

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 9th September 2021
2:00 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Rosy Moore (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Alex Beckett	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson

Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
---------------	-------------------------

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Gemma Schroeder	Project Manager: Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Richard Preston	Senior Delivery Project Manager (City Access) (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isabel Wade	Assistant Director: Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Lucy Scott.

The Chairperson expressed thanks to former Joint Assembly member Andy Williams, noting that he had become a substitute member of the Executive Board. He advised the Joint Assembly that Claire Ruskin, a former member of the Executive Board, had been nominated as the new business representative to replace Andy Williams on the Joint Assembly. Although her appointment would not be official until ratified by the Executive Board at its forthcoming meeting, Claire Ruskin had been invited to attend today's Joint Assembly meeting in an unofficial capacity.

The Chairperson also informed the Joint Assembly that it had received a book entitled "Histon Road: A Community Remembers" from the Histon Road Area Residents' Association, which celebrated the memories of local people. It was noted that the book launch would be on 24th September at St Augustine's Community Centre in Cambridge, and would be accompanied by an exhibition of work by documentary photographer Faruk Kara.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 24th February 2021, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the correction of "Whittlesworth" to "Whittlesford" on the last bullet point of Agenda Item 10 (Quarterly Progress Report), and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that nine 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 clarified that those submitting questions had been offered the option of attending the meeting in person or having their question read out by an officer.

It was noted that two questions related to agenda item 6 (Quarterly Progress Report), four questions related to agenda item 7 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy) and three questions related to agenda item 8 (Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders).

5. Petitions

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

6. Quarterly Progress Report

Two public questions were received from John Grant and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Further to the updates, the report detailed a proposal for the GCP to contribute £200k to the first stages of a traffic sensor network across Greater Cambridge, which would assist the development of a richer set of data that would demonstrate the impact of the GCP's work. While the project's timescale was still subject to discussion, it was proposed that the procurement process could commence by the autumn, allowing for the sensors to be in place by early spring and fully operational by the summer in 2022. Attention was also drawn to the update on Skills delivery in Section 11 of the report, which demonstrated that, despite challenges, there had been good progress towards the targets.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Clarified that consideration of the West of Cambridge Package had been deferred by the County Council's Planning Committee pending the submission of additional information that had been requested. It was anticipated that the planning application would be considered by the Committee in early 2022.
- Requested an update on Resident Parking Schemes (RPSs), noting that the GCP and County Council were both keen for progress to be made. The Transport Director confirmed that there were ongoing discussions with the County Council about developing an Integrated Parking Strategy, which included individual elements such as RPSs.
- Requested an update on land purchasing for the Greenways schemes. While acknowledging that the issue of land purchase was the greatest challenge for the schemes, the Transport Director assured members that a lot of work was being carried out to resolve the issues, and he anticipated being able to provide a more detailed update in early 2022.
- Welcomed that resources and events aimed at primary schools were being development for launch in the new academic year, noting the importance of primary schools for initiating aspirations in young people.
- Requested anonymised case studies in future reports that could demonstrate the wide variety of ages, levels and types of organisations taking on apprentices.

- Confirmed that a Smart Working Group was in the process of being organised.
- Suggested that the GCP could consider making a section of one of its projects solely for the use of autonomous vehicles, as there would be less impediments than on a public road, and it would support their development. The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme informed members that the GCP was discussing such a proposal with the Genome Campus.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring that changes to the strategic network were based on evidence.
- Welcomed that formal applications had been submitted to UK Power Networks (UKPN), and sought clarification on whether the response from UKPN had been either positive or negative. Noting that UKPN had acknowledged the problem raised by the GCP in its response, and that it was planning some consultation on changes that might impact the situation in Greater Cambridge, the Chief Executive reported that the GCP had requested a further meeting to discuss the matter in greater detail. She also noted that alongside the lobbying efforts, the GCP was continuing to intervene where it could, informing the Joint Assembly that an Outline Business Case would be presented later in the year.

7. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

Four public questions were received from David Trippett, Roger Turnbull, David Stoughton and Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director and Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth presented the report, which outlined proposals that would be presented to the Executive Board on 30th September 2021 to establish a comprehensive package of measures for the City Access Strategy to promote sustainable transport, improve air quality and reduce congestion and carbon emissions. This included the development of a final package of options for improving bus services, funding an expansion of the cycling-plus network, and managing road space in Cambridge. It also outlined plans to consult on a package including bus network improvements, proposals for prioritising road space for sustainable and active transport, and measures that would provide an ongoing funding source for the enhanced public transport network and more of the cycling-plus network across Greater Cambridge. Finally, it detailed plans to work with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and local bus operators to reduce emissions on the local public transport network by allocating £2.25m to support the Zero Emission Bus Regional Area (ZEBRA) bid to the Government for zero emissions vehicles across Greater Cambridge.

