

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 30th January 2020
10:00 a.m. – 5:00 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 Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Dr Andy Williams	Business Representative
Jo Sainsbury	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative
Dr John Wells	University Representative

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers

Peter Blake	Director of Transport (GCP)
Laura Gates	Strategic Communications Manager (GCP)
Chris Malyon	Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer (CCC)
Lynne Miles	Interim Lead for Growth and Economy (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Heather Williams to her first meeting. Councillor Williams had replaced Councillor Peter Topping as a South Cambridgeshire District Council on the Joint Assembly. The Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor Topping for his contributions to Assembly discussions.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor H Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Greenways (agenda item 8) as a member of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee.

Helen Valentine declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Performance Report (agenda item 9) due to her involvement with 'It Takes a City'.

Councillor Massey declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Performance Report (agenda item 9) as the Cambridge City Council councillor for the Abbey ward.

Councillor J Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge (agenda item 10) as a regular user of Stagecoach bus routes 4 and X5, as well as Whippet bus route X3.

Councillor Wotherspoon declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge (agenda item 10) as an alumnus of Robinson College.

Councillor J Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Better Public Transport: Waterbeach to North East Cambridge (agenda item 11) due to South Cambridgeshire District Council owning the lease on two properties in the Science Park.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Better Public Transport: Eastern Access Project (agenda item 12) due to his employment at Marshalls of Cambridge.

Councillor Wotherspoon declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Whittlesford Station Transport Infrastructure Study (agenda item 13) as a member of the North Uttlesford Garden Community Local Delivery Board.

Councillor Davey declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest, due to his wife working as the Assistant Director of Housing, Communities and Youth at the County Council.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 12th September 2019, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that 22 public questions had been submitted and accepted. The Chairperson added that he had not made use of his discretion to reject similar questions, as he wished to include all those who had expressed an interest in participating. The questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item.

It was noted that 1 question related to agenda item 6 (Report and Recommendations of the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly), 4 questions related to agenda item 7 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy), 3 questions related to agenda item 8 (Greenways) and the remaining 14 questions related to agenda item 10 (Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge).

The Chairperson noted that a large number of letters and e-mails had also been received from members of the public and interested parties. Where correspondence was specifically directed at the 'decision makers', this had been passed on to Executive Board members.

5. PETITIONS

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly that no petitions had been submitted in line with the agreed petitions protocol. He did however note that a public question relating to agenda item 10 (Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge) referred to a petition.

6. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY

David Stoughton was invited to present his public question. The question and a summary of the response is provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which contained recommendations from the Citizens' Assembly that had been held in September and October 2019 to consider how to reduce congestion, improve air quality and provide better public transport in Greater Cambridge. She informed the Joint Assembly that the process included responding in full to the Assembly's recommendations and this would be brought to a future meeting, although the following item (agenda item 7, Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy) covered many of the issues raised by the Citizens' Assembly. She also noted that the participants had asked to continue to be involved beyond the immediate round of GCP meetings and for there to be a high level of transparency, monitoring and feedback.

Suzannah Lansdell, associate of Involve (the public participation charity that ran the Citizens' Assembly), informed members that the consultation had been part of a wider, national project called the Innovation in Democracy Programme. Two other Councils had also received funding but Greater Cambridge was acknowledged as leading the way in the experimental form of involving citizens in decision making. She noted that participants of the Citizens' Assembly had been selected at random and that they had engaged in extensive deliberation in order to develop a collective judgement rather than individual opinions. All participants had agreed that some form of intervention was needed, with road closures being the most popular choice across the board. Among the key messages that they wished to convey to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board were a call for bold and brave action, improvements to public transport and better integration and coordination of transport.

In a brief question and answer session, one of the participants of the Citizens' Assembly expressed her appreciation and pride at being involved, while also noting the seriousness with which the participants had accepted their responsibility.

While discussing the report and the process by which the Citizens' Assembly had been carried out, the Joint Assembly:

- Praised the participants for their work and recommendations, noting the urgency with which they had called for action on behalf of the GCP. Members were keen for the recommendations to be acted on, especially given the time and money that had been invested in the Citizens' Assembly process.
- Expressed appreciation for being able to watch a live stream of the Citizens' Assembly throughout the deliberations.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly had expressed overwhelming enthusiasm for the process and recommendations, noting the importance of keeping the participants involved as action progressed.

7. PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS AND CITY ACCESS STRATEGY

Public questions were invited from Mal Schofield, Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Dr Brian Robertson), Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle) and Lilian Runblad (on behalf of the Histon Road Residents' Association). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained an analysis of work carried out so far to establish options for the GCP to consider developing further, as well as a set of proposed immediate interventions, which would address issues related to public transport, congestion and air quality. The Joint Assembly's attention was drawn to the last line of paragraph 7.3.2 of the report, which should have stated that "journey times within the charge area decrease under all modelled scenarios", as opposed to "increase". The Head of Transport Strategy commented on the extensive list of background documents in Appendix 1 of the report and emphasised that the issues would become more aggravated if no action was taken. Identifying road space and revenue as the two key considerations, she informed members that modelling had been carried out on the various options available for consideration, although she highlighted the importance of developing a coherent overall strategy in order to see how the different approaches would impact on one another.

At the start of the Joint Assembly's discussion of the report, Councillor Bick proposed a recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Massey. A copy is attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**. He argued that it was important for the GCP to maintain momentum and address the over-riding issue of congestion. While identifying the need to connect the various GCP projects together in order to ensure their maximum benefits, he stressed the urgency with which this should be done given the growth throughout Greater Cambridge and the surrounding area, as well as the fact that local authorities and businesses had declared a climate emergency. He also emphasised the need for major improvements to the bus services in order to persuade residents, commuters and visitors not to travel by car. Placing emphasis on the importance of evidence-based decisions, he called for all

options to be evaluated and considered before they were rejected, and implored the GCP to take advantage of its lack of political majority to ensure that ideology and partisanship did not affect the process.

While discussing the report and Councillor Bick's proposed recommendation, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed support for the proposed recommendation, noting that multiple members of the Joint Assembly and beyond had contributed to its development.
- Suggested that a tipping point would soon be reached regarding the issues of congestion and air pollution, while some Members argued that the tipping point had already been reached.
- Expressed concerns over penalising people for using their cars to get to work, noting that they often did so after making a rational decision based on a calculation of cost and time. With reference to the Lessons from Elsewhere paper that was listed as a background document to the report, it was recognised that attempts to implement charges had often failed when they did not command widespread support from those affected. Other members noted that all the supporting documents seemed to support the concept of a charge, including those looking at the issue from a business perspective, and that all options should be kept on the table for consideration. It was also suggested that the debate on any potential congestion charge was preventing progress in other areas and should therefore be dealt with as a separate issue.
- Cautioned over allowing exemptions to any fiscal charge, particularly for residents, in order to ensure fairness and equality. It was noted that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was also exploring possible fiscal measures, particularly in regard to the development of the CAM metro.
- Expressed support for a greater usage of road closures, particularly as it had been identified as the most widely supported course of action by the Citizens' Assembly, and it was established that cities such as York, Birmingham and Edinburgh had implemented successful schemes. It was suggested that initial public scepticism would be overcome once schemes were implemented and the benefits became evident. Some Members, however, expressed concern that road closures simply displaced problems to other areas and did not represent an effective means of challenging congestion or pollution.
- Argued that pollution charging could also lead to the displacement of pollution to other areas.
- Considered the problems faced by the local bus services, including congestion in accessing the city centre and the lack of service to many smaller communities in Greater Cambridge and beyond. It was suggested that the service required financial investment immediately to ensure cheaper fares and shorter journey times could attract a greater number of travellers. Some members observed that they had encountered serious problems when trying to use the local bus service to attend the meeting.
- Observed that the increase in people living outside the city and travelling in for work meant that there was a constantly increasing number of cars on the roads, and while

this was particularly noticeable in new developments, it also occurred with the development of small villages across the area.

