

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Wednesday 24th February 2021
2:00 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Dave Baigent (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Mike Sargeant	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Lucy Scott	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

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. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Dr Andy Williams.

2. Declarations of Interest

Helen Valentine declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy item (agenda item 6) as a resident of Queen Edith's Way.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report (agenda item 7) due to his involvement with Cambridge&. He also declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest due to his employment with Marshall of Cambridge and subsequent involvement with Marleigh.

Cllr Dave Baigent declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 19th November 2020, were agreed as a correct record and the Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that three 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 two questions related to agenda item 6 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy) and one question related to agenda item 7 (Quarterly Progress Report).

5. Petitions

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

6. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

Two public questions were received from Matthew Danish (on behalf of Camcycle) and Rosalind Lund (on behalf of the Arbury Road East Residents Association). The

questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Colin McGerty, City Councillor for Queen Edith's ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Drawing attention to the gaps and missing links in the current cycle network, as set out in Table 1 of the report, he emphasised the need for the network to be joined up and integrated to ensure cyclists had confidence in using it, highlighting the importance of engagement and consultation with residents and stakeholders in achieving this. While welcoming the fact that the two schemes identified as highest priority passed through Queen Edith's, he suggested that the A1134 (North-South) scheme appeared comparatively expensive for the proposals and queried whether the cost estimates were cautiously high and how value for money and the greatest potential impact would be evaluated. The Head of Transport and Strategy noted that cost estimates had been produced by independent consultants using standard measurements, while learning from previously completed projects had suggested a benefit from ensuring that early cost estimates included a buffer. She confirmed that engagement had already been held with some stakeholders and reassured the Joint Assembly that this would increase as the projects progressed.

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. Proposals to support sustainable transport included incentivising use of public transport while investing in its post-pandemic economic recovery, as well as enhancing and expanding park and ride sites. Proposals to consolidate active travel included identifying and overcoming missing links in local walking and cycling infrastructure, reallocating road space, and developing an integrated parking strategy.

Noting that zero emission networks would be required to meet the net zero commitments made by the GCP's constituent councils, she identified wider measures for decarbonising cars and the identification of a long-term funding mechanism for wider public transport enhancements as two key elements that had not been covered in the report. These issues would be considered in the future and would be informed by Government policy, as well as transport and workplace trends that emerged following a reduction in the impacts of Covid-19. It was emphasised that the report established momentum for direction, with specific decisions and spending to be made further down the line based on such considerations, while the Transport Director highlighted the impact of the pandemic on overall strategy, with a shift in focus to economic recovery, particularly in the public transport network, which he acknowledged would be extremely challenging.

While considering the aspects of the report related to public transport, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concern about the need to find an ongoing revenue source for projects that did not become commercially viable, as indicated in paragraph 5.6 of the report, suggesting that such situations were likely to be increasingly common and severe as a result of Covid-19. It was noted that GCP funding was finite and

therefore suggested that the long-term benefits of the expansion of the network and services would be difficult to maintain if alternative funding sources and arrangements were not secured. While recognising the constraints on City Deal funding and subsequent need to secure additional funding from partners and alternative sources, the Head of Transport and Strategy emphasised the equal importance of deciding where such spending should be prioritised.