Emphasising the central role of the City Access Strategy in the GCP's overall programme, the Transport Director noted that car use in the region had now increased to higher levels than before the Covid-19 pandemic, further highlighting the need to improve the public transport offer and cycling infrastructure, while implementing measures to discourage car use. Members were informed that under the proposals laid out in the report, most market towns and villages would see a tripling and

extension of bus frequencies, along with more direct and express links to Cambridge. Bus routes would provide improved connections to travel hubs, such as train stations and cycling routes, and would include more direct services to main employment areas within the city centre, as well as more frequent, untimetabled services. Noting that changes to fares would be considered as part of the consultation, the Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth observed that a £1 flat fare, for example, could potentially lead to a further 1.6 million journeys per year.

While all the proposals and measures under consideration would make bus journeys more reliable, cheaper and therefore attractive, it was emphasised that there would be a significant cost of up to £40m per year, and while the GCP could fund a portion of that, an ongoing revenue source would be required. Noting that it would be difficult to reach unanimity on how this should be achieved, the Transport Director emphasised the importance of the consultation for involving the local community in the discussion to ensure all requirements and opinions were represented and considered. The Joint Assembly was informed that paragraph 2.1(a) of the report should have read “as outlined in the report”, rather than “in para 7.24 and 7.25”, while paragraph 6.10 should have referred to paragraphs 6.5-6.7 instead of 7.5-7.7.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the development of the City Access Strategy as outlined in the report and the benefits that it would provide for residents and visitors to Cambridge.
- Highlighted the need to identify key strategic routes for movement around the city to ensure that traffic flowed as efficiently as possible, noting that there would be significantly more buses in the city if the employment growth continued according to the expected levels. Concerns were raised about this increase in numbers of buses and members sought clarification on where the bus routes would terminate, arguing that they could increase congestion. It was further asked for clarification on how bus users would be expected to complete their journeys if the buses did not reach the centre, and whether such clarification would be provided as part of the consultation.
- Supported the measures outlined in the report, while suggesting that supporters of proposals were generally less likely to indicate their support than objectors were to express their objections, although it was recognised that decisions were not solely based on the result of levels of support or opposition that were expressed during consultation.
- Observed that shopping preferences were evolving, with increasing online or click-and-collect purchases, which affected travel flow and public transport requirements. The Transport Director acknowledged the changes and recognised the GCP needed to respond accordingly and in an appropriately adaptable way.
- Argued that to reduce the number of cars in the city, greater attention should be given to rural areas, as it was easier to promote modal shift within urban areas than rural areas, given the increased number of connections required if using public transport, as well as the difficulty in walking or cycling for longer distances.

- Identified the multiple transport authorities in the area as one of the main causes of delay in developing the City Access Strategy and other projects, and queried whether the GCP could take a greater lead and encourage greater levels of joint working while streamlining processes.
- Considered whether City Access was the most appropriate name for the strategy, with members arguing that it suggested a focus on only improving the city itself and making it more accessible to people from outside the city, while it was noted that inaccurate references to a City Centre Access Strategy exacerbated such a perception. It was also observed that the strategy involved cross-city travel for local residents and that 'Access' was therefore an inappropriate term, while the Future Networks Map could include a more detailed section of the city to demonstrate this. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth noted that the GCP had not been able to find a more appropriate name than City Access Strategy but informed members that she would welcome alternative suggestions.
- Argued that the south-west area of the Future Network Map could include greater coverage, with the Ashwell and Morden train station in Odsey currently not serviced by buses, and other local routes and villages lacking in attractive public transport options. It was suggested that an increase in local bus connections to smaller train stations, along with a coordination of bus and train timetables, would lead to greater use of the services. Members also encouraged the inclusion of a greater number of villages on the map.
- Noted that it would be useful to be provided with information on where train journeys originated for people travelling into Cambridge.
- Argued that the cost of using public transport needed to be less than the cost of travelling by car into the city.
- Highlighted the need to re-establish bus services in rural villages following their suspension during the pandemic, noting that their continued suspension increased feelings of isolation and powerlessness in local communities, while also eroding levels of trust with bus operators and the GCP.
- Emphasised the importance of the Future Networks Map demonstrating interconnected travel options, such as cycling, bus and train networks.
- Observed that there was little consideration given for people who travelled out of Cambridge, noting that Park and Ride sites did not serve a function for residents wishing to travel out of the city.
- Expressed concern about the phasing of the project, noting that it would be ineffective to introduce improved buses to the network if they continued to suffer from congestion issues.
- Suggested that it would be helpful to clarify in the consultation that further routes and measures could be developed in the future.