- Noted that local businesses supported immediate action, although there was also a call from business representatives to be provided with as much evidence as possible in order to make informed decisions.
- Agreed that a long-term strategy needed to accompany the more immediate actions and incorporate the different GCP projects, including pilot schemes. It was observed that even high levels of investment in the infrastructure of the bus service would be hampered by the separate and unresolved issue of congestion. A further example was given of concerns that current and planned park and ride travel hubs undermined the purpose and strategy of the new rural bus network.
- Argued that analysis of the financial cost of the various options failed to consider the current cost to the economy of people stuck in traffic when travelling to and from work, with one member suggesting that the implementation of a charge may even reduce costs overall for businesses and members of the public.
- Observed that progress was key for the education sector as evidence showed that transport was key for further education students and apprentices, who often identified lack of public transport as one of the key barriers to taking on apprenticeships. When considering some of the GCP's other aspirations in terms of skills, it was paramount to take a holistic view.
- Suggested that the Residents' Parking Schemes that had been introduced across Cambridge were indicative of what could be achieved if local authorities took bold and decisive action. One member suggested that progress with further schemes had been put on hold and asked how this could be justified. The Director of Transport undertook to investigate and report back to the member concerned.
- Argued that there had been a fundamental shift in public opinion since the City Deal was initiated and it was observed that other cities facing similar concerns, such as Oxford, had responded to this shift in a speedier and more efficient manner. Members reiterated the Citizens' Assembly's calls for bold and brave action.
- Requested that the Joint Assembly be provided with a selection of options to consider and recommend to the Executive Board, rather than simply being asked to consider a single proposal.

The Chairperson confirmed the Joint Assembly's support for Councillor Bick's recommendation with a unanimous show of hands.

8. GREENWAYS

Public questions were invited from Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle), Jim Chisholm and Lynda Warth. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which provided an update on the development of the Greenways programme, a proposed prioritisation process for the twelve projects and outline budgets for the Waterbeach and Fulbourn schemes. He informed the Joint Assembly that Appendix 1 of the report presented a running order of the projects' phasing, acknowledging that some of the projects may be brought forward at a later date.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the progress made on the Greenways programme in providing safe cycling routes around Greater Cambridge. It was argued that there was a wider need for such routes across the County, in order to connect small towns and villages to larger ones.

Expressed concern that the table in paragraph 4.17 of the report suggested the Fulbourn Greenway would end at Fulbourn Old Drift. In response, the Director of Transport confirmed that this was not the case and the route would continue into the centre of Fulbourn village. The Board report would be amended to make this clear.

- Observed that during the consultation for the Fulbourn Greenway, it had been proposed that the junction of Fulbourn Old Drift and Histon Road would be improved to make it safer for cyclists, while a 20mph zone would be implemented in to the village centre with signage. The report failed to mention these features of the proposed scheme and members suggested that such a divergence from what was expressed at the consultations was unhelpful.
- Conveyed widespread local support for the Waterbeach Greenway, although it was acknowledged that there was frustration that the scheme would not be completed until 2024. Given the problems with land acquisition that held up the Oakington project, one member queried whether the relevant land acquisitions for the Waterbeach scheme could be initiated at an earlier stage in the process to accommodate the desire and need for earlier completion. The Director of Transport clarified that land acquisitions could only begin once a final decision had been made.
- Observed that the Greenway was not just for cyclists and therefore the surfaces should be of a high quality that served all the modes of transport that it was designed for, rather than being of the cheapest and easiest material to maintain.

The Chairperson concluded that all members of the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board on 19th February.

9. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Chief Executive presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme. Attention was drawn to the recommendations that would be considered by the Executive Board, as laid out in section 1.1 of the report, as well as the fact that the target of 420 additional apprenticeships in the initial City Deal had been reached in July 2019, as detailed in section 6.6. The Joint Assembly was informed that the only project with a red 'RAG' rating was the Milton Road scheme, and this was due to the fact that the Executive Board had decided that it should not start until the Histon Road Bus Priority project had been completed.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Expressed concern about the proposal to continue to allocate £531k towards the County Council's lost annual income resulting from the removal of parking charges at Park and Ride sites in the GCP area, questioning whether the policy was sustainable. Some Members, however, suggested that the parking charge had deterred some people from using the service and therefore it was preferable to continue to ensure free parking. The Chief Executive acknowledged both the support and the concerns, and explained this would be looked at as part of the planned review.
- Welcomed the additional apprenticeships that had been announced in the report, as well as the fact that 129 new employers had agreed to support apprenticeship schemes, although information was sought on how many of these employers had actually taken on an apprentice. The Chief Executive agreed to seek clarification from Form the Future, the organisation that managed the scheme.
- Suggested that the remaining work on the Links to East Cambridge and Fen Ditton Cross-City Cycle Improvements project was more significant than implied in the report.
- Requested an update on progress with the work on the Fendon Road roundabout, and suggested this was running behind schedule. The Chief Executive agreed that officers would discuss the matter with the County Council, who was responsible for this scheme.
- Praised the Modern Methods of Construction pilot project, noting that it tied in to multiple areas of the GCP's work, including housing and skills.
- Sought clarification on when the Smart Cambridge budget for 2020/21 would be confirmed and whether it was likely to have a significant effect on the GCP's net overall budget.
- Expressed concern over the GCP's £36m shortfall in the profiled costs and funding for the whole GCP programme, as detailed in section 26 of the report. Members sought confirmation on whether the partner councils had fulfilled their obligation to contribute funds to the GCP in line with the formula that had been established and requested a graphical representation of the individual councils' contributions in a future report, particularly with regard to the New Homes Bonus allocations. The Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP had carried out analysis for the chief executives of the local authorities on the issue of the New Homes Bonus and she undertook to share the data with members so that they could identify levels of past and future contributions. Further consideration of the future investment strategy would be carried out following completion of the first Gateway Review.
- Observed that the Cambridge Southeast Transport Study had a forecast completion date of 2024 but a target completion date of 2025. One member sought clarification on when the project was expected to be completed.

10. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum (LLF), attended the meeting to present feedback from the LLF meeting on 27th January 2020. She

also took the opportunity to remind the Joint Assembly of resolutions passed at the earlier meeting in June 2019. It was noted that at the most recent meeting the following recommendation had been unanimously agreed:

The LLF asks GCP to pause the C2C scheme whilst the impact of the new rail service is assessed and the business case for the bus road is revised.

The Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that the scheme had changed as a result of the consultations, noting as examples that the site of the proposed Park and Ride had been altered, the alignments had moved on Adams Road and proposals for noise barriers had been added to the scheme. He argued that support for the scheme had also been demonstrated during consultations, although he acknowledged that there were differences of opinion and that the proposal represented an attempt to find an equilibrium between opposing points of view.

Public questions were invited from Matthew Brown, Nick Hadley, James Littlewood (two questions), Carolyn Postgate, Allan Treacy, Jane Renwick, Alistair Burford, Terry Spencer, Dr Marilyn Treacy (on behalf of Dr Gabriel Fox), Dan Strauss, Roxanne de Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle) and Roger Tomlinson. A further question was read out by the Chairperson on behalf of Dr Colin Harris, who was unable to attend the meeting. In response to a question regarding a Freedom of Information request that had been received, the Chief Executive committed to responding to the Information Commissioner's Office's findings before the Executive Board meeting on 19th February 2020. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes. The Chairperson also reminded the Joint Assembly of a petition which had been submitted but not accepted because it was not in accordance with the published protocol.

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained a summary of work carried out on the development of the Outline Business Case (OBC) and the proposed route alignment for the Better Public Transport project between Cambourne and Cambridge. The Joint Assembly was informed that, in line with standard practice, the detailed design of the route, along with a full environmental impact assessment, would follow later in the process. While noting that the proposed scheme was in alignment with the Cambridge future network and CPCA's CAM project, he clarified that the OBC had to stand on its own merit, as opposed to forming a part of other plans or strategies.

Following the presentation of a video that showed the length of the proposed route, Jo Baker, a development manager from Mott Macdonald, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. He clarified that the on-road option had been discarded as it failed to address congestion issues and also caused the greatest impact on environmentally sensitive sections of the route. The scheme involved various mitigations, including noise barriers and an overall increase in vegetation along the route. Mr Baker assured the Joint Assembly that although initial safety assessments had been carried out, full safety audits would be performed as part of the next stage in the process. It was also argued that the EWR network would not connect Cambourne to the western side of Cambridge or any of the communities along the route and suggested that the train line could attract more customers to the bus service.