- Observed the urgent need for action to avoid the risk of a car-based recovery, as indicated in paragraph 1.2 of the report, and argued that most of the measures described in the report would not be realised until after June 2021, which would be too late to prevent such a recovery.
- Requested an update on progress of the development of the support package with operators and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), as indicated in section 8 of the report, and sought clarification on the nature of the trigger points that would lead to its deployment. Arguing that neither the pre-pandemic or current bus network would be viable or sustainable in the long-term, the Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that the current priority was to re-establish the core network before attention could turn to future development. He argued that it was currently impossible to predict future working trends or public transport patronage levels, and said that the national bus strategy currently being developed by the government would largely determine how to move forward, as would the end of financial support being provided to operators. It was noted that operators were equally unable to develop long-term plans for the same reasons. The Head of Transport and Strategy informed members that there was regular dialogue between the GCP, the CPCA and operators, and the trigger points would be decided once a number of variables had been clarified, including the government plan, changes to guidance, and movement levels and trends around Greater Cambridge.
- Welcomed proposals for further investment and expansion to the bus network, although concern was expressed over the cost of running services in areas with low population. The Transport Director informed members that rural areas would have reduced service levels to compensate for lower demand, although he noted the need for early and late services.
- Expressed concern about the shift of focus to economic recovery, arguing that the GCP should remain focussed on long-term objectives.
- Argued that greater attention should be paid to connecting key bus corridors to each other. It was clarified that the key bus corridors on the Future Bus Network Concept map in section 5.3 of the report had been identified in the SYSTRA study as the routes with the largest flow in passenger numbers, and that these represented the core network with connections out to rural areas with smaller flow.
- Drew attention to some features that were missing from the Future Bus Network Concept map in section 5.3 of the report, including a connection between Cambridge South station and the Granta park and ride, as well as the Foxton travel hub. The Transport Director acknowledged the need to revise sections of the map.

- Welcomed the reduced traffic flow towards Cambridge as a result of the pandemic and expressed frustration that the GCP had not developed more initiatives to ensure a continued reduction. It was suggested that consideration could have been given to developing measures such as encouraging and incentivising people to work from home or to make public transport more practical for working while traveling to and from work.
- Suggested that some of the temporary measures, such as the Mill Road bridge closure, could become permanent.

While considering the aspects of the report related to cycling, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that the potential impact of the Queens Road cycling scheme on coach parking had been identified as negative in Table 1 in paragraph 5.8 of the report and discussed whether the impact could actually be seen as positive. It was argued that the high number of coaches undermined the GCP's attempts to improve air quality and reduce pollution, while also being a danger to cyclists and pedestrians. One member suggested that a coach park outside the city centre with a shuttle service to transport visitors could create revenue and improve air quality. The Head of Transport and Strategy clarified that the impact was listed as negative due to the challenges to delivery that the issue caused, noting that relocating coach parking would not be straightforward. However, she informed members that Cambridge City Council and Visit Cambridge were considering coach and tourist access to the city as part of the development of a destination management plan.
- Argued that gaps identified in cycling schemes that had already been implemented, such as those on Arbury Road and Milton Road, should be resolved before commencing new schemes. It was also noted that the Mitcham's Corner Gyratory had been identified as a concern for deliverability of the North Cambridge scheme in Table 1 in paragraph 5.8 of the report, while further missing links on Northampton Street and Magdalene Bridge had not been included, and it was suggested that failing to resolve such issues with schemes would potentially dissuade cyclists from using them. It was suggested that in the future funding should be guaranteed until the completion of projects, to avoid missing links remaining.
- Argued that despite the need for further improvements, the overall progress on cycling infrastructure had been one of the GCP's most significant and visible successes. It was suggested that the priority that the GCP placed on cycling when there was such high local appetite for it would naturally lead to an increase in the number of cyclists, leading to significant benefits for relatively low costs, which would help lead to long-term changes in transport choices.
- Highlighted the need to improve cycle routes that served educational facilities, particularly secondary schools, especially given the large number of cyclists within such age groups. It was suggested that the ranking of some projects in Table 1 in paragraph 5.8 of the report had not considered the usage of routes by students. The Head of Transport and Strategy acknowledged the suggestions and undertook to increase focus on those schemes around educational settings.