- Observed that Cambridge did not share a culture of everybody using public transport in the same way that it existed in other cities, such as London, and suggested that encouraging families, through discounts or free travel for children, would help ingrain a culture shift. It was also argued that people were reticent to walk to or from a public transport service, and therefore that it would be useful to highlight the benefits of such active travel. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth acknowledged the need to encourage people to try buses and informed members that options such as target fares were being considered.
- Suggested that work on developing a clean air zone could be carried out alongside work on the City Access Strategy given that it would take a substantial period of time to implement and for the bus operators to prepare their fleets for compliance.
- Argued that automated taxis would be common in the future, significantly reducing the cost of journeys, and it was suggested that this eventuality needed to be considered as part of the strategy's development.
- Emphasised the need to be bold, fast and committed, arguing that it was unrealistic to expect every part of the strategy to work perfectly and without any negative side-effects. While members supported the need for further consultation, it was argued that an appropriate balance needed to be established for the various measures between cost, speed of implementation and public consultation. It was also argued that it needed to be made clear how the consultation would differ from previous consultations, to ensure that people felt listened to. Acknowledging the concerns, the Transport Director highlighted the importance of consultations for identifying the necessary measures and to establish a wide spectrum of opinions.
- Suggested that greater focus could be given during the consultation on how the measures would be beneficial to local residents, particularly regarding less obvious benefits such as lowering carbon emissions, improving public health and connecting communities, rather than simply the benefits of reducing congestion and making it easier for people traveling from outside the city. The Transport Director noted that the use of personas as part of the consultation for Choices for Better Journeys had been successful and popular, and that it was being explored how to do something similar with the City Access Strategy consultation.
- Emphasised the need to consult with parish councils while developing integrated transport strategies, given their knowledge of local communities and their needs. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth acknowledged the observation and informed the Joint Assembly that they would be involved.
- Highlighted the need to involve people in the consultation from outside the Greater Cambridge area, particularly in East Cambridgeshire, given that many of them would benefit from the Strategy. It was also recognised that the widest representation of input as possible should be sought in the consultation.
- Requested that the consultation consider the possibility of on-demand bus services. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth noted that the CPCA was carrying out such trials in Huntingdonshire and confirmed that they would be considered as part of the consultation.

- Suggested that it would be helpful for the consultation to include comparisons of how the different measures would affect carbon emissions.
- Highlighted the importance of making it clear during consultations that such improvements to the bus network would only be sustainable with the implementation of an ongoing revenue source, and it was argued that the consultation should include discussions on the level of financial costs and penalties involved in the schemes.
- Noted that a high level of car journeys in the city were made by local people and therefore argued that the implementation of any measures such as a congestion charge would need to be accompanied by improvements to alternative options.
- Expressed concern about the impact of potential charging for vehicles accessing the city centre, particularly self-employed delivery drivers on low income, whose situation was already precarious following the impacts of the pandemic. It was emphasised that such affected stakeholders needed to be involved in the consultation.
- Expressed concern about allowing exemptions to charging for electric vehicles, as it would unfairly punish those who were unable to afford to upgrade their car.
- Highlighted the need to exempt some people from charging for reasons such as disability or inability to pay, although it was also argued that the climate crisis did not affect everybody equally and that one of the objectives was to reduce health inequalities and increase equality of access to public transport.
- Queried whether an equilibrium where enough people had been discouraged from using their vehicle and enough revenue was received from those who were prepared and able to pay a charge had been identified.
- Observed that replacing fuel-consuming vehicles with electric vehicles would not resolve the underlying congestion issues, and noted that while reducing carbon emissions they still produced pollution and led to accidents and road deaths.
- Acknowledged that developing a fair charging system was complex, but recognised that an ongoing revenue source would be required in order to ensure the Strategy was sustainable, and that this needed to be clearly explained throughout the consultation.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the direction set out in the report, with its main concerns revolving around ensuring the consultation was as inclusive, representative and informed as possible

8. Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders

Three public questions were received from Linny Purr, Kirsty Howarth (also on behalf of Nick Flynn, Robert Rawlinson and a number of local residents), and Anna Williams

(on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out proposals for the future of six Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) that had been implemented by the County Council and funded by the GCP, and which would be presented to the Executive Board for recommendation to the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee. Following the GCP's initial support and funding for the ETROs and consultations, five of the schemes had been recommended for being made permanent, with a further proposal to rescind the sixth scheme. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that if the Luard Road scheme, which had been recommended for rescindment, was be made permanent, it would be necessary to address concerns and make improvements to traffic signals on Long Road, which would mitigate the disbenefits that had been identified, although it was observed that such a change would require the GCP to agree to undertake the required improvements.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposals to make the ETRO schemes permanent but expressed concern about the effects that the permanent measures would have on nearby roads as a result of the long-term displacement of traffic. It was suggested that the Executive Board could ask the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee to reconsider possible mitigation of such issues.
- Noted that the Luard Road scheme had received the highest level of strong support during the public consultation out of all the schemes, and sought clarification on the negative impacts that had been identified and which had led to the report recommending that the Luard Road scheme be rescinded. It was confirmed that the main issue had been regarding displacement of traffic to Long Road and the resulting negative effects, such as increased pollution in that area.
- Observed that Sedley Taylor Road had been used by vehicles as a rat run during the temporary closure on Luard Road, and expressed concern about the GCP therefore supporting the scheme being made permanent, as it was likely to lead to vehicles to continue to use Sedley Road in such a way. One member argued that traffic displacement would be an inevitable of any of the schemes.
- Suggested that, if the Luard Road scheme were recommended to be made permanent, the GCP could undertake long-term monitoring of the displacement effect on Long Road. The Transport Director acknowledged that such an approach would be reasonable.
- Confirmed that the supplementary information circulated to the Joint Assembly prior to the meeting had also been published on the meeting website alongside the agenda.

As a result of the discussion on whether to rescind the Luard Road scheme or make it permanent, along with the other five schemes, it was unanimously agreed to convey the following message to the Executive Board:

The Joint Assembly supports making permanent the Luard Road closure, but to mitigate impacts on other roads, requests work is undertaken on traffic signals in the area, and long-term monitoring is undertaken on the effects of displacement on Long Road.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held on Thursday 18th November 2021.

Chairperson
18th November 2021

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 9th September 2021
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