The Strategic Communications Manager highlighted the extensive consultations that had been held with local communities, businesses, landowners and other key stakeholder groups, noting that the LLF had been formed in 2015. She confirmed that the GCP regularly

participated at local authority meetings while also hosting meetings with affected communities and landowners. There were two working groups comprised of statutory stakeholder groups, including Cambridge Past, Present and Future, the National Trust, British Horse Society and Camcycle, which were involved throughout the scheme's development.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that the scheme tied in to the City Access Strategy, as did all GCP projects, and that it would be counter-productive to develop the route only for buses to reach Cambridge and become caught in congestion. It was suggested that the Executive Board should ensure that it would not negatively affect the GCP's overall strategy.
- Expressed concerns over the number of mature trees that would be removed and observed that biodiversity loss or gain was not limited to the number of trees. It was suggested that further considerations of the environmental impacts of the proposed route would have been helpful at this stage of the process, although it was acknowledged that such issues would be covered in the more detailed design stage and environmental impact assessment. One member remarked that the value of greenbelt land was environmental in nature and could not only be measured in financial terms.
- Queried whether further mitigations to noise pollution, such as triple glazing, had been considered for affected properties, although it was argued that noise problems already existed and that the scheme was being developed to reduce the level of traffic and resultant noise pollution. It was suggested that key principles, such as erecting noise barriers in Hardwick and bunding in Coton, should be written in to the further design brief to ensure that all concerns were being addressed. One member commented that the commitment made in paragraph 11.1 of the report to use electric vehicles "at the earliest opportunity", was vague and lacked commitment.
- Argued that the proposed scheme did not address the problematic issue of congestion along the route between Cambourne and Cambridge, but merely sought to bypass it. One member expressed frustration that the high level of attention given to lowering congestion within Cambridge City was not replicated across the wider GCP area.
- Suggested there were sections of the route that still required further investigation and consideration, such as the location of the Park and Ride site, noting that although the principle of the connection was supported, strong opposition had been given to the proposed route. Some members voiced concern that the project was being progressed too quickly and therefore not receiving the necessary level of consideration.
- Sought clarification on why the route corridor was not being developed for multi-modal travel, as was the case in many other such routes. The Director of Transport confirmed that the possibility of providing a route for walking and cycling alongside the bus route was in consideration.
- Expressed concerns over safety with regard the proposal for buses to travel in both directions with only one lane on Adams Road, suggesting that if there were two buses passing each other they would be forced to encroach over the advisory markings and in to the adjoining cycle paths. The Director of Transport acknowledged the concern and request for information on traffic management possibilities but assured members that such details would be investigated and considered during the detailed design stage, as

required by the Department of Transport. Given the proximity of the cycleway to the proposed busway and potential encroachment, it was further observed that electric buses would need to be fitted with devices to ensure that they could be heard by cyclists. One member suggested that as the proposals involved the removal of parked cars from Adams Road, this could represent a safer route for cyclists, although it was argued that this would only be achieved with a segregated cycleway.

- Acknowledged the widespread opposition to routing buses along Adams Road, noting the petition that contained over 3000 signatures as well as objections from Camcycle. One Member observed that the GCP usually prioritised pedestrians, then bicycles and then public transport, and suggested that the Adams Road proposal had reversed this order of priority.
- Observed that the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan stated a requirement for the provision of a bus priority measure that reached Queens Road in Cambridge, while the proposed route ended at Grange Road, to the west of Queens Road. It was also noted that the Local Plan proposed that the measure should run on or parallel to the A1303. The Director of Transport commented that the inner-city elements of the bus route tied in to other pieces of work being carried out by the GCP, such as the City Access Strategy and the signals review.
- Sought clarification on whether a proposal for a cyclical one way system in West Cambridge had been investigated and assessed. The Director of Transport acknowledged the proposal and indicated that, if considered, it would be required to go through assessment processes for safety and other issues.
- Observed that there were no speakers or members of the public from Cambourne, noting that Cambourne Village College had expressed support for the scheme, and queried whether consultations had been held with such institutions. One member suggested that some supportive views expressed during the consultations had not been considered in the report and should be considered at the Executive Board meeting.
- Suggested that it would have been preferable for the Joint Assembly and Executive Board to be presented with a variety of routes to choose from, rather than simply be asked to agree to a route put forward by officers without considering alternatives. It was argued that a process which developed multiple potential routes and variations would have led to a stronger final scheme.
- Noted that the OBC was not based on providing a service to communities and businesses between Cambridge and Cambourne and was instead focussed on transporting people towards the different areas of Cambridge, such as the Science Park, Biomedical Campus and universities. It was argued that, once completed, the EWR would provide a much more attractive option for reaching such locations and therefore the OBC needed to be reviewed, given the fact that the scheme would be permanent and the GCP was committed to long-term planning.
- Established that local businesses regularly analysed their workers' needs for travelling to work and actively promoted alternative modes of transport, such as bikes and the use of Park and Ride facilities, suggesting that parts of the scheme did not encourage the modal shift that the GCP was promoting. One member commented that while train

services were popular with employees, buses were rarely used, with the exception of the busway connecting Cambridge to St Ives.

- Voiced concerns over the multiple tiers of local government involved in transport decisions across Greater Cambridge and the surrounding area, noting that there was widespread confusion, especially regarding the role of the CPCA.
- Acknowledged the objections to the scheme raised by the Mayor of the CPCA related to how the scheme would potentially prejudice the CAM network, although it was noted that the EWR would also be likely to impact the CAM network in the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor. The Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that CPCA officers had assisted in drafting the report and had supported it, while the CPCA Board had approved the future CAM consultation on 29th January 2020, which included the GCP's Cambourne to Cambridge scheme as part of the network.
- Suggested that Cambourne should have been provided with better transport connections long before this scheme and that future development plans and housing issues provided strong justification for its construction.

Following the discussion, the Chairperson thanked the members of the public for their participation and summarised the issues that had been raised and considered by the Joint Assembly, informing members that he would present their opinions to the Executive Board on 19th February 2020.

11. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: WATERBEACH TO NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained the background and rationale for the Better Public Transport project running from Waterbeach to North East Cambridge, as well as an update on the technical work and engagement to date and the proposed programme going forward. The Director of Transport informed members that the engagements with stakeholders that had already been held were in anticipation of the formal consultation stage, which provided an extra layer of engagement with those affected by the project and represented a fundamentally different approach that resulted from experiences with previous projects. The Joint Assembly was advised that the project would be considered again in greater detail at its meeting on 4th June 2020.

While discussing the report, one member reiterated a preference to be provided with a range of options from which they could recommend a preferred choice. The Director of Transport acknowledged the request and assured the Joint Assembly that it would be taken in to consideration.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the next steps of the project, as laid out in section 4 of the report.

12. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT: EASTERN ACCESS PROJECT

The Director of Transport presented the report, which contained the background and rationale for the Better Public Transport project on the access corridor in to East Cambridge, as well as an update on the technical work and engagement to date and the proposed

programme going forward. The Director of Transport indicated that although the project would also be considered in greater detail at the meeting on 4th June 2020, the consultation phase would be slightly delayed in order for it to follow the Waterbeach to North East Cambridge project's consultation stage but also to ensure that it aligned as much as possible with the Local Plan process.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that the project covered an area that included a large number of parish councils and emphasised the need to involve them in the consultation phase, along with those on the periphery of the corridor and beyond that would also be affected by the project. The Director of Transport assured the Joint Assembly that they would be involved.
- Expressed concern over delaying the project given that the congestion issues on Newmarket Road were already a serious problem. The Wadloes Road roundabout was also identified as an area prone to congestion that needed resolving as soon as possible and it was queried whether an interim solution could be developed before the Eastern Access Project was initiated. The Director of Transport undertook to investigate and consider any short term measures.
- Confirmed that the dotted line on the map in section 3 of the report indicated the boundary of a study area, as opposed to any proposed construction.
- Sought clarification on whether Coldham's Lane would be upgraded, as suggested by the map in section 3 of the report. The Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that the final area had not been confirmed and it was possible that Coldham's Lane would be included.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the next steps of the project, as laid out in section 4 of the report.

13. WHITTLESFORD STATION TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

The Director of Transport presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on the outcomes of a public consultation exercise regarding the Whittlesford Travel Hub and considered the next steps in delivering the proposed transport infrastructure. The Joint Assembly noted plans for South Cambridgeshire District Council to work with the County Council to explore the possibility of applying for decriminalised parking powers in the district. The Director of Transport noted that civil parking enforcement schemes generally took up to two years to introduce following the respective consultation and therefore the intention was to initiate the process as soon as possible.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that the last sentence of paragraph 5.3 implied that there would be no bus access improvements carried out if Stagecoach opted not to serve the station. Noting that the purpose of a travel hub was to be served by public transport, members sought clarification over whether the project would go ahead if no service was provided, with one member arguing that the GCP's ambition should not rest on the decisions of a

private company. The Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP was attempting to establish a commitment from the commercial bus operator, but that he would reflect on the wording of the sentence in question.