- Sought clarification on the nature of consultations on the proposed packages, as mentioned in paragraph 5.8 of the report, particularly regarding which schemes would be included, how much funding would be available and the level of input that would be available to participants. It was confirmed that the consultations, which would involve key groups such as parish councils, would provide an opportunity to propose further schemes and identify priorities.
- Expressed concern that £20m would not be sufficient funding to complete many of the proposed projects, and it was confirmed that the final amount of funding would be assessed following the consultations.
- Suggested there was a need for further safe cycle routes in the fringes surrounding Cambridge, such as routes connecting Cottenham to Willingham, Wilburton and Waterbeach train station.
- Welcomed the identification of missing links in access routes to the Biomedical Campus (BMC).
- Expressed concern there had not been a higher level of consultation with parish councils and local residents as part of the analysis of the current cycling network.
- Identified issues with the design of some implemented schemes, such as a lack of dropped kerbs and cycle routes that were too narrow to allow bikes to pass each other.
- Argued that current cycling routes were sometimes mislabelled as underused, and therefore considered to have low cycling potential for development, with the suggestion that the routes were currently underused precisely because of their under-developed and dangerous nature.
- Expressed concern that consolidating funds would lead to the development of schemes only with the greatest impact, which often involved higher costs and longer delivery time, to the detriment of smaller and quicker projects.
- Acknowledged the benefits to cyclists and pedestrians resulting from the Mill Road bridge closure, with one Member suggesting that the road infrastructure along Mill Road could be improved to produce further benefits.

While considering the aspects of the report related to creating space for sustainable transport and discouraging car use, the Joint Assembly:

- Clarified that a revised network hierarchy would be based on the varying purposes and uses of roads, such as for access, residential buildings or shopping. An assessment would be made of how the current network could be categorised in order to promote public transport, cycling and walking. The County Council, as the highway authority, would lead on the project although the GCP would participate, including input from the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, and the resulting hierarchy would be delivered through a strategic framework of road-space

reallocation measures, including Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders alongside standard Traffic Regulation Orders.

- Noted that the parking strategy would seek to improve parking management in a way that promoted sustainable transport, although it was acknowledged that income from parking charges was an important source of revenue to the local authorities. The Head of Transport and Strategy identified several factors that affected people's parking choices, including cost, availability and reliability, and argued that all such factors needed to be considered in the development of an integrated parking strategy.
- Emphasised the importance of persuading a large number of people to change their travel habits by making sustainable options easier, cheaper and more attractive. It was suggested that reallocation of road space and removal of parking were effective ways to achieve this.
- Expressed frustration that the implementation of Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) had been paused by the County Council in 2020, noting residents' widespread support for the measures and their effectiveness in cutting pollution and improving parking behaviour.
- Acknowledged that the Citizens' Assembly had voted strongly for the reallocation of road space as its preferred scheme, particularly for closing roads to cars, while an integrated parking strategy had been third on its list.
- Highlighted the importance of reducing the number of cars entering the city centre given the high levels of growth that were planned around Cambridge.
- Emphasised that pollution levels would not be lowered by simply concentrating congestion on to fewer roads, which would concurrently intensify problems for public transport travelling along such roads.
- Argued that the demand management measures detailed in the report were relatively mild in effectiveness and lacked an over-arching strategy.

While considering the aspects of the report related to reducing pollution and emissions, the Joint Assembly:

- Sought clarification on the timeline for the proposed conversion to a Euro VI bus fleet. The Head of Transport and Strategy indicated that the target was to achieve a complete Euro VI fleet within months, as opposed to years, and she noted that it was possible to upgrade buses instead of replacing them with new ones. Discussions were ongoing with bus operators to identify buses and costs.
- Established that the CPCA had not been able to bid for the government's fund for an all-electric bus fleet due to a requirement to be able to upgrade its whole fleet within a certain level of funding, which was not possible due to the size of the Cambridge bus fleet. The Head of Transport and Strategy assured members that the successful bids would be analysed by both the GCP and the CPCA in anticipation of similar opportunities arising in the future.

- Argued that the proposed measures were not strong enough, lacked ambition and had already been tried. The Head of Transport and Strategy drew attention to the appraisal of options detailed in paragraph 5.14 of the report, which would identify consider ways to limit access to vehicles not meeting emissions criteria. She also acknowledged that it would be unreasonable to enforce targets on operators in the current climate, as they had no resources with which to upgrade buses.