No		Question	Answer
6	John Grant	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>The question refers to paragraph 13.2 on pp 52-53 of the Agenda Pack, and item 7 paragraphs 3.2 and 3.8 on pp 67-69.</p> <p>Following the success of the trial in west Cambridge, will GCP consider using Autonomous Vehicles in Waterbeach, to provide transport within the village and new town, including serving the railway station (whether or not it is relocated) and the various industrial and research sites?</p> <p>Will the team also consider the possibility of running the Vehicles at a higher speed (probably on dedicated tracks) to link into neighbouring settlements such as north Cambridge and Cottenham?</p>	<p>The trial at West Cambridge was successful, including highlighting the challenges that need to be solved before full autonomy can be considered a viable part of the public transport system.</p> <p>The GCP has an interest in various types of guidance systems including optical and autonomous technologies and continue to keep the development of these under review to ensure that we are in the best possible place to take advantage of them when the circumstances allow.</p>
12	Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Evidence published in July 2021 from the Cycle City Ambition Programme emphasises that there is significant potential to grow cycling in Cambridge: the sooner this is unlocked, the sooner benefits could be realised in terms of health, congestion, air quality and reduction of carbon emissions. Therefore Camcycle's questions on this agenda item seek to press for the rapid delivery of key active travel routes.</p> <p>1. There has been no specific agenda item on the much-needed Greenways at any meeting this year.</p>	<p>1. The focus this year has been on making progress on scheme design. Detailed designs for Comberton Greenway are nearing completion, and Haslingfield Greenway is well advanced.</p> <p>These are now providing the templates for subsequent Greenways. Greenways were all taken to the Executive Board last year and will be brought back to the Executive early next year once the design process is completed. Planned communications regarding the</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can you provide detail on the progress on these schemes? ○ What are the 'early interventions' which have been allocated £1.75m for delivery this financial year? <p>2. We're pleased to see progress on the Chisholm Trail but seek reassurance that Phase 1 will open by the end of 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the 'significant time risks' mentioned in point 10.13? ○ When will the bridge over Coldham's Brook and the railway underpass be addressed and will either require closure of the Coldham's Common path? <p>3. We'd also like to know more details on progress on the Madingley Road project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the timeline for completion next year? ○ Will detailed designs be presented to the Executive Board in December? <p>4. The objectives of the Smart Signals project (13.7) are confusing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How are they prioritising those using sustainable transport (especially pedestrians or those wheeling cycles) when easing motor traffic congestion and reducing idling seems to be the main focus (item 7, 6.9)? ○ Are the GCP's traffic reduction targets built into junction designs? Junctions are a significant barrier to safe active travel routes and the reallocation of road space because 'traffic flow' at junctions consistently seems to be placed higher than space for people. 	<p>Greenways programme will take place in the near future.</p> <p>2. There is no specific risk to single out. Supply chain pressures on resources and materials remain, but our expectation is the project will be completed in 2021.</p> <p>The Coldhams Common element of the trail including the bridge/culvert and rail underpass sections, is scheduled for completion by November 2021 and it is not proposed at this time that the route will be closed during this period.</p> <p>3. The date set out in the Quarterly Progress Report for Madingley Road is the completion of design. This is in line with the current budget allocation.</p> <p>Design work is due to be completed in Autumn 2021. Engagement with stakeholders will then follow.</p> <p>4. (A) A key aim of the trial is to assess the capability of Artificial Intelligence to identify and prioritise each sustainable transport mode including pedestrians, cyclists and buses in particular by reducing their wait time at junctions. Part of the evaluation of the trial will look at the impact of giving greater priority to sustainable transport modes and the impact this has on overall junction performance/user experience to help inform future decisions.</p> <p>(B) The smart signals project is part of the GCP's integrated transport strategy to tackle congestion, air quality and the climate challenge, including a reduction in traffic.</p>
--	--	--	--

3	David Trippett (Resident of Coldhams Lane and officer of Coldhams Lane Resident's Association)	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>At the previous meeting of the GCP, members firmly agreed that Eastern Access schemes needed to alleviate private motor traffic on the Northern trunk of Coldhams Lane, described as "one of the very worst congested roads in Cambridge" (Cllr Herbert). Extensive free parking at the Beehive Centre, demonstrably inadequate bus services, and the GCP's works to ameliorate traffic on Newmarket Rd were all cited as continuing drivers of congestion for Coldhams Lane. Residents continue to suffer from heavily congested traffic, and are very hopeful that the GCP will follow its words with actions. What proposals are being brought forward as a result of last meeting's discussion, and how will this integrate with the extended vision for a 'future bus network' recently published as part of its City Access paper?</p>	<p>The proposals being discussed today set out a bus network for the area as a whole, which would include improvements such as more frequent services, new local connections, lower overall traffic levels and lower fares.</p> <p>If approved by the Executive Board, a more detailed consultation on proposals will take place in the autumn as well as a consultation on the Cambridge Eastern Access scheme proposals.</p>
11	Roger Turnbull Apt Planning Ltd acting for a Stapleford resident working at Addenbrookes Hospital.	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 66 of the Agenda gives greater priority to shorter-term bus improvements to promote sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions. 2. In 2020, Systra Ltd produced the Cambridge Bus Network Report (page 73 of Agenda) to meet the GCP target to reduce traffic by 20% by 2031. It proposed 10 min. frequencies from rural villages to Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) which aligned with City Deal objectives. 3. Paragraph 2.1.24 of the Systra Report said that the rural bus network was unattractive because it was "circuitous & infrequent." It proposed a new X7 service (4 buses p.hour) 	<p>The City Access report outlines the sort of improvements that need to be made to adequately reduce traffic and support the transition to zero carbon.</p> <p>The proposed consultation would, if approved by the Executive Board, seek views on detailed proposals for bus services which would then be followed by the development of a business case for specific proposals.</p>

