



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Thursday 12th September 2019
2:00 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

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

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance

Councillor Ian Bates	GCP Portfolio Holder for Transport
----------------------	------------------------------------

Officers

Peter Blake	Director of Transport (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Jo Sainsbury and Helen Valentine.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Davey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report (item 6), as he was formerly the Chief Executive of the Connections service and his wife was currently the Assistant Director of Housing, Communities and Youth at the County Council.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to a number of matters referred to in the Quarterly Progress Report (item 6), including careers advice, apprenticeships, electric car sales and Project Spring as a result of his involvement in either Cambridge Ahead and/or Marshalls Limited.

Dr Andy Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report (item 6) due to AstraZeneca's involvement in Project Spring and Form the Future.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 6th June 2019, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following correction (removal in strikethrough, addition in bold):

- “The Director of Transport recognised the concerns and noted that it would be hard to justify the cost-if the park and ride site was only intended as a temporary project **of tunnels.**”
(second sentence of third bullet point in Minute 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub)

The Chief Executive provided the Joint Assembly with an update on the Citizens Assembly referred to in Minute 8, noting that the first of two sessions had been hosted the previous weekend. 56 of the 60 participants attended the debates, of which videos had been livestreamed and uploaded to YouTube. The experimental new form of democratic engagement was so far judged to have been a success and the next session, to be held over the second weekend of October, would go into greater detail and attempt to find possible solutions to the area's transport problems.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that six public questions had been submitted and accepted. It was agreed that five of the questioners would be called to address the Joint Assembly at the start of agenda item 7 (Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements: Final Design), with the remaining questioner to be called at the start of agenda item 8 (Madingley Road Cycle and Walking Project).

5. PETITIONS

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

6. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme. Attention was drawn to the request for funding made by Cambridge Ahead, as laid out in section 6 of the report, as well as the allocation process for Section 106 contributions, which had previously been requested by the Joint Assembly and was detailed in section 15 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concern that the report showed that only 13 people had started apprenticeships since March 2019, which suggested that it would be difficult to obtain the target of 420 apprentices by March 2021. The Head of Strategy and Programme informed members that the data in the report only contained numbers that had been verified by the Department of Education and that the target of 420 apprenticeships had in fact potentially already been passed. The Chief Executive also noted that the Joint Assembly had agreed to move towards a more focussed contract and deliberative intervention, and this was not represented by the numbers in the report. A further update would be provided once verification of the numbers had been received, while steps would be taken to make this clear in future reports.
- Welcomed the research that had been proposed by RAND Europe and given the fact that local authorities no longer provided careers advice in schools, it was considered beneficial for the GCP to discover where it should focus attention in the future. It was suggested that the issue of careers advice should be discussed with actual providers of careers advice and not just school head teachers and that the results of the research should be considered by the GCP once it had been completed.
- Requested greater clarity on the scope of the RAND research, drawing attention to the use of the word 'schools' in the first bullet point of section 6.2 and its lack of clarification over the type of schools involved. The Head of Strategy and Programme committed to obtaining further information from RAND regarding the scope of the research. It was also established that a timetable for the research project could not be finalised until funding had been obtained, although it was hoped to begin during autumn. At that point, consideration could be given to undertaking further work focussing on the quality of the service being provided.
- Sought clarification on the age group of the students that had engaged in the apprenticeship activities detailed in section 5.5 of the report. Members were advised that they would be provided with the information as long as it did not breach General Data Protection Regulation rules.
- Noted the companies listed in the report that had pledged to recruit apprentices within the coming year and queried whether other companies, such as pharmacies, had been approached. The Head of Strategy and Programme agreed to encourage providers to seek as many placements as possible.