- Suggested that updating Local councillors, parish councils and the local rail user group regularly, as stated in paragraph 7.5 of the report, was not enough and that they should have a higher level of involvement. The Director of Transport agreed to reconsider the wording of the paragraph.
- Observed that the project was a complicated programme with multiple agents involved and links to busy areas such as Granta Park. Members expressed concern that unless surrounding issues, such as heavy congestion on the adjoining A505, were addressed, the Travel Hub would be blighted by inaccessibility.
- Considered the development of civil parking enforcement across South Cambridgeshire, noting that the district council did not currently receive any revenue from parking charges. The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder informed the Joint Assembly that there was an ongoing study on the Royston to Granta Park corridor that involved councillors from Cambridgeshire County Council, Hertfordshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, where such an issue should be considered. He also noted that the County Council had worked with Cambridge City Council to introduce parking enforcement within Cambridge and would welcome engagement with South Cambridgeshire District Council over the issue as well, although he cautioned that it was neither a quick or easy process to implement.

The Chairperson concluded that there were no objections to the Executive Board continuing with the project as laid out in the report.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday 4th June at the Guildhall, Cambridge.

Chairperson
4th June 2020

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

Questioner	Question	Proposed Response
1 David Stoughton	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Recommendations of the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly</p> <p>Following the report of the Citizen's Assembly, I'd like to present the result of our survey on attitudes to, and effects of, traffic congestion in the CB1 estate and to ask whether proposed measures will help mitigate the problems being experienced? I ask this especially in the light of the high levels of respiratory disease the survey reveals and the increasing number of young children in the area.</p> <p>The survey results have been fairly widely distributed but it would be useful if I could be permitted to ensure all members of the assembly can consult them in advance of the meeting.</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing the results of your survey, which have been shared with Joint Assembly and Executive Board members. Last June, the Executive Board formally agreed that improving air quality should be a key consideration in developing the final city access strategy, and the Citizens' Assembly specifically considered air quality issues as part of their deliberations.</p> <p>The paper for agenda item 7 looks at the potential impacts of different interventions on air quality. Measures to encourage more trips by public transport, walking and cycling, to decrease the number of car trips, and to support the electrification of vehicles – particularly buses – would help to address air quality issues and the resulting health impacts.</p>
2 Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>* Note: Referencing excerpts from DfT's 'National Travel Survey: England 2017'. See Background information attached. Excerpts quoted below, prior to official question.</p> <p>Excerpts: Changing commuting behaviour is far from easy. "The proportion of households without a car has fallen from 48% in 1971 (based on the Census) to 24% in 2017 while the proportion of households with more than one car increased over this period, from 8% to 35%" " Also, household car ownership remains high and is likely to have contributed to falling bus patronage. 76% of households in England owned at least one car or van in 2017. In 2017, 56% of households in England in the lowest real income quintile owned at least one car or van, up from 48% in 2009 (2017 National Travel Survey.) There are 30 million cars registered in the UK. Most new dwellings have and will continue to provide 1/2 car spaces.</p>	<p>The paper presented to the Joint Assembly identifies that – to improve journey times, tackle poor air quality and reduce carbon emissions – a step change in sustainable transport provision is required. More people need to take public transport, cycle or walk, and the paper considers the significant improvements required to make these changes.</p> <p>The analysis suggests that electrification has a role to play in addressing the issues identified. But that a fundamental shift in mode share is also required to tackle congestion and address planned growth.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>Car dependency The car has become a home extension and the journey to work a complex set of activities including school runs, shopping, visiting friends/relatives with caring needs and keeping essential appointments such as doctors/dentists. In marked contrast bus based public transport commuting requires an incident risk & combination of travel modes including walking, car driving, cycling and train.</p> <p>Modal choice "Travel to work by bus including P&R and Guided Bus usage based is declining "Surface rail trips per person per year have increased by 56% between 2002 and 2017 to 21 trips . Trips on London buses, that decreased in the years from 2010 onwards were at the same level in 2017 as 2002. Trips on other local buses decreased by 19% between 2002 and 2017."</p> <p>Statement "The GCP has a target of 10 to 15 per cent reduction in city centre traffic flows over 2011 levels, as part of the £500m devolution funding resulting from the City Deal negotiations. Traffic has grown considerably since 2011, this target now equates to a reduction of more than 20 per cent over today's levels or the equivalent of almost one in four cars off the road. By 2031 employment is forecast to rise by 30 per cent."</p> <p>Question Is the above aim practically achievable? There is a pressing need for alternative attractive commuting choices. Does the progressive way forward to 2030 depend far more upon the conversion to electric vehicles/bikes (including e cargo) together with the accelerated provision of dedicated & integrated cycleways around and through the city? Also to quadruple the capacity in P&R/Travel hubs and encourage car drivers to complete their journey to work other than with their car. Traffic restrictions in the city may however have to accommodate more P&R single decker buses.</p>	
--	--	--	--

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		Assumption The construction of tunnels and the metro is unlikely before 2025.	
3	Dr Brian Robertson	Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy Which voting members of the GCP will support a motion to: 'Prioritise Active Travel'? A supplementary question is Will you please place and vote for a 'Prioritise Active Travel' motion? Note: Details of such a motion can be seen in the Cllr Bartington 'Prioritise Active Travel' passed by Oxfordshire CC.	<p>The evidence set out in the paper, improving both public transport and active travel options is vital to offering people a competitive choice that enables them to leave their cars behind.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) programme is designed to increase travel by sustainable modes.</p> <p>All schemes encourage active travel, as well as improving public transport provision along key routes and corridors.</p>
4	Camcycle	Agenda Item No. 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy Camcycle welcomes the update on the City Access strategy and thanks those involved for the amount of research conducted on this project. It's clear that both scientific evidence and public opinion support the goal of switching a significant number of journeys in and around Cambridge to walking, cycling and public transport. It's also clear that this must be done to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support local authorities on their journey to zero carbon - Improve local air quality and people's health - Address issues of transport inequality in the area - Reduce congestion and maintain a thriving economic region, attractive to businesses - Make Cambridge a nicer place to live, work and travel. <p>We strongly support the proposals to improve junctions for those walking and cycling, trial car-free days, subsidise electric bike hire,</p>	<p>The GCP members are working closely together to address the growth challenges faced by the Greater Cambridge area. The desire for action is clear from public and business engagement, and 'be bold, be brave' was a key message from the Citizens' Assembly.</p> <p>The partners are continuing their discussions ahead of the Executive Board meeting in February. The Joint Assembly discussion of the evidence to date and potential next steps will support them in that. The paper identifies a series of actions that could be advanced in order to ensure a build-up of sustainable transport capacity and trial different approaches to addressing congestion issues.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

	<p>develop a lease scheme for e-bikes and cargo cycles, improve and increase cycle parking and work with schools and businesses to increase levels of cycling.</p> <p>We also strongly support the building of increased cycle infrastructure and the piloting of further road closures, modal filters and community streets; these measures are essential to the growth of cycling in the area for all ages and abilities. We welcome the forthcoming publication of the Cambridgeshire LCWIP. We also support additional demand management measures such as a flexible congestion charge.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the timely action required may be compromised by the lack of a joint approach between the local authorities. We understood from media reports that the councils would be working to resolve their differences in a workshop this month.</p> <p>We would like to ask the Joint Assembly to confirm that this workshop has taken place and to ask when the essential measures included in this report to improve the health, wellbeing and success of our city will begin to be implemented?</p>	
--	--	--

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

5	Lilian Rundblad, Chair, Histon Road Area Residents' Association HRARA	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Clean Air Zones CAZ, Air pollution from emissions and particulates, impact on health and welfare</p> <p>The Health and Welfare of the Cambridge residents is at stake when the improved transport schemes are rolled out to cope with the growth of the city. Not only the physical health risks ranging from heart-lung disease, to stroke and dementia but also mental health such as depression and suicide.</p> <p>55% of roadside traffic pollution is made of non-exhaust particles such as Brake, Tyre, and Road surface wear. While legislation has driven down exhaust emissions the non-exhaust particulates emissions have increased. EV, PHEV, and charge hybrids reduce exhaust emissions but they are still particulate polluters.</p> <p>Many cities in Europe have already introduced Class 2 Zones with Euro 6 standards on their major arterial routes into the city centres and expand their CAZ. To introduce Class 2 and Euro 6 on arterial roads such as Histon Road in coordination with the present GCP construction ending sometime in 2021, Cambridge would expand the CAZ from the junction with Huntingdon and Victoria roads reducing exhaust emissions.</p> <p>To cope with the non-exhaust emissions - particulates, the most effective source is Trees and Hedges. Certain species of trees are more effective than others. They should be planted in the highway boundary by the actual vehicle emissions. This week is the start of the site clearance, and there will be quite substantial losses of greenery. It leaves little protection for cyclists and pedestrians as well as front-gardens.</p> <p>With increased vehicle traffic expected due to expansion from 2 to 3 lanes and the improved Guided Bus B single decker route to Addenbrookes with more buses per hour</p>	<p>The GCP is committed to putting the vegetation back as part of the Histon Road scheme, indeed there will be more trees than before when the scheme is completed.</p> <p>The paper outlines a number of potential policy options to addressing the congestion and air quality challenges we face. A Clean Air Zone is one of them. The Joint Assembly and Executive Board will need to consider the alternatives open to them and determine next steps.</p>
---	---	--	---