While considering the aspects of the report related to the overall comprehensive package, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concern that the GCP was not taking enough action to counter the risk of a car-based recovery once Covid-19 lockdown restrictions were removed in June 2021. It was observed that the future measures and milestones listed in section 8 of the report would not be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board until after this date, and it was suggested that the package of short-term measures approved by the Executive Board in February 2020 should be implemented by the time lockdown restrictions were eased. The Head of Strategy noted that measures approved in February 2020 were mostly proceeding, although some that were related to public transport had not been able to progress due to a number of reasons, including Department for Transport regulations and restrictions on the use of public transport. The Transport Director emphasised that no local authority or organisation had yet been able to develop a recovery plan for public transport due to its ongoing reliance on financial support from the government.
- Endorsed a holistic and integrated approach to the wide range of schemes and activities across the GCP programme, in a way that aligned the individual schemes but also made it clear to people what their purpose was and how they fitted in to an overarching strategy.
- Argued that the City Access Strategy failed to live up to the Citizens' Assembly call for the GCP to be bold.

As a result of the discussion on members' concerns about the pace of action following the lifting of restrictions not aligning with the Citizens' Assembly's call for a bold approach, it was unanimously agreed to convey the following key message to the Executive Board:

The Joint Assembly asks the Board to apply a bolder vision and to speed implementation, to get in place actions that can make a difference in relation to the 21st June trigger point and in particular focussing on alternatives to this becoming a car-based recovery.

7. Quarterly Progress Report

One public question was received from Michael Page (on behalf of the Hurst Park Estate and Milton Road Residents' Associations). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Ian Manning, County Councillor for Chesterton division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Noting that the budget proposal included a return of the unspent element of the Residents Parking Implementation budget to the City Centre Access budget, as indicated in section 15.11 of the report, Councillor Manning emphasised that the project had not been completed and multiple areas were still waiting to resolve parking issues. He expressed concern that such a reallocation could be misinterpreted as a lack of funding for future RPS implementations, which could then cause further delays. The Head of Strategy and Programme clarified that there would not be a reduction in RPS funding and explained that the incorporation of the funding into the City Centre Access budget would enable consideration of resident parking as part of the wider integrated parking strategy.

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Attention was drawn to the completion of the procurement process for a new skills contract, which had resulted in Form the Future being selected to continue working with Cambridge Regional College to deliver the new service from 1st April 2021. It was also noted that the report contained the multi-year budget strategy, including the detailed GCP budgets for 2021/22.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the new skills contract with Form the Future and endorsed the organisation, recognising its success throughout the previous contract.
- Drew attention to the importance of smart signalling in being able to control the road network and reduce the number of cars entering Cambridge.
- Clarified that the Autonomous Vehicle Project had been delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions impacting on the ability to carry out trials.
- Suggested that the GCP should encourage partners at the BMC to improve communication to the public on transport matters, such as the variety of travel options available for people visiting the site. The Head of Strategy and Programme assured members that the GCP was involved in work that brought together different partners at the BMC in order to achieve such objectives.
- Sought clarification on why the Fulbourn / Cherry Hinton Eastern Access section of the Cross-City Cycle Improvements project had been identified with a red RAG status. It was confirmed that there was an outstanding issue related to a floating bus stop and that further explanation would be included in the report to the Executive Board.
- Observed that the Chisholm Trail project had been identified with a green RAG status despite recently receiving a 45% increase to its budget. The Transport Director confirmed that the status was correct although acknowledged that further context should be included in the Executive Board's report.
- Noted that a decision on the planning application for the West of Cambridge Package scheme had been expected by the County Council Planning Committee

in January 2021 and queried whether its subsequent deferral would impact the development of other travel hubs that had been submitted. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that the County Council had been informed of a possible call-in by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, which would be confirmed in May 2021, and any consideration by the Planning Committee would be subject to that decision. He confirmed that each travel hub was considered on a case-by-case basis and any further call-ins would be based on their individual size and location.

- Confirmed that the Cambridge South East Transport project was no longer a study and would cease to be referred to as such.
- Supported the concerns expressed by Councillor Manning regarding the return of unspent RPS funding to the City Centre Access budget. The Transport Director acknowledged that the wording could be misconstrued but assured the Joint Assembly that it was simply an accounting move and that the RPS funding would remain available for the schemes.
- Queried whether any of the £1.5m that had been allocated for the Eastern Access project, as indicated in paragraph 15.7 of the report, would be spent on the development of Coldham's Lane. The Transport Director noted that the inclusion of Coldham's Lane in the project had been discussed during the consultation phase and informed members that an update would be provided when a report was presented at the meeting in June 2021.