- Discussed how the wayfinding solutions had been received at Cambridge central train station. Members were informed that the simpler elements, such as real time data being read from a screen, had been used more frequently than the more complex elements, such as those involving buttons. Evaluation was ongoing and would inform the next steps. Further hotspots were being identified for wayfinding technology across the city, including at the biomedical campus.
- Noted that a detailed analysis of the data collected during the Mill Road bridge closure would be carried out over the following six months, although members were informed that the situation had been complicated by unplanned incidents in the area and this had affected the data. It was also acknowledged that there was widespread support for expanding the methodology in to further areas of city planning. The Chief Executive confirmed that residents' calls for part of the road to be pedestrianised would be considered in the context of work on City Access and Spaces and Movement Planning Guidance.
- Clarified that the data and analysis produced by Geospock, as outlined in section 13, would be made available to the public in the future.
- Remarked on the green 'RAG' status of the Fulbourn / Cherry Hinton Eastern Access project, noting that work had been suspended until summer in 2020 and that it was to be incorporated into another project that was already a number of years behind schedule. It was argued that the current status should therefore be reclassified as red and the Director of Transport agreed to review the project's status.
- Requested an update on developments of the Oakington Travel Hub, following the Executive Board's agreement in March for an alternative location to be considered. The Director of Transport informed members that he had attended a meeting with the GCP Portfolio Holder for Transport and Oakington Parish Council, and that the results of the discussions would be reported to the Joint Assembly at a future meeting.
- Welcomed the clarification of the allocation process for section 106 contributions, given the complex division of responsibilities for transport across the different levels of local government, although it was noted that similar confusion also existed over highways advice. Members also reiterated the need for coherence in the travel strategies of the different bodies that the GPC worked with, such as the Combined Authority and England's Economic Heartland, and asked to be informed of any opposing plans or strategies.
- Suggested that the anticipated £30k overspend on the Greenways Development this financial year was due to mistakes when initially setting the budget. The Director of Transport observed that additional work had been required and that it was preferable to ensure the project was completed properly rather than sticking to an exact budget line.
- Established that the Cambridge South train station was in the second stage of the Network Rail's Guide to Rail Investment Process, with the intention being to reach the third stage within the following 12 months. While development funding of just under £11m was already in place, the development process would establish further funding options, including accurate assessments of how the funding would be used not only in the immediate short-term, but also in the years ahead.

- Requested that the money saved from the projected £120k underspend on Residential Parking Schemes be reserved for the unsuccessful schemes being potentially reconsidered in the future.
- Suggested that it was the responsibility of UK Power Networks, as opposed to the GCP, to fund research into how it could fulfil its duty of delivering Grid capacity faced by the new developments in and around Cambridge. The Chief Executive acknowledged the concern and informed the Joint Assembly that it was a question of timing, as the developers were unable to provide the upfront costs of increasing the network capacity and to not increase the capacity would hold up progress of the new developments. Members argued that providing temporary funding to increase infrastructure capacity was different to carrying out a study on where such infrastructure was needed, but the Joint Assembly was reminded that members had previously agreed to the expense on the basis that it would develop the understanding of growth and its needs. It was also noted that utility companies operated on different planning cycles to local authorities and were not under any obligation to consider planned new developments until they had received planning permission.
- Established that interviews for the Gateway Review had been completed by Government consultants and a report was expected by early 2020.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Ian Manning, County Councillor Champion for Evidence informed Policy who, following a brief introduction, invited two PhD students from the University of Cambridge's Department of Engineering to introduce the findings of the Cambridge University Science and Policy Exchange (CUSPE) study on reducing air pollution and congestion across Cambridgeshire, as detailed in section 17 of the report. The Joint Assembly was informed that carbon dioxide levels across Cambridgeshire could be expected to drop by around 27% by 2050, largely due to technological improvements and governance, but it was suggested that this was not an ambitious target given climate change. Attention was drawn to the findings that an average vehicle produced emissions between 200% and 300% higher than those declared and that levels of air pollution on the roads in the city centre had been repeatedly recorded above the legal limit. After mirroring case studies that had been carried out across the world, the study's findings had led to the recommendations laid out in the report, although it was stressed that the recommendations should be considered as minimum targets and accompany other projects and objectives as part of an over-riding agenda.

While discussing the findings of the CUSPE study, the Joint Assembly:

- The findings of the report would be considered in further detail by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in November and December, as part of the forthcoming item on City Access.
- Welcomed the study and its findings, recommending that it be submitted for consideration by any local authorities involved in developing transport strategies.
- Observed that the statistics regarding the percentage of journeys being made by bus, cycling or walking, as set out in paragraph 17.3, would be more useful with a differentiation between the alternative modes of transport, rather than being combined in to one figure.

