



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board

Thursday 30th June 2022

4:00 p.m. – 5:40 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Elisa Meschini	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes (substitute member)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andy Williams (substitute member)	Business Representative
Andy Neely (substitute member)	University Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in attendance:

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

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Stephen Kelly	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development (Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Assistant Director: Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (GCP)

1. Election of Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Baigent, seconded by Councillor Milnes and resolved unanimously that Councillor Meschini be elected Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the municipal year 2022/23.

2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Smith as the South Cambridgeshire District Council representative on the Executive Board, as well as Councillor Milnes as her substitute, and expressed thanks to former Executive Board members Councillor Gough and Austen Adams. She noted that there were currently vacancies for the University and Business Board representatives on the Executive Board, and that Andy Neely and Andy Williams would continue to attend in their capacity as substitute representatives until such time as substantive representatives were appointed.

It was proposed by the Chairperson, seconded by Councillor Baigent and resolved unanimously that Councillor Smith be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the municipal year 2022/23.

3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Smith (substituted by Councillor Milnes).

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Milnes declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Waterbeach Station Relocation item (agenda item 11), as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee.

Andy Neely declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Waterbeach Station Relocation item (agenda item 11), as a resident near to Waterbeach train station.

Councillor Baigent declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Camcycle).

5. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 17th March 2022, were agreed as a correct record, and were signed by the Chairperson.

6. Public Questions

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

It was noted that four questions related to Agenda Item 9 (Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme), and two questions related to Agenda Item 11 (Waterbeach Station Relocation).

7. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 9th June 2022.

8. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, and which also included a proposal for cycling improvements on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Following recent economic shocks caused by events including Covid-19, the UK's withdrawal from the EU, and the war in Ukraine, a growth in the employment gap between knowledge-intensive jobs and non-knowledge-intensive jobs had been identified in the Greater Cambridge area, and it was emphasised that there was a need for the region to ensure it continued to attract and retain key sector businesses alongside the development of key infrastructure. Attention was also drawn to details of the review of the first year's work carried out by Form the Future, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

Noting that a range of issues had been raised by the Joint Assembly, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted concerns about the implications of the overprogramming within the capital spending pipeline for the GCP, and he welcomed that officers had agreed that an item would be brought forward on the matter during the next year. Concern had been expressed over the deliverability of exception sites, and he noted that officers had undertaken to raise the issue with colleagues at South Cambridgeshire District Council. He also confirmed that the Joint Assembly had endorsed the delivery of cycling improvements on the Addenbrookes site.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that there was a lack of HGV drivers in the region, and suggested that it was a skills gap that required attention. Acknowledging the concern, the Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme informed members that the Combined Authority was undertaking a wider skills programme across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region and undertook to raise the matter with them.

- Expressed concern about the scarcity and cost of accommodation in Greater Cambridge, noting that many lower-skilled workers, as well as key workers, had to travel over 50 miles to work as a result of this issue, further compounding the matter. It was noted that with the significant levels of growth in the region business communities were agitating for additional housing. Highlighting that housing was central to the City Deal, the Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme emphasised that the various schemes and infrastructures that the GCP would fund and implement over the coming years would help to alleviate some of the constraints, although she acknowledged that the problem would not be resolved quickly.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

Endorse the request to deliver cycling improvements on the Addenbrookes site at Car Park H/6 Puddicombe Way and Adrian Way, as set out in Section 6.8 of the report.

9. Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme

Four public questions were received from James Littlewood, Councillor Howard Kettel, Dr John Coppendale, and Jim Rickard. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which detailed the impact of the approved development of the Stapleford Retirement Village on a section of the Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme (CSETS). Following a review of the options to realign the impacted section of the route, two proposals had been established, as set out in Paragraph 4.8 of the report. In line with the extensive consultation and engagement that had already taken place throughout the development of the scheme, an additional targeted consultation on the two options would be carried out in order to identify and mitigate any adverse impacts, and to provide consultees with an opportunity to comment on the revised section of the route. The Transport Director emphasised the GCP's continuous commitment to refine the scheme to minimise environmental impacts.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had acknowledged the need to deviate from the original alignment and had supported consideration of the two options, as well as the proposal of a targeted consultation on them, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly conveyed frustrations that the scheme would be delayed and that the GCP did not appear to have been sufficiently sighted on the planning application.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Expressed concern over how the CSETS route had been presented and redesigned throughout its development, drawing attention to the proximity of the route to local communities that it was not designed to serve. However, it was observed that the Local Liaison Forum and most of the local communities had supported the route selection.