8. 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 Figure 1 in paragraph 4.2 of the report, which set out a summary of the application and delivery process, with consultants likely to be able to make a recommendation in late 2021. It was noted that £200k of the £25m budget was being requested to develop the project's next stages.

Emphasising that electricity grid capacity constraints represented a barrier to growth and the delivery of homes and jobs in the region, the Chief Executive argued that they also inhibited the GCP's aspirations around the electrification of transport solutions. She noted that utility providers were restricted to operating reactively to confirmed demand and that this was problematic in the Greater Cambridge area due to its high growth forecasts. 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 where the issue in Greater Cambridge would become critical.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly considered whether the proposed new infrastructure would be sufficient for the anticipated levels of growth in the area or whether the GCP would be required to install further infrastructure in a few years' time.

Acknowledging the concerns, the Programme Manager reassured members that the GCP was working with the Local Plan team to evaluate future demand levels in order to establish the necessary level of infrastructure. She also suggested that the project would look to deliver step increases in capacity over time.

9. 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 10th 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 while reducing its reliance on third parties.

The Chairperson emphasised that the decision to approve additional funding had already been made by the Executive Board, acknowledging that the request had been made without prior consideration by the Joint Assembly due to the fact that the issue was urgent and had arisen in between their respective meetings. He informed members that at the Executive Board meeting he had expressed concern about the situation on behalf of the Joint Assembly and supported the need to review the project's management in order to avoid similar problems in the future.

10. Date of Future Meetings

The Chairperson noted that although the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 3rd June 2021, it was likely to be rearranged to accommodate the nomination of members to the GCP by the constituent councils following the local elections on 6th May 2021. Details would be confirmed as soon as possible.

Chairperson
10th June 2021

Appendix A – 1st April 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

Questioner	Question	Response
<p>Matthew Danish on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,550 members that works for more, better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities in the Greater Cambridge region.</p> <p>We have the following comments and questions for the Joint Assembly, stemming from agenda item 6 'Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy':</p> <p>We welcome the introduction of new proposals to deal with cycling 'missing links' in the Greater Cambridge region. In general, we believe that the GCP will gain excellent value for its money by building a network of high-quality cycle routes suitable for all ages and abilities. There is much need for improvement throughout the region, and while the routes identified are relevant, we have questions about how they were prioritised in the Active Travel Study document that accompanies the agenda.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Why at this stage were certain 'key cycle connections' left out of the evaluation, and will they be added as the project moves forward? For example, Arbury Road (east) is one of the most important cycle links in the area without any infrastructure; it has been identified by the LCWIP, it is marked as a 'key cycle connection', but otherwise it has been left out of the Active Travel Study. Likewise for Barnwell Road and Brooklands Avenue. (2) Will the GCP commit to using LTN 1/20 as the basis for designing high-quality cycling infrastructure? We are concerned that some of the specific 'gap analysis' sections in the Active Travel Study make low-quality suggestions that would be worse than nothing, such as shared-use pavements or narrow advisory cycle lanes. (3) What were the criteria for the ranking of Cycling Missing Links in Table 1 of agenda item 6 and what were the specific numbers for each item? 	<p>The GCP is making a significant investment in the local cycling network, with more than £115m going into 12 Greenways, the Chisholm Trail, A10 cycle route and a series of cross-city cycle projects – as outlined in the Budget presented alongside the Quarterly Progress Report. In addition, active travel routes will also be provided as part of the GCP's four corridor schemes, and both the Histon and Milton Road projects significantly improving these routes for cycling.</p> <p>Beyond this investment, and that made by local partners including the County Council through the government's Active Travel Fund, the study aims to identify potential gaps in the network and consider how these could be addressed. The methodology for selecting routes is set out in the published study. As already stated, Arbury Road is included in the County Council's Active Travel programme. The Brooklands Avenue/Hills Rd junction is included in the Hills Rd route but Brooklands Avenue itself doesn't score highly for cycling potential and is not included in the LCWIP. Officers are proposing that the GCP seeks comments on where any additional City Deal funding for cycling should be targeted through a public consultation.</p> <p>The guidance in LTN 1/20 will significantly inform and influence the design of future measures.</p> <p>The criteria for the initial appraisal of the cycling missing links is set out on pages 25 and 26 of the published study, including the scores and ranking for each link.</p>