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		HRARA asks the Joint Assembly to encourage the officers to investigate the inclusion of Histon Road in the Cambridge CAZ and introduce Class 2 and Euro 6 standards by the end of the construction in summer 2021.	
6	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Greenways</p> <p>Members of Camcycle are happy to see the proposals for the Greenways and the request for additional funding, and we hope the Joint Assembly will support these plans as the Greenways cannot arrive a minute too soon.</p> <p>Q1: In light of the climate emergency, we ask the Joint Assembly to consider what steps could be taken to speed up delivery of the Greenways sooner than the proposed date of late 2024?</p> <p>Q2: In another project, the GCP has proposed removing all car parking along Adams Road. Given that this is a desirable safety feature on its own, may we ask for the removal of parking and addition of traffic-calming on Adams Road to be included as another 'quick win' project that can be implemented straight away to increase cycling safety on one of the busiest and most important cycle routes in Cambridge?</p>	<p>Q1. The proposed programme for the delivery of the schemes is a realistic forecast which is based upon experience from previous similar schemes. The timescales for delivery of the Greenways depend heavily on how land negotiations progress. The team hear the sense of urgency in the question and will seek to expedite scheme delivery when possible.</p> <p>Q2. No further quick win schemes are currently being considered or proposed as part of the Greenways project. Adams Road is subject to consideration as part of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.</p>
7	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Greenways</p> <p>I'm here, yet again, requesting cycle infrastructure that, in this case, would costs 'peanuts' and would benefit many who already cycle, especially to school, but also the many who would cycle if only they had a safe and pleasant route.</p> <p>I've read the reports about Greenways, and was puzzled and disappointed at the lack of commitment to complete improvements to the 6km route from Sawston through Stapleford and Shelford to the rapidly expanding Biomedical Campus.</p>	Thank you for the information. It will be considered as part of the Sawston Greenway later this year.

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

	<p>We have already upgraded some 2 kms of route to 3+m wide as part of the 'quick wins', and further 1.5kms of the Genome path which may well need changing as part of the Cambridge South Station and East-West rail program. BUT we still have 2.5km of short, linking sections on busy minor roads with limited visibilities on bends, a difficult road crossing, a section directly adjacent to a busy main road with an 'effective' width of as little as 400mm (between kerb and lamp post), a much used crossing that isn't a Toucan, and even a section of footway where cycling appears not to be legal!</p> <p>The traffic free alternative, included in the original consultations, has 450m of redundant rail land with agreed permission to the south of Shelford station, and 700m of route on land adjacent to the new agricultural reservoir with a co-operative owner. All that is needed for an excellent route to be completed is the remaining 450 metres adjacent to the rail line. Apart from a possible delay over land issues this should be another quick win.</p> <p>Let us get it done for the benefit of all the school children, and before developments on the Biomedical Campus, the Genome Campus, and the old Spicers site double the cycle flows here.</p> <p>Why cannot it be progressed now?</p> <p>Cycles through Stapleford:</p>	
--	--	--

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<table><tr><th colspan="5">Stapleford A1301 adj to bus stop Wedn 22 Jan 07:30-08:40</th></tr><tr><th>Time ending</th><th>N'bound</th><th>S,Bound</th><th>Lights</th><th>Weaves</th></tr><tr><td>07:40</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>07:50</td><td>10</td><td>9</td><td>9</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>08:00</td><td>12</td><td>19</td><td>18</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>08:10</td><td>13</td><td>33</td><td>22</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>08:20</td><td>20</td><td>33</td><td>23</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>08:30</td><td>16</td><td>16</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>08:40</td><td>16</td><td>7</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>Totals</td><td>90</td><td>120</td><td>87</td><td>71</td></tr></table>	Stapleford A1301 adj to bus stop Wedn 22 Jan 07:30-08:40					Time ending	N'bound	S,Bound	Lights	Weaves	07:40	3	3	3	2	07:50	10	9	9	9	08:00	12	19	18	8	08:10	13	33	22	14	08:20	20	33	23	14	08:30	16	16	9	12	08:40	16	7	3	12	Totals	90	120	87	71	
Stapleford A1301 adj to bus stop Wedn 22 Jan 07:30-08:40																																																					
Time ending	N'bound	S,Bound	Lights	Weaves																																																	
07:40	3	3	3	2																																																	
07:50	10	9	9	9																																																	
08:00	12	19	18	8																																																	
08:10	13	33	22	14																																																	
08:20	20	33	23	14																																																	
08:30	16	16	9	12																																																	
08:40	16	7	3	12																																																	
Totals	90	120	87	71																																																	
8	Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Greenways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Excluding the racing industry, over £90 million pa contributed to the local economy as a result of the ± 25,500 horses in CambridgeshireThe equestrian industry is UK’s second largest rural employerEquestrian national accident records - since November 2010: 42 people have died, 1085 injured; 315 horses have died, 945 injured.The East has one of the worst equestrian accident records.No recorded report of injury to third party, by a horse on a PROW anywhere, ever. <p>The GCP claims to include equestrians on the Greenways – always with the caveat ‘where possible’ but equestrians are constantly omitted from GCP statements, presentations, response to CamCycle’s question from the last meeting refers only to walking / cycling project pledges yet many routes are planned on bridleways.</p>	<p>Q(a) The safety of all users is already considered in Road Safety Audits and appropriate solutions sought.</p> <p>Q(b) Yes we will preserve existing amenity.</p> <p>Q(c) The GCP has a multi-user remit and we will continue to work with stakeholders to delivery on that.</p> <p>Q(d) The Greenways project will work to provide safe and attractive routes for all users.</p>																																																		

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>Despite the stated GCP intention and BHS participation in the GCP NMU Working Group, 'quick win' projects jeopardise the safety of horses / riders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roadside shared pedestrian / cycle paths leave horses dangerously sandwiched between fast moving vehicles and fast moving, two-way cycle traffic. 2. Verge tarmac shared pedestrian / cycle path 'improvements' force horses off the safe grass verge into the traffic flow. 3. NMU access on the first Greenway delivery rescinded following post construction Road Safety Audit consigning horses to roads deemed unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. 4. Rural grassed byway sealed with dangerous, slippery SMA totally unsuitable for horses. <p>If the GCP really intends the Greenways to be multiuser, delivery must be by an unbiased team with equal accountability for all.</p> <p>Will the GCP please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Include the need for safety of equestrians in all safety audits? (b) Preserve the existing amenity for horse riders on Greenway routes? (c) Appoint an Active Travel Delivery Team with a multiuser remit? (d) Take no action which reduces the safety of equestrians? <p>Background information: some photos are attached to illustrate the points made.</p>	
--	--	--	--

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

9	Matthew Brown	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Recalling that Cambridge American Cemetery is a Grade I protected Cultural Heritage Site (#1001573) listed by Historic England, as well as an “approved” American Cultural Heritage Site listed by the US Commission of Fine Arts; how does the GCP intend to mitigate (or eliminate) risks of environmental damage, noise pollution, visual pollution, and emissions pollution to this (and other) cultural heritage sites?</p> <p>*Note: Two attachments in email received 20/01/2020.</p>	<p>The C2C scheme is intended to provide public transport and non-motorised improvements which address congestion on the A428/A1303 corridor.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case considered today includes an assessment of economic, societal and environmental considerations. It concludes that the development of the C2C proposals should take place away from the American Cemetery.</p>
10	Nick Hadley	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Cambridge Innovations Parks Ltd whole-heartedly support the proposed scheme.</p> <p>We believe our proposals for our site adjacent to the proposed route will complement the scheme and significantly benefit all parties.</p> <p>Could GCP please advise on the strategic objectives of the scheme in terms of economic growth and employment creation along the proposed route corridor?</p>	<p>The strategic case recognises pressure on the transport system from Local Plan growth and proposes infrastructure to address this. Specifically, C2C responds to local development pressures such as Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield, West Cambridge, St Neots.</p> <p>Along the C2C corridor, around 11,500 additional homes are planned in Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield, and North West Cambridge.</p> <p>Development is estimated to support 13,400 additional jobs, leading to increasing pressure on the already heavily congested A1303 approaching M11 junction 13 and the city centre. A further source of pressure on the C2C corridor will come from 3,800 new homes which are planned for the St Neots East site.</p> <p>A dedicated public transport route is essential to connect existing and expanding communities to Cambridge and contribute to tackling congestion, air quality and climate change.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