- Highlighted that an increased movement of people around the Cambridge South train station could impact the design of the CSETS route in the surrounding area. The Transport Director assured members that the GCP worked closely with the rail industry on such matters.
- Suggested that the delay to the scheme caused by the required realignment provided an opportunity to refine the scheme further, for example to further minimise the environmental impact on the Nine Wells nature reserve. Confirming that the GCP would continue to refine the scheme in this way throughout its development, the Transport Director informed members that discussions would be held with the nature reserve.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the impact of the Stapleford Retirement Village planning application on the CSETS route;
- (b) Approve an additional targeted consultation for the impacted section of the route through Stapleford; and
- (c) Note the commitment to continue to refine the scheme design to minimise environmental impacts of the scheme.

10. Parking Strategy Update and Residents' Parking Scheme Delivery

The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth presented the report, which included the proposed objectives and vision of the Integrated Parking Strategy that was being developed by the GCP alongside the county and city councils, following a period of public engagement on parking issues within Cambridge in February and March 2022. The focus of the objectives and vision, set out in section 4 of the report, was on rebalancing parking provision across the city to encourage people to use sustainable modes of transport, thus shifting demand for car parking away from the city centre. The strategy was being developed with awareness of the importance of parking revenue to both councils' budgets, and it was confirmed that if the resulting interventions led to an overall decrease in revenue, alternative fund streams would need to be found to avoid an impact. The strategy had been updated to include additional comments raised by the Joint Assembly, including to reflect the GCP's ambition to improve access for all modes and to recognise the need to increase the supply of cycle parking due to increasing demand.

The report also included an initial delivery plan for residents' parking schemes, following the county council's request to reinitiate their implementation. As well as the underlying objectives of the Integrated Parking Strategy, feedback from the public engagement on parking issues demonstrated support for the delivery of additional parking controls across the city, and it was proposed that an initial tranche of six

schemes be delivered in Elizabeth, Hurst Park, Romsey East, Romsey West, Wilberforce and York, with further new schemes to be considered in 2023.

Welcoming the additions that had been made to the strategy to reflect some suggestions made by the Joint Assembly, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly noted that a range of parking issues had been raised, including parking enforcement outside residents' parking schemes, pavement parking, and the impacts of large events on local residents. Members had welcomed the reinitiating of the residents' parking scheme programme and had supported the delivery of the six initial priority schemes.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Emphasised the need for additional secure cycle parking, but highlighted that the issue should be addressed sensitively to avoid creating conflict between cyclists and car drivers. It was suggested that lampposts within residents' parking schemes could be potentially considered for cycle parking, due to the increased visibility that they afforded.
- Acknowledged the need to consider pavement parking, including in areas of the city where it was currently necessary.
- Welcomed the reinitiating of the residents' parking schemes programme, and supported the proposal to consider increasing the size of residents' parking schemes to increase flexibility.
- Highlighted the Integrated Parking Strategy's objective of sustainable and inclusive growth, and emphasised that parking should serve that objective, rather than hinder it.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Agree the objectives and vision for the Integrated Parking Strategy;
- (b) Note the feedback from the parking issues engagement;
- (c) Agree the six initial priority residents' parking schemes for delivery as set out at paragraph 6.4 of the report, as the first tranche of schemes to be funded out of the existing city access budget; and
- (d) Agree that the GCP should aim to deliver parking controls across the whole city over time, with a further tranche of schemes brought to the GCP Board for agreement next year.

11. Waterbeach Station Relocation

Two public questions were received from Jane Williams and John Grant. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented the report, which proposed a role for the GCP in ensuring the delivery of the Waterbeach station relocation, and which included details of plans to engage with the local community on the delivery of this project. The relocation of the station, which was a requirement of the planning permission for part of the Waterbeach New Town Development, would enable the delivery of 4500 homes, and it was highlighted that the acceleration of housing growth was one of the core objectives of the City Deal. With the developer, RLW, having confirmed that it could contribute £17m towards a total cost of £37m for the relocation, there was a funding gap of approximately £20m.