		<p>routed via the A1301, cutting journey times from Great Shelford by c.15 mins, Fig 32 & para 4.3.10.</p> <p>4. My question is, will City Access programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet GCP objectives to reduce traffic by 20%, & reduce carbon emissions, - Identify that the rural bus network is unattractive due to circuitous routes & infrequent services, - Increase bus frequencies from 20 mins to 10 mins on the A1301 corridor (instead of bypassing Sawston, Stapleford & Great Shelford, as proposed in the CSET Study), <p>Does the City Access proposals make the £100m+ cost of the CSET proposals Poor Value for Money, with an under-estimated impact on the Green Belt/landscape?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With minimal modal shift (page 18 of the Outline Business Case Econ Case 2020), - Misleading travel benefits excluding 20-30 mins perceived walking/waiting times which are longer than cycling journey times, & by-passing the 14,000 pop. in Sawston, Stapleford & Great Shelford, (Shelford Rail Option report), - With a negative effect on existing bus services, losing 56% of their passengers (Table 4.3 & para 5.2.2 of Mott MacDonald Update May 2021). <p>Will the revised CSET Economic Case include the City Access measures in the GCP Do-Nothing case, against which the CSET proposals will be assessed?</p>	
--	--	--	--

		I therefore repeat my Freedom of Information request for the release of 2020/21 CSET transport modelling results & evidence of revised travel benefits.	
2	David Stoughton Chair, Living Streets Cambridge	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The City Access Strategy makes constant references to promoting walking but has few proposals that address the barriers pedestrians face. Reducing congestion and pollution and closing some streets to cars would greatly improve the environment and potentially encourage walking. However, our survey and outreach at Living Streets Cambridge records an increasing number of negative factors that deter walkers and especially the disabled, the partially sighted and the blind.</p> <p>Notable among the factors deterring pedestrians are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant growth in pavement parking since lockdown, possibly encouraged by increases in deliveries and collections, but there have been noticeable increases in entirely residential areas too, o The growing multiplicity of alternative modes of transport, including private eScooters, motorised skateboards and spinning wheels, which are either illegal or unregulated but whose users assume that taking them on footways is permitted despite the alarm this causes for many pedestrians, o Further increases in unnecessary cycling on pavements. <p>Living Streets welcomes alternative modes that support active travel where they are segregated from footways and sees an opportunity to greatly improve first and last mile travel for longer journeys and those involving public transport. Availability of eScooters at bus stops might, for instance, increase bus</p>	<p>The City Access proposals aim to support increased walking by reducing traffic, pollution, and refocusing the city away from the car to create more pleasant environments and open up opportunities to create more space for people walking.</p> <p>The GCP is not the appropriate body to regulate or enforce road traffic or highway legislation. We continue to work with partners to deliver improvements across the Greater Cambridge environment.</p>

	<p>occupancy.</p> <p>However, if walking is to increase significantly, these negative factors need to be addressed and, while control of them is split between different councils and agencies and may require legislation, collaborative action is essential.</p> <p>Will this assembly undertake to coordinate policies to segregate modes of travel and return the footways to the use of pedestrians as intended? Further, will it work with appropriate bodies to ensure that footways are properly regulated and abuses controlled?</p> <p>Finally, will the Greater Cambridge Partnership explore the potential benefits of integrating legal alternative modes such as licensed eScooters with public transport?</p>	
--	--	--

13	Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The City Access project is vitally important, but this report raises more questions than it answers. Given the risk of a car-based recovery from Covid and the county's limited carbon budget, the plans and timelines are unambitious. There is no holistic vision pulling together work from local authorities (e.g. Making Space for People, LCWIP) to deliver a sustainable transport network with integration between public transport and active travel.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new bus strategy will see up to 1,150 buses entering Cambridge per day (Systra) which requires space for their movements and will create additional conflict with people walking and cycling. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What will be done to mitigate this? o What's happened to the plan to extend the Core Traffic scheme with additional bus gates? 2. The paper states that measures to discourage car use must follow the implementation of alternatives; however both reliable bus journeys and safe cycle routes depend on traffic reduction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Steer report suggests 'an incremental approach...that ratchets up incentives and disincentives in tandem'. Is this being explored? 3. Point 6.9 talks about bringing forward a programme of roadspace reallocation to deliver 'a revised network hierarchy ... that prioritises sustainable modes of transport' building on Active Travel Fund schemes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How does this fit into City Access? o Does the 'roadspace management scheme' scheduled for 	<p>Delivering a transformed transport network for Greater Cambridge that addresses the growth and climate challenges we face requires a vastly improved public transport network and lower car levels – this paper sets out a clear way forward on these two key issues.</p> <p>Taking your questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report explores the issues for the city environment of lower overall traffic levels, creating space for public transport, walking & cycling. Detailed bus routing and bus stop locations would also need to be considered as the proposed network is developed further following consultation. 2. Phasing is being explored to support the delivery of the proposals. 3. Cambridge's transport network is currently very constrained, and it would be difficult to deliver any large-scale road space reallocation without vehicle displacement impacts. The city access proposals for lower traffic levels would open up opportunities to take a bolder approach to the network. The draft road network hierarchy will therefore need to reflect the emerging city access proposals and is likely to be consulted on separately. 4. Choices for Better Journeys was a high level consultation undertaken prior to the pandemic, revised government policy on buses and active
----	-------------------------------------	--	---