- Commented that the prioritised modes of travel mentioned in paragraph 17.4 should include practical, affordable and reliable modes of transport, as well as sustainable ones.
- Argued that vehicles were not tested under road conditions and that discrepancies in emission levels were not necessarily down to impropriety, although it was acknowledged that the test cycles had been found to be unrepresentative.
- Suggested that different transports could have been categorised by technology, such as diesel or electric, rather than just characteristics, as that would promote innovation. It was considered unlikely that a superior alternative to electric vehicles would be discovered and produced widely before 2030, and therefore current policies and strategies should be focussed on that technology. It was suggested that such focus should include new homes having fast electric charging points, the grid's capacity being increased and buses across the county being replaced by electric vehicles.
- Queried why trains had not been included in the list of sustainable modes of transport and it was noted that while trains were a major form of transport on a regional level and in many other urban areas around the country, this was not the case on a county level across Cambridgeshire.
- Considered that the 60% targets included in the recommendations would be based largely on transport within and around the city, as opposed to more rural areas, and this implied that the target within the city would be significantly higher in order to achieve an overall 60% target across the County.
- Requested further assistance from the research team in the future, including on issues such as considering whether the variables for reducing emissions and improving air quality could be separated or were too intrinsically linked to be treated as separate issues. It was suggested that although the two problems often shared the same solutions, considering them as separate issues attracted a broader range of interest, discussion and action.
- Sought clarification on whether the recommendations could be compared to the GPC's current targets, given the difference in variables and goals, and if so whether they could be incorporated to the overall strategy in any way. It was acknowledged that the study had been based on research from across Cambridgeshire, whereas the GCP's remit was a smaller area around the city of Cambridge. The Director of Transport suggested that the targets outlined in the findings broadly coincided with those of the GCP, although he also observed that the promotion of electric vehicles would be beneficial in an environmental sense, but would have little impact on congestion.
- Enquired whether the figures mentioned in paragraph 17.4 of the report included total carbon dioxide emissions or only those related to transport and given that the national target was to be net zero by 2050, what would need to be done in the intervening years between 2030 and 2050 to achieve such a goal. It was suggested that carbon sequestration would be necessary to reach net zero levels and members were informed that this was considered in a further CUSPE study.
- Established that the study looked at public transport and not freight transport, noting that HGV's were estimated to produce 58% of emissions by the latter group.

7. HISTON ROAD BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS: FINAL DESIGN

Lilian Runblad, the Vice Chair of the Histon Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) attended the meeting to report on the outcome of the LLF meeting held on 22nd July 2019.

Public questions were invited from Anna Williams, Lilian Runblad, Judith Perry and Anna Crutchley. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** to the minutes.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained details of the final design for Histon Road and the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board on 3rd October 2019. Attention was drawn to paragraph 3.18, and members were informed that alternative arrangements were still being discussed with Stagecoach and further information would be provided at the Executive Board meeting. It was noted that the Histon Road LLF had supported the option of a shorter closure over a longer one and members were also informed that minor adjustments would potentially be made to the landscaping aspect of the design.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that it was not only Histon Road residents that would be affected by the diversion of the local bus, as users from the entire length of the bus route would be affected. Members expressed concern that there had not been wider consultation with this community, including Cottenham, specifically noting the extra time and cost burden placed on students who already had to cross the city to reach schools and colleges. It was acknowledged that County Councillors for the affected wards had been included in consultations and that there was also a limit to the extent of the consultations that were possible. The Chairperson added that as local County Councillor he had raised this at a recent meeting with the Parish Council.
- Questioned why road markings for cyclists at the north approach to the Gilbert Road/Warwick Road junction were different for cyclists approaching from the south. It was also suggested that there was an error on the detailed plans, which did not show any of the new, 'proposed trees' in blue outline. Members also sought clarification of the status of the trees shown on the penultimate page of the designs, going out towards the A14, which were shown as scheduled for removal for no apparent reason. Officers undertook to look into these matters and provide a detailed response.
- Argued that the proposed double yellow lines (DYL) in the southern part of Histon Road would unfairly affect local residents, given that other short-term visitors to the area were liable to ignore the parking restrictions and not be punished, whereas those who lived in the area would be forced to find alternative locations for parking. Members sought clarification on how the DYL restrictions would be enforced and the Director of Transport confirmed that it was an issue for the County Council to consider.
- Proposed the imposition of a 20mph speed limit, given that the new layout would establish a straight and uncluttered road. It was also suggested that a speed indicator device, potentially solar-powered, could also assist in reducing the speed of traffic flow.

