced by Mott MacDonald:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much did this report cost?</li> <li>2. Why was it commissioned when CoMoUK (referenced in the report) has already published detailed guidance on 'mobility hub' design, case studies and accreditation?</li> <li>3. What questions did it answer that GCP officers could not answer without it?</li> <li>4. What will change as a result of this report being written?</li> </ol>	<p>The Travel Hub design principles are based on policy set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan to shift forwards from the Park&amp;Ride approach and create multi-modal hubs that are better integrated with their communities. The Local Transport Plan was subject to stakeholder and public consultation.</p> <p>The report was delivered within agreed scheme budgets and considers a range of design considerations within the Greater Cambridge context. It will guide the development of the GCP's</p>

Appendix A – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>There are serious omissions, including in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Net change to carbon emissions from construction and use of travel hubs.</li><li>• Ecological impacts on greenfield sites, in particular from loss and disruption to natural habitats and water flows, and polluted rainwater run-off.</li><li>• Safety needs and concerns of women and girls using travel hubs.</li><li>• Needs of disabled people and their carers, e.g. ‘changing places’ toilets.</li><li>• Design guidance for buildings and infrastructure in the greenbelt.</li><li>• Data collection (e.g. site usage, car and cycle park occupancy rates)</li><li>• Free WiFi provision, especially in locations where mobile phone coverage is poor.</li><li>• Supplementary uses, e.g. for mobile library, health screening and other services; farmers’ and craft markets.</li></ul> <p>And, specifically in relation to large Park &amp; Ride sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Abstraction of bus passengers from local to Park &amp; Ride services.</li><li>• Public health impacts of air pollution in villages from vehicles accessing Park &amp; Rides.</li><li>• Localised road congestion.</li></ul> <p>Using the term ‘travel hub’ to cover all permutations of facilities from a 2,000-space Park &amp; Ride to a village bus station does not aid public understanding. By rebranding Park &amp; Rides (which are well understood) as ‘travel hubs’, GCP is obscuring the scale and impact of the planned car parks at Hauxton (1,614 car parking spaces), Babraham (up to 2,000 spaces) and Scotland Farm (1,438 spaces) – all greenfield sites in the green belt.</p>	<p>future sites.</p> <p>Each proposed hub will be consulted on individually as part of scheme development and will consider climate, ecology, safety and the other design questions raised.</p>
--	---	---