11	James Littlewood	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Now that we finally have a preferred route, we can also see what the impact of this would be. This route would clear-fell mature woodland alongside St Neot's Road, grassland habitat at Madingley Mulch would be built over, hedgerows on our land that would be severed, orchard trees would be uprooted, a meadow bisected and the scrub in a city wildlife site destroyed and ponds would be infilled next to the University sports ground. A large scar on the landscape will be created during construction, which will take years to recover. Why has this not been detailed in the officers report?</p>	<p>An initial environmental assessment has been undertaken and this is reflected in the Outline Business Case and supporting Option Appraisal Reports. (A full EIA is the next step in the process).</p> <p>The Green Belt land impacted by C2C plans is largely agricultural and mitigation measures propose potential planting features (such as flower meadows) which could enhance biodiversity. Work will continue, engaging with local communities as plans develop.</p> <p>Other sites impacted, such as the ponds by West Cambridge and the city wildlife site by the M11, are man-made. Similarly, much of the planting along the A428 is relatively new.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation measures include 'bundling' to limit the visual impact of the road on the landscape and every effort will be made to replant in areas where trees and vegetation must be removed. This will be considered further as part of the detailed design, the next stage in the process.</p> <p>At a scheme level, the GCP is committed to ensuring a 10% net biodiversity gain so the ecological value of the area overall would be increased.</p> <p>Scheme design principles - covering aspects including biodiversity gain, connecting habitats and fitting into the landscape – have been devised to guide planning development, by Landscape Heritage & Ecology and Non-Motorised User working groups, representing stakeholder groups including CPPF, The National Trust and Camcycle.</p>
----	------------------	--	---

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

12	James Littlewood	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>If the route of East-West Rail goes via Cambourne, then this would have significant impacts on the business case for the busway in terms of future passengers, it would also open up the possibility of an interim solution: In the short-term, an in-bound bus lane could be provided along the A1303. This could be achieved much more quickly, at significantly less cost, with much less impact on the environment, green belt and local communities. This could be in place whilst the new railway was being progressed. The railway would eventually provide the mass-transport solution for the Cambourne area with the bus lane continuing to provide access to west Cambridge. Cycle provision could be achieved via a branch of the Comberton Greenway, a route which would be much better for cyclists because it would be a more gradual climb and away from traffic. Therefore, is it not premature for the GCP to be making a decision without first knowing the outcome of East-West Rail, and if the outcome is via Cambourne, would it not be sensible to pause and take stock of the alternative options that this might create?</p>	<p>EWR and the Expressway are projects designed to support deliver of 1,000,000 homes across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.</p> <p>Having announced a preferred route corridor for the scheme, the next stage for EWR will be business case assessment and exploring detailed route alignment. This will include a planning and growth scenario that is likely to outline 10,000's of new homes for Cambourne.</p> <p>Thousands of new homes will provide an even stronger need for local public transport improvements to provide connectivity from across Cambourne, and other residential areas including Bourn Airfield.</p> <p>C2C would connect local communities to any potential rail stop. GCP will continue to work together with East West Rail to align plans in the event that a preferred route provides for a station at Cambourne.</p> <p>In the meantime, the situation continues to worsen for those using the existing network to travel in from communities to the west. For car users and those reliant on public transport, using the A1303, a commute of around 8 miles can regularly take over an hour. Developments such as Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield, West Cambridge, St Neots, committed to in the Local Plan, are advancing and need to be connected to destinations across the city.</p>
13	Carolyn Postgate	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>I understand that a decision will be made very soon on the proposed route for the East-West rail project from Bedford to Cambridge, and that a route via Cambourne is the most likely.</p> <p>How can the GCP justify pressing forward with a costly off-road busway from Cambourne to Cambridge if a fast, reliable rail link is going to exist within the next 10 years? With a station at Cambourne, it's clear that the EWR scheme will provide good connections for people within a few miles</p>	<p>EWR and the Expressway are projects designed to support deliver of 1,000,000 homes across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.</p> <p>Having announced a preferred route corridor for the scheme, the next stage for EWR will be business case assessment and exploring detailed route alignment. This will include a planning and growth scenario that is likely to outline 10,000's of new homes for Cambourne.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>of Cambourne (thus including Bourn Airfield Village) to Cambridge stations serving the City Centre, Science Park and Biomedical Campus, the most important employment sites. What “last mile journeys” does GCP envisage will then be served by the proposed busway and how many people will that benefit?</p>	<p>Thousands of new homes will provide an even stronger need for local public transport improvements to provide connectivity to it from across Cambourne, and other residential areas including Bourn Airfield.</p> <p>C2C would connect local communities to any potential rail stop. GCP will continue to work together with East West Rail to align plans in the event that a preferred route provides for a station at Cambourne.</p> <p>In the meantime, the situation continues to worsen for those using the existing network to travel in from communities to the west. For car users and those reliant on public transport, using the A1303, a commute of around 8 miles can regularly take over an hour. Developments such as Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield, West Cambridge, St Neots, committed to in the Local Plan, are advancing and need to be connected to destinations across the city.</p>
14	Allan Treacy	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>The East-West rail route to be announced shortly will have an impact on the BCR calculations carried out by Mott MacDonald In respect of the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway. Will the GCP please confirm that the BCR will be recalculated and published once the East-West rail route is announced and that benefits accruing to the rail project will not also be attributed to the busway?</p>	<p>The C2C scheme has been assessed using the Department for Transport and HM Treasury’s appraisal guidelines. This sets out the framework for considering the likely impacts of public funded investment to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money • Transport, economic, social and environmental benefits • Maximum benefit with minimal impact <p>The impact of the C2C on the national and local economy is substantial;</p> <p>(The assessment of the wider economic benefits of the scheme are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national land value uplift of £458m achieved through unlocking housing development • Over 900 new jobs created and over 5,000 new houses built contributing to £102.8m additional Gross Value Added (GVA) per annum through the number of jobs created and homes built)