- Expressed concern over the impacts that the works and traffic diversions would have on the surrounding neighbourhoods and other major traffic routes, especially by HGVs. It was noted that residents in these areas had been suffering from the effects of other major works over recent months and years and that they might appreciate a period of calm before experiencing further disruptions. The Portfolio Holder for Transport also acknowledged the concerns about HGVs using alternative routes, but observed that stopping them from using one road would just force them down another and that there would always be residents somewhere who suffered as a result.
- Welcomed confirmation that the proposals would result in a net gain in natural capital, but stressed the need to secure commitment from the relevant authority to accept responsibility for ongoing maintenance.
- Enquired about the possibility of planting edible plants to create a roadside garden and the Director of Transport undertook to investigate.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly had not voiced any strong objections to the proposed recommendations and therefore endorsed them with the Assembly's support.

The Joint Assembly noted that Lilian Runblad intended to step down as Vice Chairperson of the Histon Road LLF. The Chairperson on behalf of members thanked her for her support and contribution to the work of the LLF.

8. MADINGLEY ROAD CYCLE AND WALKING PROJECT

Karen Weimer, the Secretary of the Madingley Road Area Residents' Association was invited to ask her public question, the details of which are set out in **Appendix A** to the minutes, along with a summary of the response.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which included the results of local stakeholder engagement and proposals to commence a public consultation exercise on proposals for the scheme. It was noted that this stage of the process, which was effectively a pre-consultation, had been conceived following a review of the processes of previous schemes. Discussing the options with local stakeholders before the consultation stage would allow for a stronger, more informed and more participatory consultation.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the early stage of local engagement and the benefits that it would potentially bring to the project and noted the positive feedback received. Members hoped this would be replicated for other similar schemes.
- Observed that it was not clear from the plans where bus stops would be located or how they would be accessed with regards to the bicycle lanes. The Director of Transport agreed that it would be clearer in future reports.
- Expressed frustration that the project was being forced into a compromise due to the narrow width of a bridge and suggested that it was unfortunate that all too often proposals were compromised rather than seeking to solve the underlying problem. The

Director of Transport acknowledged the concerns but stressed that it in this instance was not possible to build a wider highway.

- Noted that Madingley Road provided a particularly green entrance to the city and that the design stage should bear this in mind and not detract from it.
- Suggested that university students would be a key demographic affected by the project, and that it would be important to proactively engage them in the consultations.
- Observed the proximity to the Adams Road bicycle route and the need to avoid excessive and unnecessary crossings.
- Sought clarification on the final budget given the very broad estimate covered in the report. The Director of Transport acknowledged that it was a broad figure but informed the Joint Assembly that it was only intended as a guide at this stage and the final budget would depend on the result of the proposed consultations.

The Chairperson surmised that there had been no challenges to the recommendations to be passed on to the Executive Board.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday 21st November 2019 at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne. However, given the fact that the agenda contained an extensive number of items for consideration, it was proposed that the meeting be rearranged to 10:00 a.m. with a morning and afternoon session separated by a lunch break. The general consensus was in favour of adopting such a change and it was agreed that final confirmation of the meeting time would be circulated to members.