Noting that the relocation of the station was a requirement of the planning consent and therefore it was not for the GCP to question the necessity of the project itself, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly informed the Executive Board that the Joint Assembly had acknowledged the wider role of the GCP in facilitating development projects to deliver housing or jobs in the area, and therefore had supported the proposals to ensure the 4500 homes were delivered. Notwithstanding, the Joint Assembly had expressed concern that the developers had been unable to fund the relocation in accordance with its original agreement, and emphasised the importance of ensuring that it did not set a precedent that could lead to further developers making similar requests in the future. He also asked the Executive Board to be cautious and minimise the financial risk to the GCP as much as possible.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged that the role of the GCP went beyond funding road infrastructure projects, and recognised that failure to support the station relocation when there were no other funding options available was likely to lead to the loss of 4500 homes, which would be of significant detriment to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan given the demand for additional housing to support the high levels of growth across the region.
- Supported the proposal to allocate £37m to the station relocation, with £17m to be repaid in line with the S106 agreement. but emphasised the importance of highlighting the GCP's disappointment at being required to provide such funding and concern over the responsibilities and risks that it would be taking on.
- Observed the higher value of land assigned for residential use than land assigned for agricultural use, although it was acknowledged that there was significant investment required to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure a site was clear and serviced, which suppressed the base land value for the land owner.
- Sought clarification on whether any profits exceeding the affordability gap of 20% that had been agreed as part of the planning application process would be reverted to the local planning authority. Noting that the appraisal process took into

account additional factors, such as build costs and infrastructure inflation costs in terms of delivery, and that the calculation was therefore more complex than simply profit made by the developer, the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development confirmed that any additional income over £20m would be assigned to affordable housing.

- Clarified that the £17m that would be repaid to the GCP would be index-linked and therefore would increase with inflation, which provided the developer with an incentive to repay as quickly as it could.
- Welcomed that the car park would be a public asset that would benefit local residents in the long-term.
- Noted that long leases were not the same as land transfers.
- Highlighted the importance of undertaking effective and wide-ranging consultations to ensure that the local community was engaged in the process. Noting that some key parameters of the project had already been set, such as the planning consent, the Transport Director assured members that the GCP would develop a plan and process to ensure such engagement took place, which would include issues such as how the two stations were connected in active travel terms rather than wider issues of the Waterbeach New Town project.
- Considered whether the consultation should include existing users of the current station beyond the local community. Acknowledging that the station was used by people who lived outside Waterbeach, the Transport Director suggested that those who would be most affected by the relocation would be the local community. Nonetheless, he confirmed that the GCP would be working with Network Rail and the wider rail industry, which would provide opportunities to disseminate information more widely. He also emphasised that equal consideration would be given to any contributions that were received from outside the local community.
- Queried whether there were statistics available on the number of commuters travelling along the Waterbeach train line, for example from Ely to London. Noting that the planning authorities would have considered the impact and distributional effect of traffic and transport in the area as part of the original planning application, the Transport Director undertook to provide members with the information.

The following amendment to recommendation (c) was proposed by the Chairperson, seconded by Councillor Milnes, and agreed unanimously (additions in bold, removal in strikethrough):

- (c) ~~Comment on~~ **Support** plans to engage with the local community, on scheme delivery, subject to an Executive Board decision to progress the Joint Agreement;

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Approve the allocation of £20m to fund the relocation of the station and agree to forward fund the remainder of the cost, £17m, which will be repaid to the public sector in line with the S106 agreement;
- (b) Endorse GCP's role in ensuring the delivery of the station relocation and confirm that the scheme fits within the GCP's Integrated Transport Programme;
- (c) Support plans to engage with the local community, on scheme delivery, subject to an Executive Board decision to progress the Joint Agreement; and
- (d) Note the draft Heads of Terms, as set out in the confidential Appendix 1 of the report.

12. Dates of Future Meetings

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was due be held on Wednesday 28th September 2022, and noted the programme of meeting dates up to the end of 2023.

Chairperson
28th September 2022

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 30th June 2022
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

Questioner	Question	Answer
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past, Present & Future</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>There have been some significant changes in relation to CSET scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preferred Option for Local Plan is to extend Biomedical Campus next to A1307. This won't be directly served by the CSET route, whereas it could be served by an option discounted in 2018. This will significantly increase the Benefit Cost Ratio of that option compared with the current route. 2. A factor in the GCP Boards' 2018 decision to discount a route in the A1307 corridor was that it could not form part of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM). The CAM has been dropped. Given that CAM was a factor in reaching a decision on preferred routes, there is a requirement to review that decision. 3. Now that the detailed route alignment is known, it will poorly serve the villages of Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford and in some cases could undermine bus services that serve village centres. 4. Planning Inspector recently granted permission for a development, including creating a new country park. The Busway would run adjacent to this park having a negative impact on the park. In other words, the negative impact of the Busway has increased. 5. Permission for Cambridge South Station will be granted 	<p>The City Deal was signed to deliver the planned growth in the existing Local Plan and address the previous infrastructure deficit, felt acutely at locations such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</p> <p>The preferred option was the most favoured at the consultation, and does that.</p> <p>The future Local Plan has not been agreed and the question is therefore speculative at best. The comment regarding Benefit Cost Ratio is factually inaccurate.</p> <p>The CSET project has always been planned and assessed as a stand-alone scheme in accordance with DfT requirements. It also forms part of the GCP's integrated transport programme, modelled on the successful Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, CSETS will deliver significant benefits to CBC and surrounding area.</p> <p>The CSET Phase 2 scheme was originally envisaged to serve the business parks only. Following consultation, proposals to move closer to villages were included and intermediate stops are now provided at Sawston, Stapleford, and Great Shelford.</p> <p>The off-road route provides a more convenient service</p>