		<p>2023 at the earliest (6.25) just apply to charging elements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The February report suggested that the draft network hierarchy would be consulted on this year – is it due to be part of the City Access consultation? <p>4. It's unclear why two further consultations are needed following Choices for Better Journeys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What will they involve? ○ Will options be set in context of the GCP's traffic reduction targets and partners' climate commitments (3.3) so residents can make properly informed responses? 	<p>travel, and the emerging Local Transport Plan refresh.</p> <p>The proposed consultation this autumn would reflect this new context and move forward to discussing detailed bus service proposals as well as principles for reducing traffic levels. A second consultation could then follow on a detailed scheme.</p>
4	Linny Purr **	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>This question is an appeal to the GCP to carry out its science from a 'systems' perspective and see road closures as being about justice, not chiefly about transport.</p> <p>Closing a road to through traffic is a socially divisive act. This is a moral issue and it is immoral to use people as collateral damage.</p> <p>In the meeting notes, for each closure that is recommended, it states, "It is inevitable that some traffic would be displaced."</p> <p>This means that while some get to live in a cul-de-sac, 'green' and great with enhanced active travel, virtually no traffic past their doors and increased value of their homes, others, inevitably, are forced to take their traffic, congestion, emissions, and danger as well as their own.</p>	<p>The City Access proposals have been developed to progress these issues from a "holistic" perspective.</p>