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

			At present there is a preferred route corridor but no preferred route alignment for East West Rail, nor clarity as to the associated growth and so it is not reflected in our BCR calculations for the Outline Business Case. As and when a preferred route and associated growth is agreed then that would be reflected in the final iteration of the business case, the 'Full Business Case,' for C2C which would be prepared once the necessary powers are in place to deliver the scheme but before approval by the Executive Board to proceed to construction.
15	Jane Renwick	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>The proposed route for the off-road busway has now resulted in huge opposition among the communities from Hardwick right through to Grange Road. Given that this now means that two thirds of the proposed route is so deeply unpopular, is it not time to reconsider this misguided and damaging route alignment?</p>	<p>It is not correct to say there is huge opposition. It is correct to say that there are different views amongst the community.</p> <p>Public consultation and engagement has been a key element of the work to date and decision makers will consider that alongside the technical evidence.</p>
16	Alistair Burford	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Re: Page 116. 5.9 FIGURE 4. Reliability comparison of non-segregated route vs segregated routes.</p> <p>Interestingly this illustration shows that bus lanes perform as well as the guided busway and furthermore the Cambourne to Madingley Mulch illustration is equally favourable on the existing road without any kind of bus priority.</p> <p>This seems to undermine any claims that the off-road busway is required for reliability.</p> <p>Despite this the Officers continue to insist that the off-road route from Cambourne to Adams Road is the only feasible option.</p> <p>They insist it's the only feasible option because it's CAM compliant, despite the high level of uncertainty surrounding the nascent CAM scheme and its costings.</p>	<p>In line with Department for Transport guidelines, existing, rather than planned services are used to assess reliability. Assessment demonstrates that the existing Cambridgeshire Guided Busway sections perform better than non-busway sections.</p> <p>Two sections of the current road network, from Madingley Mulch to Drummer Street, are among the worst performing sections in terms of reliable journey times.</p> <p>The recommended route is estimated to improve average morning peak time journey times by 19 minutes, from 50 minutes to 31.</p> <p>Proposals reflect plans for a future CAM, but in line with Government guidance, the OBC considers Cambourne to Cambridge as a free-standing investment.</p> <p>The impact of the C2C on the national and local economy is substantial. The assessment of the wider economic benefits of the scheme are:</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>They insist it's the only feasible option even though it exposes the residents of St Neots Road, Hardwick to 8 lanes of traffic in front of their properties.</p> <p>They insist it's the only feasible option even though it will cause permanent damage to the iconic Coton Corridor.</p> <p>All this at a cost of £157m!</p> <p>Figure 4 shows that despite the absence of any kind of bus priority the service from Cambourne to Maddingley Mulch is already as reliable as a segregated route. The problem is Maddingley Hill. The Officers have looked at the feasibility of building a busway down Maddingley Hill and informed the Board that it was not possible. However a number of technical groups outside of the GCP believe that an on-road bus lane down Maddingley Hill with smart 'bus prioritised' signalling at the narrowest point outside the American Cemetery is possible and could be developed quicker and for a lot less money</p> <p>Given all of the above coupled with the unacceptable BCR and lack of support from so many of your constituents, this Assembly should be telling the Board not to support the inaptly named 'preferred route' and asking the Officers to look at ways of making a bus lane work for the entire route.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national land value uplift of £458m achieved through unlocking housing development • Over 900 new jobs created and over 5,000 new houses built contributing to £102.8m additional Gross Value Added (GVA) per annum through the number of jobs created and homes built. <p>Utilising these wider economic benefits, the local Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the scheme is calculated at 3.48. This demonstrates good value for money.</p>
17	Terry Spencer	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>What are the exact routes being considered between the end of the proposed off-road busway at Grange Road and the three suggested destinations (City centre/Parker Street, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and Cambridge Science Park, before the CAM is completed?</p> <p>How can the GCP claim in the agenda pack, Figure 4, page 116, that the reliability of the preferred off-road option is higher than the on-road</p>	<p>A bus strategy has been developed to use the C2C route for travel from Cambourne to key employment destinations in and around Cambridge (see Appendix F to OBC).</p> <p>Routes are based on realistic service numbers and anticipated demand. This approach builds upon the successful approach adopted as part of</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>options between Madingley Mulch roundabout and the city centre, when this option is likely to pass along heavily-congested and narrow streets between the West Cambridge campus and the city centre? These streets are used by cyclists and pedestrians, and are neither safe nor have the capacity for more buses.</p> <p>How can the GCP state that the off-road option will be future-proofed, when this option will rely on completion of the CAM scheme being considered by the Combined Authority? Has the GCP taken into account the likelihood that the CAM scheme will not be constructed using rubber-tyred buses in tunnels, because – according to a recent report by Cambridge Connect – the CAM scheme in its current form is too high a risk to attract investment and uses unproven technology?</p>	<p>the Cambridge Guided Busway scheme which has delivered a significant increase in service and patronage.</p> <p>Bus services will be confirmed as the scheme develops, working with bus operators. However, the initial bus strategy proposes direct express services to key employment centres, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne to Cambridge City Centre at 10-minute interval service (six buses per hour). • Cambourne to Biomedical Campus at 30-minute interval service (two buses per hour). <p>The recommended route emerges onto Grange Road at the closest possible access point to the city centre and services continue on to key destinations.</p> <p>The GCP is working with the CPCA to deliver a future CAM network and the CPCA has categorised C2C as part of phase 1 on the network.</p> <p>The OBC reflects potential transport investment through projects including CAM and EWR, but in line with Government guidance, considers Cambourne to Cambridge as a free-standing investment.</p>
18	<p>Dr Gabriel Fox</p> <p>Questions to be asked by Dr Marilyn Treacy</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Despite GCP's insistence for the past 5 years that the C2C scheme has to be off-road and segregated, their proposed route turns out to be 60% on-road with no bus segregation for services between Cambourne and the Biomedical Campus; and 40% on-road for services to the City Centre.</p> <p>On-road stretches include the first mile out of Cambourne towards Bourn Airfield Village, 25mph roads through the West Cambridge site, Adams Road, Grange Rd, the Backs, Silver St, Trumpington Rd, Pembroke St, Downing St, plus Regent St and Lensfield Rd on the way back, as well as 7km of the M11 for the route to CBC. Some of these are among the most congested streets in the city.</p>	<p>The GCP has not stipulated an on or off road option.</p> <p>The project team have undertaken a rigorous assessment of both off and on road alternatives over the years spent developing the scheme. Stages and outcomes of assessment have been presented and are recorded in detail across three Options Appraisal Reports.</p> <p>An optimised on-road option was developed to incorporate ideas from stakeholder groups and include both inbound and outbound public transport priority. When assessed in comparison with the off-road</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>Given this clear admission that off-road is not obligatory, and given the evidence provided by GCP in Figure 4 of the JA Report that bus lanes are just as reliable as off-road busways, why has GCP not worked up the best possible route using on-road bus lanes?</p> <p>Even on the busiest city roads, such as Newmarket Rd, bus lanes can offer just as good reliability as a busway, if not better. And GCP has accepted in its meetings with the LLF Technical Group that a bus lane is technically feasible the whole way in-bound between Madingley Mulch and the West Cambridge site and most of the way outbound too, even without any significant land acquisition.</p> <p>Is it not the case that a route including bus lanes along that stretch would be at least as fast and reliable as GCP's proposed route and offer a many-fold improvement in BCR, both the official one and the made-up "local BCR"?</p> <p>GCP has used excuse after excuse and tactic after tactic to avoid doing a proper comparative evaluation of a segregated on-road route. Without that we are in danger of having £200m of taxpayers' money wasted on a scheme that is inferior to one that could be implemented in half the time for a quarter of the cost. Will the GCP finally agree to working up an optimal on-road route with the local community?</p>	<p>option, the off-road route between Madingley Mulch roundabout and Cambridge was found to provide greater overall benefits.</p> <p>Both on and off-road alternatives have environmental and social impacts, but the results of assessment shows that an on-road alignment, even single lane, using the existing and increasingly congested A1303 presents significant environmental and heritage constraints and impact to properties caused by the widening of public highway in the confined space. Reliability in journey times can't be assured and limitation in highway space make continuous bus priority and segregation problematic.</p> <p>This point has been reiterated on many occasions during meetings and in correspondence with the LLF and Technical Group. OAR reports along with LLF minutes and correspondence are all available online.</p>
19	Dan Strauss	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>In February 2018 the GCP's Summary Report of Consultation Findings of the C2C Better Bus Journeys Phase 1 stated "the rugby club access was predominantly supported by respondents that discussed this area of the route. Adams Road was felt to be busy with pedestrian and cycle traffic which adding a bus route to would make unsafe".</p> <p>On the GCP's INSET Assessment Public Acceptability criteria the Rifle Range scored 5.</p>	<p>The initial public acceptability score for Rifle Range reflected strong support from many stakeholders at the time of the 2017 consultation for the principle of a segregated and direct route to Grange Road. Subsequently, strong representation was made regarding Green Belt impacts and protection of the West Fields, and dialogue with a number of landowners identified conflicts with the Rifle Range route. Further design work identified the need for greater land take which was also less acceptable to stakeholders.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>By January 2020 that score had fallen to the lowest possible. 1. Why the 80% reduction in public acceptability?</p> <p>Because Jesus College wanted access and the Rugby Club wanted occasional access for “special events only”. Downgraded from 5 to 1.</p> <p>Adams Road on the other hand is the second busiest cycle route in Cambridge: it’s used by 5900 cyclists every day. That’s why over 3000 people have signed this petition to stop 220 buses a day being routed along it. It’s public acceptability score is 3.</p> <p>So Jesus College and the Rugby Club wanting access, downgrades the Rifle Range Public Acceptability score to 1, but 5900 cyclists a day, no designated cycle lanes, 30 buses an hour and 2 complex road junctions leaves Adams Road unchanged with a score of 3.</p> <p>3000 people versus a College and a Rugby Club.</p> <p>Can the Joint Assembly inform the Executive Board of this petition of over 3000 signatures that demonstrates the lack of public acceptability of using Adams Road for the Busway and instead urge them to revert to the Rifle Range route option?</p>	
20	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Camcycle supports all forms of sustainable transport. However, we are gravely concerned about the Adams Road section of the proposals. Almost 6,000 people per day cycle there, peaking at over 800 people per hour on busy days. The anticipated expansion of the West Cambridge site will further increase these numbers by thousands of people per day. We have been informed that future plans could mean that there would be 30 buses per hour running on Adams Road, which is just 8m wide between the kerbs. Past experience with similar situations on a shared section of the Guided Busway route gives us cause for concern, such as</p>	<p>Although the presentation of detailed road layout options is not mandatory at this stage in defining a route alignment, the project team has developed initial layouts in order to support discussion and address the concerns of stakeholder groups and residents.</p> <p>Should plans advance, we would continue to engage and work with the local community and CamCycle to develop layouts that prioritise the safety of all road users. Current proposals remove the parked cars</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>the incident on 21st June 2017 when a bus driver attempted an unsafe pass of some cyclists and drove the bus into a wall near the Cambridge Assessment site.</p> <p>Q1: We ask the Joint Assembly to give careful consideration to the implications of putting that many buses along Adams Road and whether the project is trying to cut a little bit of cost by shifting injury risk onto members of the public?</p> <p>The Adams Road route mixes buses with thousands of people cycling daily, while the Rifle Range route does not. Yet, according to Mott MacDonald's INSET Assessment criteria in the third Options Assessment Report, both Adams Road and the Rifle Range route are scored the same in terms of safety. We find this hard to believe.</p> <p>Q2: We ask the Joint Assembly to consider this discrepancy in the INSET safety assessment and whether this is an indication of a rushed proposal that has not been fully-worked out yet in terms of risks and mitigations?</p> <p>We ask the Joint Assembly to recommend to the Executive Board that the Adams Road route option not be pursued because its safety risks have not been adequately explored.</p>	<p>forcing two-way traffic and cycles to compete for half the space and seek to improve the current poor layout at Wilberforce junction.</p> <p>Whilst Adams Road is a busy cycle route, it is comparable with other busy corridors in Cambridge such as Magdalene Street where similar (or higher) cycle volumes compete with similar (or higher) bus flows in a much more constrained environment.</p> <p>Cutting cost was not a determining factor in revisiting the West Cambridge alignment.</p>
21	Dr Colin M Harris	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>The C2C plan shows the busway extending to Grange Road, following a route via Adams Road.</p> <p>The GCP has published plans in support of the CAM scheme, and as such we assume this is GCP policy. Can the GCP please explain how the Adams Road section of the proposed western busway is compatible with the proposed CAM tunnel scheme? Will this section not be redundant when a tunnel is built, and if so, is it not unjustified to use public funds for a scheme that is likely to be redundant well before the end of lifetime of the busway scheme?"</p>	<p>It is proposed that the scheme would use existing public highway at Adams Road. No new infrastructure would be required and minimum changes are proposed on Adams Road due to the conservation area status.</p> <p>At the point that tunnels are built, metro-style vehicles would enter a West Cambridge tunnel portal, at a location to be determined by the CPCA in advance of Adams Road.</p>