Appendix A – 1st April 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

<p>Rosalind Lund, Chair Arbury Road East Residents Association (ARERA)</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Why is Arbury Road South absent from the prioritised list of missing links for the GCP's Future Investment Strategy? Agenda Item 6, para 5.8 on the draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) provides an initial prioritised list of missing links (table 1 p31). But table1 (p135) shows the Arbury Road "corridor" as complete. It is not. Arbury Road from North Cambridge Academy to Milton Road has no cycle provision. It is a narrow road with parking on pavements. It and Union Lane are a missing link in the corridor to the cycle bridge across to Newmarket Road or to Cambridge North station.</p> <p>When SQW evaluated this 'corridor' in 2019, it only considered Phases 1 and 2 of the GCP's improvements and judged that was 'complete'. Mike Davies, then Director of Cycling for GCP/CCC, disagreed. He offered to hold a workshop on how to improve cycling and pedestrian provision on the remainder of Arbury Road in October 2019. After his departure, the Cycling Team (January 2020) refused to hold this workshop because of imminent improvement works on Histon Road.</p> <p>CCC's LCWIP indicates that Arbury Road South (same section as above) and Union Lane should be treated as a "prioritised cycling route" implemented in the "short term" and recommends "consider making this section of Arbury Road one way in order to provide on-road cycle lanes or put in modal filter". The CCC's Highways Committee has already agreed that such a modal filter should be in the second tranche of government supported measures to combat COVID and reduce pollution. This should be shown high on the GCP's list of priorities.</p>	<p>As you have set out, both Arbury Road and Union Lane are included in the County Council's Active Travel Fund list and therefore are not included in this study as that programme would provide government funding for these schemes.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix A – 1st April 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

<p>Michael Page on behalf of the Hurst Park Estate and Milton Road Residents' Associations and County Councillor Jocelynn Scutt Chair of Milton Road LLF</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7: Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>In reference to pages 123 and 129 of Agenda item 7; it is stated in 12.8 that in order to manage network capacity, construction of Milton Road was delayed to coincide with the completion of the Histon Road works - and in 12.9 it states that the Histon Road works remain on schedule for completion by the summer of this year.</p> <p>However in 15.9 there is an assumption that construction on Milton Road will not begin until April 2022 – approx. 10 months later.</p> <p>You may remember that public consultation on the Milton Rd project started in December 2015 and was followed by years of hotly debated but productive work between the project team and stakeholders including residents' associations and the Local Liaison Forum. This resulted in a Final Concept design and Strategic Outline Business Case approved by the Board in the summer of 2018. A Final Design including landscaping was approved by the Board in March 2019 and a frozen 2D design was released in June 2020 with further engineering design details completed by the end of last year.</p> <p>Question 1 to officers: What is the reason for a further 10 month delay to the start of construction? Is it really necessary after all the time that has been available to prepare during the Histon Rd works?</p> <p>Question 2 to Assembly members: Are you content to allow another year to pass by without challenge before construction starts on what should be a shovel-ready, oven-ready project, while sections of Milton Road continue to crumble and disintegrate?</p>	<p>The suggested slight delay to the commencement of construction of the Milton Road scheme to the 1st of April 2022, follows previous concerns from a number of stakeholders that we should not run two major projects, both in the north of the city, back to back without allowing a settling in period following the completion of Histon Road.</p> <p>A gap between the project also allows for any snagging issues on Histon Road to be addressed, and provides a small window of opportunity for any urgent utility, or maintenance works that have been on hold while Histon Road has been under construction.</p>
--	--	---