Chairperson
21st November 2019

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

No	Questioner	Question	Recommendation Rationale Chair's response
1.	Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes the upcoming improvements to Histon Road. We thank officers for including a protected junction at Gilbert Road and strongly support effective continuous footway designs at side roads. Along with the removal of parked cars, the changes to this road will improve safety for those cycling or walking.</p> <p>However, we seek reassurance that this scheme is being built and considered in the context of a comprehensive cycle network that will connect all areas of the city, and reach out to surrounding villages. We seek reassurance that the current levels of investment in cycling will continue after the end of this year. We seek reassurance that all cycle schemes are being planned with the aim of encouraging cycling for all, including unaccompanied child cyclists, those with larger cycles, those with disabilities and those travelling to destinations other than work.</p> <p>We note that the CUSPE Study on Reducing Air Pollution and Congestion recommends that walking, cycling and public transport make up a minimum of 60% of travel in Cambridgeshire in 2030. Evidence shows that to rapidly increase modal shift, isolated sections of high-quality cycle facilities will not be enough. The Greater Cambridge Partnership must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to build high-quality cycling infrastructure, connecting it up to create a network suitable for all. • Tackle dangerous junctions (75% of collisions involving a cycle occur at junctions. The changes at King's Hedges Road and Victoria Road do not go far 	<p>The comments regarding the Histon Road scheme are welcomed.</p> <p>The GCP is committed to putting in place a comprehensive network of safe, attractive and direct cycling routes over the coming years.</p> <p>The Greenways Project is aimed at creating links out from Cambridge to surrounding villages. Other schemes such as Madingley Road cycling improvements are also in the early stages of development.</p> <p>Major schemes such as the South East Transport link, Cambourne to Cambridge, and the A10 corridor improvements will all contain significant cycling and walking elements.</p>

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>enough to improve actual and perceived safety for cyclists).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement bold demand-management schemes to encourage people to switch away from driving. <p><i>Camcycle would like to ask the Joint Assembly to confirm that Histon Road is being considered as part of a comprehensive cycle network and that investment in cycling will continue at or above existing levels into the second tranche of City Deal funding.</i></p>	
2.	Lilian Rundblad on behalf of the Histon Road Residents Association	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements</p> <p><i>Air Quality Histon Road</i></p> <p>A representation from HRARA was noted in the TRO Consultation without a reply (page 79 of 183 in the Agenda for GCP Joint Assembly 12th September 2019). It was a follow up of the Executive Board decision on March 20, 2019, to introduce Air Pollution controls before, under and after the construction phase for the Histon Road Project. The data should be displayed and easily available to the public.</p> <p>With only a month to go before the construction of the road starts it seems logical that data and analysis should already be available.</p> <p>HRARA requests that the “BEFORE” analysis be available regularly from NOW and on. And that information regarding the display of the data and where to find it is given to the public.</p>	<p>Air Quality monitoring is currently undertaken by Cambridge City Council who publish an annual monitoring report at: https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/6048/air-quality-annual-status-report-2018.pdf. As well as publishing data on air quality in the City, the report also sets out a lot of detail about either the measures already in place or that are proposed to be implemented with aim of improving air quality and reducing traffic related pollution.</p> <p>This monitoring includes two locations on Histon Road where diffusion tubes are used to monitor nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels: https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/3448/air-pollution-diffusion-tubes-map.pdf</p> <p>In order to provide further detail on the contribution of vehicles to air quality on Histon Road, traffic/vehicle monitoring cameras have recently been installed in two locations on Histon Road and are in the process of being calibrated. These cameras will also be able to differentiate between types of vehicles including cycles.</p> <p>Once the cameras are up and running and data starts to be collected the GCP will start looking at ways in which the data can be effectively shared with the public, most likely via an online portal.</p>

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

			<p>The cameras are scheduled to operate over a period of 5 years and will therefore be used for post scheme monitoring.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Lilian Rundblad on behalf of the Histon Road Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements</p> <p><i>Construction Management Plan (pages 131-155) Appendix D</i></p> <p>HRARA is well aware that a project like Histon Road will cause severe air and noise pollution during the construction period. On page 136 in the Construction Management Plan hours of work: Monday-Friday day working 7:30 to 18:00 Saturday working 7:30 to 16:00 Monday-Sunday Night Works 20:00 to 6:00 at time of carriageway surfacing</p> <p>GCP promises on page 42 - No Night Time HGVs from A14 on Histon Road during the Construction period. GCP has not proposed any TRO for speed limit, weight restrictions, ANPR but contrary states there will be no restrictions on the outbound lane Histon Road. During 1 ½ years, Histon Road residents have experienced just how little the HGV drivers care to follow any signage used by Highways. A14 diversion routes start at 21:00 to 6:00. It does not take much imagination to see that Histon Road residents will not have any longer periods for rest and sleep. This is a health issue that must be taken seriously.</p> <p>HRARA request GCP to guarantee that there will be no diversion night time HGV traffic on Histon Road during the construction period and suggest that Automatic Number Plate Recognition ANPR be installed between Huntingdon road junction to Kings Hedges Road to discourage deviation from the designated diversion routes M11 and A505.</p>	<p>Histon Road will be closed in the inbound direction for the duration of the works, it is logical that this in turn will block HGVs from accessing Histon Road from the A14.</p> <p>The GCP does not intend to put in place any restrictions on Histon Road in the outbound direction so this means that All vehicles will be able to leave the city centre via Histon Road at all times of the day.</p> <p>GCP will monitor the situation both before and during the works using the new cameras on Histon Road, and will be able to make further recommendation to the County Council as the highway authority with regard to addressing issues such as night time HGV traffic so that an appropriate course of action can be pursued.</p>