		<p>Road closures also harm the local economy; commuters who live beyond cycling distance; the elderly and disabled, and all those with mobility problems; all users of the road for necessary journeys; and locals forced to take lengthy detours round the barrier. The environment will suffer as alternative journeys are much longer.</p> <p>When all the rhetoric round, 'It's for COVID, cycling, speeding, lorries, climate-crisis, 'trial only'", is done, you are still left with the policy being either fair or unfair.</p> <p>National evidence (Ealing et al) proved that road closures and cycle lanes are not all you need to change travelling behaviour. Traffic evaporation was a false claim. Other equitable solutions and incentives are available.</p> <p>Please govern by consent from a holistic perspective and manage interdependency. Put justice and the environment, at the heart of transport policies.</p> <p>If not, children in the 'side roads' will be forced to live in 'High Traffic Neighbourhoods'. One question will be, "Who is it who will go and explain to these children why their lungs are not as important as the ones that you gave a 'Low Traffic Neighbourhood' to?</p> <p>** Representing the vast majority of residents in Havenfield Retirement Flats, Arbury Road, for whom she is the spokesperson (04.09.20 Survey of 57 occupied flats - 44 opposed to modal filter, 5 supported, 1 abstention).</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Nick Flynn and Robert Rawlinson *</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>1. Given the officers report states no negative evidence to support the proposal to rescind the experimental order, and there is clear evidence the objectives have been met, as well as the proven popularity of the scheme with residents and non-residents, what is the justification for re-opening the road?</p> <p>On 'whether it should be retained', the Luard/Sedley Taylor scheme scored more highly in responses from non-residents than it did from residents - 61% of all respondents feeling that the restriction should be retained and made permanent, more than for the schemes in Newtown, Nightingale Avenue or Storey's Way.</p> <p>2. What would be the council's reason for re-opening the road when this would make the roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians? Both the council and central government have stated objectives to encourage people out of their cars and to use other more environmentally friendly modes of transport. The GCP report states it was used by over 700 cyclists per day.</p> <p>The report states consultation responses show it has been 'successful in improving walking and cycling and making the area safer'. Also, there is clear evidence previously provided to the Council on the frequency of accidents before the closure of the road.</p> <p>According to the GCP's own report, there were 2 serious and 6 slight injuries on Luard Road or Sedley Taylor Road including their junctions with Hills Road or Long Road</p>	<p>Journey time data has indicated an increase in eastbound delays on Long Road following the closure of Luard Road at a time when overall traffic levels fell.</p> <p>Given the effect that longer delays on Long Road could have on air quality, this aspect of the trial closure needs to be considered and weighed against the environmental benefits achieved by reducing traffic on the closed route.</p> <p>Whilst journey times on Long Road have fluctuated during the trial, there is a concern they could increase again as traffic levels return to pre-pandemic levels.</p> <p>The information provided in the report on road collisions is based on data provided by the Police in accordance with national requirements.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>from 2017 to the start of the trial period in 2020. No collisions were recorded during the ETRO trial period.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding the intended impact of the road closure to displace traffic on to Long Road, away from Luard/Sedley Taylor roads that have become a classic residential 'rat-run', what evidence is there to show a net increase in traffic and/or pollution levels that could be used as a justification to remove the road closure?</p> <p>The officers' report states 'there is no data to support that the displacement has been any worse than for any road closure sites', there is NO proposal to rescind any of those 5 ETRO schemes. In addition, the officers' report states that there is 'no air quality data' to support or disagree that any traffic displacement has negatively affected pollution levels.</p> <p>4. Given the justification for rescinding the order is an alleged increase in complaints to the signals team regarding the Hills Road/Long Road junction, where is the evidence on changes in journey times and what consideration has been given to the impact of the reopening of the nearby Fendon Road roundabout in July 2020? This change, shortly before the Luard Road Experimental Traffic Order came into effect, would also have been expected to increase traffic volumes on Long Road independently of the Luard Road scheme.</p> <p><i>Note: the above represents a combination of questions submitted by Nick Flynn and Robert Rawlinson * to avoid duplication.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p><i>* Mr Rawlinson's questions were put forward by the following list of residents on Luard Road and Sedley Taylor Road and presented as a single request for the convenience of the Joint Assembly:</i></p> <p><i>Chris Parkins, Susan Hegarty, Doreen Hodgson, Braden Howarth, Jim Metcalf, Heather Warwick, David Clary, Heather Clary, Peter Hewkin, Rory Powe, Don Broom, Sally Broom, Vivien Perutz, Michelle Pearl, Emma Duncan, Anne Lyon, Richard Lyon, Robert Rawlinson, Callinan and Pete Fox.</i></p>	
--	---	--

14	Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes this report; it's good to see detailed data on traffic flows, journey time, speed, collisions and air quality, in addition to consultation responses.</p> <p>As the report says, these schemes included the long-term goal to create a better environment for active travel and support the government's target of half of urban journeys being walked or cycled by 2030. Key metrics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people who used these routes as a pedestrian or cyclist • The improvement in actual and perceived safety (the main barrier to active travel) • A reduction in motor traffic which may create a route suitable for all ages and abilities without the need for protected infrastructure. <p>The report shows that all schemes were successful, with routes rebalancing transport in favour of walking and cycling. Over 80% of those travelling in Carlyle Road, Silver Street and Luard Road are doing so actively, and daily levels of cycling in Carlyle Road are approaching those on popular routes such as the Riverside bridge. According to LTN 1/20, the level of motor traffic on Bateman Street now makes it an appropriate route for all types of cyclist, whereas the 4000+ vehicle movements before (2018) created a barrier to many.</p> <p>Camcycle would like to see all these schemes retained and improved. It is completely unacceptable that Luard Road has been recommended for removal when it has achieved its aims.</p>	<p>Journey time data has indicated an increase in eastbound delays on Long Road following the closure of Luard Road at a time when overall traffic levels fell.</p> <p>Given the effect that longer delays on Long Road could have on air quality, this aspect of the trial closure needs to be considered and weighed against the environmental benefits achieved by reducing traffic on the closed route.</p> <p>Whilst journey times on Long Road have fluctuated during the trial, there is a concern they could increase again as traffic levels return to pre-pandemic levels.</p>
----	-------------------------------------	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are high levels of cycling on this route. 2. A majority (61%) support the retention of the filter. 3. 63% of respondents say the road is safer. 4. Collisions (and, anecdotally, non-reported 'near misses') have been reduced. <p>How can the GCP claim one of its transport aims is to 'prioritise greener and active travel' when here it is placing motor traffic flow and driver convenience above safer walking and cycling?</p>	
--	--	---	--