30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

		<p>Dr Harris is not able to be present at the meeting to ask the question, but has asked if a response could be made at the meeting (so that the Joint Assembly may benefit from the GCP response) and also emailed to him.</p>	<p>There would be a section of busway from West Cambridge to Adams Road which would become redundant, but this could then be re-used to provide a much-enhanced cycle route.</p> <p>By contrast, the Rifle Range option would require more infrastructure which would eventually be rendered redundant.</p>
22	Roger Tomlinson	<p>Agenda Item No. 10: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Freedom of Information requests revealed that after the Joint Assembly in November 2018, County Transport staff identified that the Natural England and Historic England reports on the route had been misrepresented in the Mott Macdonald and Transport Director's reports, to almost reverse their meaning, with Cambridge Past Present and Future, the government agencies and the National Trust being aware of this.</p> <p>However, No changes were made to the report and so the December 2018 Executive Board was not told about this when it approved further work. James Littlewood of Cambridge Past Present and Future submitted a question about this which was not answered in the Board meeting.</p> <p>We have followed this up with FOIs on the communications between Mott Macdonald and the Transport Director but these have been refused claiming exemption under the "the Environmental Information Regulations". These state that there should be a "Specific interest in transparency with regard to democratic decision making process regarding the project". Under these circumstances information should not be withheld.</p> <p>The Information Commissioner is about to adjudicate on this matter. Are Joint Assembly members happy to be making crucial decisions based on erroneous reports?</p>	<p>Full consultation responses are made available online and are presented to the Board in full as a supplement to consultation reports.</p> <p>The Freedom of Information Act request referred to in the question was submitted/responded to in January/February 2019. Following the outcome of an internal review, a complaint was made to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) in June 2019.</p> <p>Some information held by the GCP was released, but some was identified as being exempt from disclosure under Regulation 12(4)(d) of the Environmental Information Regulations, which states that "a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that the request relates to material which is still in the course of completion, to unfinished documents or to incomplete data". This information related to the drafting of reports and responses to the public consultation which were subsequently published. In line with the Regulations, the exemption was subject to a public interest which took into account transparent decision making, details of which were set out in our original response.</p> <p>The GCP received a response from the ICO on 29 January 2020 and are reviewing the decision.</p>

**30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy
Recommendations from Councillor Bick**

Assembly recommendations on City Access Strategy

The GCP Joint Assembly welcomes the amassing of evidence to support the development of the City Access project, including data from the successive exercises in public engagement culminating in the Citizens Assembly.

It re-affirms its commitment to an integrated strategy to reduce congestion together with transport-related air pollution and carbon emissions.

To deliver this, it recommends that the Board makes progress on the project by developing detailed options for a package of phased interventions, together with a timeline to be considered at its meeting in June, in order to realise:

- A major improvement in the bus network and services on it, as illustrated by Systra (ref.6.9–6.18), including options for fairer fare structures and low-cost journeys;
- Measures to accelerate the cleaning and greening of bus and commercial delivery fleets;
- An income stream arising from a scheme of demand management, which both funds the major bus improvements and reduces other traffic by 10-15% from its 2011 level, enabling buses to operate efficiently (ref.7.17-7.33)
- The vision of “Making Space for People” (ref.7.3-7.4), utilising the opportunity created by the above to re-allocate highway space for public realm that is safer, healthier and more conducive to walking and cycling, including properly assessed road changes in central Cambridge in line with the Citizens Assembly recommendations.

The Assembly recommends the Board to carry this out with reference to the attached principles adopted by the GCP in June 2019 and to accompany the options with a full equalities impact assessment.

The Assembly considers that the resulting package must achieve its impact within the timeframe for planned growth, whilst also recognising it has the potential to support a wider CAM metro network on a later timescale.

The Assembly notes the progress already underway on supportive interventions (ref. 10.3) and it recommends the Board to consider further short-term measures (ref.10.4) to the degree that they are consistent with an agreed approach to longer term strategy or are independently sustainable.

**30th January Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy
Recommendations from Councillor Bick**

City Access Principles – Adopted by the GCP Board June 2019

	Overarching Principles Proposals should...		Implementation Principles Proposals should...
1	Tackle both congestion and air pollution now and in the future, with benefits sustained over the long term, and supporting a reduction in carbon emissions locally	A	Tackle congestion and air quality at the busiest times in particular
		B	Open up opportunities to significantly transform the public realm to prioritise walking and cycling
		C	Clearly articulate the long term objectives of any scheme, to enable people to make consistent choices over time
		D	Include provision for monitoring in order to secure and sustain benefits to traffic levels and air quality
2	Encourage behaviour change to reduce car journeys and emissions, in particular for people to make more journeys using public transport, cycling and walking	E	Create an integrated, easy to use network offering significantly more people travelling in Greater Cambridge regularly for work and education an attractive and affordable choice to travel by public transport
		F	Offer more direct public transport services between key sites, avoiding the need to change or travel through the city centre where possible
		G	Be comprehensive: offering extended hours and appropriate coverage across the travel to work area
		H	Provide services for those commuting out of hours
		I	Consider how to ensure it is cheaper to take public transport into Cambridge than to drive and park
		J	Support wider modal shift to sustainable transport modes beyond commuter journeys
3	Significantly improve access for people travelling into and around Greater Cambridge for regular journeys, supporting the economy and creating better journeys for our communities	K	Enhance the environment and improve the sustainability of Greater Cambridge as the area continues to grow, supporting the shift towards zero carbon
		L	Bring forward public transport improvements before any demand management scheme becomes operational
4	Be fair and equitable to both those travelling to Greater Cambridge from further away, as well as to those residing within the City and South Cambridgeshire	M	Offer people flexibility in how they make their journey
		N	Ensure money raised through any demand management scheme is ringfenced for improving transport in Greater Cambridge and across the wider area, and that spending decisions and allocations of this money are clear and transparent, consistent with 1-3 above