ahead of the busway. The rail scheme will proceed first and therefore the busway construction works will have to fit around or be delayed by Network Rail. This creates a risk of further delay, compared to alternative options.

An alternative busway within the A1307 corridor would deliver similar journey times and reliability at significantly less cost, more quickly and with less damage to the countryside. Due to the expansion plans of the Campus it would deliver better Benefit Cost Ratio. Please will the GCP review the decisions made in 2018 and 2021 against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?

Option 2 of the proposed alignments around the retirement village would leave an area of land between the busway and Haverhill Road which was no longer viable for agriculture. The landowner has already indicated that they will not allow this land to be used for mitigation because they have development aspirations for it. It is therefore almost certain that if Option 2 went ahead that there would be a planning application submitted for housing on that land. Whilst the outcome of such an application cannot be known, there is clearly a risk that development could be granted in future. Especially as approval has been given for development on an adjacent site. Therefore, it is misleading to conclude that the impact on landscape, environment and green belt would be similar for both options; Option 2 carries a high risk of future harm whereas Option 1 does not. It is important that the consultation highlights the risk of future development associated with Option 2, so that people are fully aware of the implications of their choice. Please will you commit to providing information about this risk as part of the public consultation?

to the villages than an on-road A1307 service and was the most supported in previous correspondence.

The GCP operates in a rich-governance environment. Planning issues, including the theoretical question around possible future planning applications, are a matter for the Local Planning Authority. It will be for the LPA to comment on any perceived risk or otherwise.

<p>Cllr Howard Kettel Stapleford Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Following a consultation on two on-road and one off-road route conducted February to April 2018, a decision to go ahead with the off-road route was made at the GCP Exec meeting 11th October 2018, with the Transport Director highlighting that ‘the proposals were closely aligned with the development of the CAM’ (item 7 in the Minutes). Indeed the submitted Paper at Appendix B-Business Case (B.39) states: ‘The CAM proposals which form part of Strategy 1 contribute towards delivering the extended network envisaged within the LTTS’ and furthermore at B.109: ‘The proposed mass transit route is currently envisaged to form part of a wide CAM network’. However the Officer’s report to GCP Exec Board 30th June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.32 suggests that the CAM requirement was introduced after the Executive Board decision to adopt the off-road route which appears to be inconsistent with the facts.</p> <p>Given that CSET has been designed to be CAM compliant and this has now been dropped, will the GCP review the scheme against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?</p>	<p>The CSET project has always been planned and assessed as a stand-alone scheme in accordance with DfT requirements. It also forms part of the GCP’s integrated transport programme, modelled on the successful Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, CSETS will deliver significant benefits to CBC and surrounding area.</p> <p>The off-road route provides a more convenient service to the villages than an on-road A1307 service and was the most supported in previous consultation.</p> <p>As the paper outlines, the decision on the preferred route predates the requirements for CAM.</p>
<p>Dr John Coppendale</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The Officer's report to the GCP Executive Board meeting to be held on 30th June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.30 states: "Route options were consulted upon in 2017. The entirely off-road option was the public's preferred solution."</p> <p>Noting that the vote for the alternative A1307 was split by offering two options compared to only one-off road option</p>	<p>Major transport scheme development follows a prescribed process laid down by the Department for Transport. The CSETS scheme development has followed this process.</p> <p>This scheme has been subject to four public consultations and such consultations have been carried out in accordance with the guidance of the Consultation Institute.</p>