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

<p>4.</p>	<p>Judith Perry on behalf of Benson Area Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements</p> <p><i>Removal of Parking on Histon Road</i></p> <p>Officers' comments to detailed objections (3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12) to installation of double yellow lines along Histon Road – all identical – did not answer detailed points raised.</p> <p>No evidence was presented addressing off-peak traffic which is light and flows freely. The problems addressed are during morning and evening peak hours five days a week.</p> <p>Off-peak parking was not studied, nor the BenRA survey showing weekend parking problems, justifying the officers' claim of adequate parking to compensate parking removal.</p> <p>Removal of parking cannot reduce (non-existing) off-peak congestion, however it carries the danger of attracting more traffic changing Histon Road from a quiet residential B-road to a high-speed arterial road.</p> <p>Decreasing travel time for buses is only achievable during peak hours, – parked cars do not increase off-peak travel time.</p> <p>Difficulties for residents needing work done on their houses, physical damage to houses from increased vibration, carers needing to park for an hour at a time, not only be 'dropped off', all were not addressed by officers. Possible danger to cyclists detailed in several objections cited above was also not addressed.</p> <p>Restricting parking only during peak times is amply demonstrated all over London and on Queens' Road (the Backs) where parking is restricted only in the morning rush hour despite its far heavier off-peak traffic Histon Road's.</p>	<p>One of the key priorities of the Histon Road scheme in to encourage a shift towards more sustainable modes of transport which include walking, cycling and public transport. Over time, such a shift aims to reduce the growth in traffic and congestion on Histon Road.</p> <p>Making the road safer for cyclists is a big part of making cycling a more attractive method of transport along this route therefore encouraging more people to use their cycle as their main mode of transport along this route.</p> <p>Histon Road as it is currently configured is particularly un-attractive to cyclists. This has been stated by member of the public at numerous engagement and consultation events. At the southern end of Histon Road the main issue is caused by the parking which forces cyclists to mix with the traffic in this area. This is a problem both at peak time and at non peak time. The scheme aims to provide a safe route for cycling at all times of the day, in both directions by providing continuous cycle lanes along the whole length of Histon Road.</p>
-----------	---	---	--

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>We object to blanket unnecessary off-peak parking removal and ask for a proper study of off-peak traffic including detrimental effects of parking removal.</p> <p>No adequate justification for applying solutions designed for the rush hour to the area 24/7 has been presented.</p> <p>Q1. Do you have any evidence that there is problem that needs to be addressed in off-peak hours?</p> <p>Q2. What is the justification for removal of parking in off-peak hours?</p>	
5.	<p>Anna Crutchley on behalf of Benson Area Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements</p> <p><i>Air Quality, Noise and Vibration</i></p> <p>Referring specifically to BenRA objections to the TRO as on page 61 of this meeting's agenda. We left the last Histon Road LLF meeting in July with an unclear picture of how the environmental monitoring on Histon Road would be carried out and we would like to follow up on this project and ask the GCP to provide us with more detailed information than in their stock response found in the agenda papers.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about air quality, noise and vibration at the south end of Histon Road, within the Benson Area parking zone, and whether the GCP so called 'improvements' will indeed make life better for residents and businesses.</p> <p>Without any monitoring before the work is started, any 'improvements' cannot ever be demonstrated and monitoring later will not be able to be used to evaluate the benefit or detriment of the exercise.</p> <p>Q1. Could GCP provide BenRA with details of:</p>	<p>As set out in the answer to Public Question 2:</p> <p>Air Quality monitoring is currently undertaken by Cambridge City Council who publish an annual monitoring report at https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/6048/air-quality-annual-status-report-2018.pdf As well as publishing data on air quality in the City, the report also sets out a lot of detail about either the measures already in place or that are proposed to be implemented with aim of improving air quality and reducing traffic related pollution.</p> <p>This monitoring includes two locations on Histon Road where diffusion tubes are used to monitor nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels. https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/3448/air-pollution-diffusion-tubes-map.pdf</p> <p>In order to provide further detail on the contribution of vehicles to air quality on Histon Road, traffic/vehicle monitoring cameras have recently been installed in two locations on Histon Road and are in the process of being calibrated. These cameras will also be able to differentiate</p>