	<p>(1702 people voted for the A1307 as opposed to 1064 for the off-road route) and you could in any event vote for all options, and the more recent Anthony Browne survey, with a considerably higher number of respondents, showed that 81% would definitely not, or probably not, support the GCP busway.</p> <p>In the light of this, will the GCP have regard to overwhelming public opinion and review their route?</p>	<p>Local residents, stakeholders groups, public authorities, and even the local MP, have had, and will continue have the opportunity to contribute to our consultations.</p>
<p>Jim Rickard</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Tracing the history of the CSET project through the WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Haverhill Corridor Study carried out for Cambridgeshire County Council, and your own agenda packs for October 2018 and June 2020, it's clear that the benefit to cost ratios of the different options have evolved. This is quite natural as more work is done on a project. However, the two strategies following the A1307 alignment have consistently shown better BCRs than the GCP's preferred route. Recent developments involving speed restrictions, an additional pedestrian crossing for the retirement village and the need to reposition the Haverhill Road stop and slew the route around the retirement village would appear to penalise your currently preferred route still further. Conversely the projected south-eastern expansion of the Biomedical Campus would appear to improve the business case for the two routes along the A1307, and strategy 2 in particular.</p> <p>Will the GCP therefore reassess the BCRs for all three strategies, and make public the outcome of that reassessment?</p>	<p>The scheme will continue to be developed in accordance with the prescribed process outlined by the DfT.</p> <p>A Full Business Case will be presented for the Board's consideration, in due course, as required by the DfT.</p>

<p>Jane Williams</p>	<p>Agenda item 11 - Waterbeach Station Relocation</p> <p>Why were RLWE unable to secure a commercial funding arrangement? Does this indicate the risk /terms are so difficult that no funder was prepared to commit? If so why is the GCP prepared to do so?</p> <p>Payback based on station car park revenue is not the same as profit. Revenue is total income pre deductions. If revenue is anticipated at only £200K per annum not all of this is likely to be available to pay off the GCP loan. This gives a loan payback period of at least 100 years. Is this a wise investment/use of City Deal? It is noted that this will only be a partial completion of the relocated station. What guarantees have been given that RLWE/GCP/DFT funding will be in place?</p> <p>Could the GCP confirm that the station car park will not be reduced in size to enable the developer to fund the station? This is key regarding anticipated revenue return from car parking fees and reducing traffic on the A10.</p> <p>What is Network Rail's position regarding the station being delivered by 2025? What stage of negotiation are RLWE/NR at? What is the cost of decommissioning the existing station? Who will fund it?</p> <p>What business model/ predicted numbers are the GCP using for the Waterbeach greenway, segregated busway, P&R and relocated station? Policy SS/6 para 3.42 SCDC adopted LP states "The existing A10 is at capacity and road improvements will be required, including measures to address capacity at the Milton junction with the A14. Developers of Waterbeach New Town, U&C and RLWE "</p>	<p>The developer has, despite trying to develop a business case for the station, not been able to secure funding.</p> <p>The car parking revenue will not pay off the capital investment. That investment comes from Government to support delivery of the Local Plan, and in this instance to support 4,500 homes.</p> <p>The station car park will be delivered as per the current planning application, it will not be reduced at the whim of the developer.</p> <p>Discussions continue with Network Rail. The costs of closing the existing station are included in the project.</p> <p>The details of the Waterbeach busway are available on the website, a further iteration of the business case will be brought back to the Executive Board later in the year.</p> <p>The planning decision and associated consultation has already taken place. The paper makes clear GCP's commitment to engagement as part of scheme delivery.</p>
----------------------	--	--

	<p>have substantially underfunded transport plans" stated by Sharon Brown SCDC planning committee meeting on 29th January 2021</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0blfv3t_x6s</p> <p>I conducted a quick straw poll to seek the views of community. 190 people responded. 94% voted against GCP funding the station. What sort of public consultation will GCP conduct regarding the station relocation?</p>	
<p>John Grant</p>	<p>Agenda item 11 - Waterbeach Station Relocation</p> <p>Has any modelling of likely destinations for journeys by residents of the new town been done, and if so what was the outcome? On January 2nd 2001 Waterbeach Parish Council passed a motion stating (inter alia) that "placing such a settlement on the main railway line to London will encourage those who work in London to move to such a settlement, thus reducing its effectiveness as a solution to the Cambridge housing problem." What proportion of the 4500 houses are likely to be occupied by people who work locally? And what proportion of local journeys are likely to be to destinations that are near a rail station?</p> <p>If rail will be an option for significant numbers of people, has there been any consideration of the detail of how the train service would be delivered? There is very little spare capacity on the railway, and it is not clear where a local shuttle service would be able to terminate, for instance there is not expected to be platform space for trains to turn round at Cambridge South.</p>	<p>The assessment of the site was undertaken by the relevant statutory planning and consenting authorities, namely the Local Planning Authority (South Cambridgeshire DC) and the Highways Authority (Cambridgeshire CC).</p> <p>We will pass the questions to said authorities for a response.</p>