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>a. the start and end dates of the monitoring, i.e. before and after the rebuilding of Histon Road?</p> <p>b. the methodology that is/will be employed?</p> <p>c. what the system will be for remedying any decrease in air quality or increase in noise and vibration?</p> <p>and following on from that:</p> <p>Q2. What is the future of the GCP after the Histon Road project is completed – i.e. who will be accountable for any failures in the GCP claims that the Histon Road project will improve the environment?</p>	<p>between types of vehicles including cycles, and will also be able to calculate journey time between the two points.</p> <p>Once the camera are up and running and data starts to be collected the GCP will start looking at ways in which the data can be effectively shared with the public, most likely via an online portal.</p> <p>The cameras are scheduled to operate over a period of 5 years and will therefore be used for post scheme monitoring.</p> <p>When the scheme is complete, it will be handed over to, and be maintained by the Local Highways Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Karen Wiemer (Secretary, Madingley Road Area Residents Association)</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Madingley Road Cycle and Walking Project</p> <p>I'd like to thank the Officers and Paul Rawlinson and the team working on this project for how much they have included residents along Madingley Road and listened to our comments during the pre-consultation phase and the speed at which the project seems to be progressing.</p> <p>My question mainly relates to safety and functionality of the proposed cycle paths. Option 1 includes long sections of cycle path adjacent the roadway with separation by a Cambridge kerb. How will vehicles be kept from using the cycle lane as a loading bay or waiting area? For both options, is there scope for adding another crossing in the section between Astronomy and Grange Road? For Option 1, there are no crossings between Madingley Rise and Storey's way and for Option 2 nothing between Astronomy and Storey's Way. A lot of people live along this area and will need to cross Madingley Road to access the cycle path in the right direction for their journey. An additional crossing would also help pedestrians get to the two bus stops along this section. For both options, is there any scope to improve the design at the very east end of the road? It remains pretty much unchanged and</p>	<p>Thank you for your words about the scheme.</p> <p>Cambridge Kerb is used in a number of areas in the City including Huntingdon Road. The differentiation in the kerb from the road, coupled with the colour of the cycle lane discourages people from driving onto these lanes for deliveries or waiting, there is no evidence of it being an issue elsewhere.</p> <p>If it were to become a problem, we could raise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to prevent unloading and waiting along the route.</p> <p>There are crossing areas on the options drawings at Grange Road, Storeys Way and Madingley Rise. The options are still being developed, We are looking at areas where crossings will be of benefit.</p> <p>The area East of Madingley Road near the Northampton Street roundabout is a narrow stretch that does not support opportunity for widening or segregation. We are in discussion with local landowners to</p>

12th September 2019 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>seems a missed opportunity given the level of foot and cycle traffic in this area. Will the design be future proofing for electric bikes? The establishment of a consistent 30mph speed limit along the length of Madingley Road is very welcome. Especially for Option1, would there be any scope to lower the speed limit given that the cycle path is mainly adjacent the roadway?</p>	<p>assess if a small area of land would be available along this stretch. If this is possible then we would look at further improvements along this area.</p> <p>In design terms electric bikes are treated in the same way as non-electric bikes. For future proofing we need to design infrastructure that will support a significant increase in cycling, including electric bikes. It was reported in the Environment Journal on 10 July 2019 that tens of thousands of e-bikes could be sold in the UK each year as improvements to bicycles and better cycling routes make cycling more popular.</p> <p>Road speed will continue to be monitored, the options will seek a 30mph limit along the road from Eddington into the city, and this recognises the expected growth in the use of cycles along this route.</p>
--	--	--	--