



**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 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021

4:00 p.m. – 5:35 p.m.

Present:

### Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Neil Gough (Vice-Chairperson *)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Elisa Meschini (Chairperson *)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Austen Adams	Business Representative
Phil Allmendinger	University Representative

\* following confirmation of election [agenda items 1 and 2 refer]

### Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in Attendance:

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

### Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson

Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Dr Andy Williams	Business Representative (Substitute Member)

### Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Assistant Director: Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Election of Chairperson

The Chairperson noted the longstanding convention that the Chairpersons of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board were representatives of different political groups, and announced that he would therefore be resigning from the position of Chairperson.

It was proposed by Councillor Baigent, seconded by Councillor Gough and resolved unanimously that Councillor Meschini be elected Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/22.

## 2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Baigent, seconded by Councillor Meschini and resolved unanimously that Councillor Gough be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/22.

## 3. Apologies for Absence

The Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor Gough for his work as the former Chairperson, and welcomed Austen Adams as the new business representative on the Executive Board. She welcomed former Joint Assembly member Andy Williams as the new substitute business representative on the Executive Board and noted that she had used her discretion as Chairperson to allow him to attend in a non-voting capacity. She also welcomed Mayor Dr Nik Johnson of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, noting that she had used her discretion as Chairperson to allow him to attend in a non-voting capacity, in recognition of the CPCA's role as the Strategic Transport Authority.

The Chairperson also informed the Executive Board 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 had been launched on 24th September at an exhibition of work by documentary photographer Faruk Kara.

The Chairperson proposed a change to the order of the agenda, with Agenda Item 9 (Quarterly Progress Report) to be presented after Agenda Item 11 (Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders) in order to ensure that Mayor Dr Johnson could be present for the debate on Agenda Item 10 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy).

There were no apologies for absence.

## 4. Declarations of Interest

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 1st July 2021, were agreed as a correct record, subject to a correction to the spelling of 'Austen Adams' in recommendation (b) of Agenda Item 6 (Executive Board Membership), and signed by the Chairperson.

## 6. Executive Board Membership

Noting that the Business Board had nominated Claire Ruskin to replace Dr Andy Williams on the Joint Assembly, it was resolved unanimously to:

Endorse the appointment of Claire Ruskin to the Joint Assembly.

## 7. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board 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 one question related to agenda item 9 (Quarterly Progress Report), four questions related to agenda item 10 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy) and four questions related to agenda item 11 (Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders).

## 8. 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 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

## 9. Quarterly Progress Report

One public question was received from Martin Lucas-Smith (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response 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 to 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 Executive Board:

- Welcomed the proposal to support the first stages of a network of traffic sensors across Greater Cambridge.
- Acknowledged the importance of knowledge intensive jobs in the region, particularly during the pandemic, and queried whether the GCP was working on connecting the growth in this sector to the subsequent need for suitable homes for its employees. Noting that a range of work had previously been carried out to identify the kind of tenures that might be required, the Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme informed members that the GCP had worked with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, as part of the work on the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy, to ensure that the concept of a key worker included all jobs that were important to the economy. Similar discussions had been held during the ongoing development of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note progress across the GCP programme; and
- (b) Approve funding of £200k to support the first stages of a network of traffic sensors in Greater Cambridge which will support the 2025 Gateway Review.

## 10. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

Four public questions were received from Lynda Warth, Sharon Dence, Edward Leigh and Martin Lucas-Smith (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 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 additional zero emissions vehicles across the Greater Cambridge network.

Emphasising the central role of the City Access Strategy in the GCP's overall programme and the importance of working in conjunction with the CPCA, the Transport Director highlighted the need to improve the public transport offer, along with the walking 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 a 25% reduction in fares across Cambridgeshire could potentially lead to a further 2.5 million journeys.

While all the proposals and measures under consideration would make bus journeys more reliable, cheaper and therefore attractive, there would be a significant cost of up to £40m per year, and while the GCP could fund a portion of that, it was emphasised that an ongoing revenue source would be required. The proposed consultation would seek feedback from the public on the proposed bus network concept in detail, including fares, operating hours and how the network could be funded and delivered. The outcome of the consultation would then support work with the CPCA, bus operators and other partners on the detailed design of the bus network.

Noting the Joint Assembly's strong consensus for moving forwards with a bold strategy for tackling climate change, air pollution and congestion, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised that such measures should be fair and not inhibit access. While there had been unanimous support from the Joint Assembly for the proposed consultation, one member had expressed reservations about some of its proposals, and the Chairperson drew attention to some underlying issues that had been identified. Members had emphasised the importance of the proposed consultation clarifying the overall benefits, both inside and outside the city, of the proposed measures compared to not taking any action, while also ensuring that participants understood the relationship between the proposed improvements to the

bus network and the need for a revenue source to fund it. The Joint Assembly had also highlighted that the consultation should reflect the socio-economic and geographical diversity of those who would be impacted by the strategy.

Mayor Dr Johnson welcomed the report and the proposals that it contained, noting that they aligned with the Local Transport Plan that was currently under development, and paid tribute to the working relationship between the GCP and the CPCA. Highlighting the health-related reasons behind the need to reduce car usage while increasing the use of both public and active transport, he noted that an improved public transport network would also benefit the environment, as well as work and education opportunities across the Greater Cambridge region and beyond. He acknowledged the central role that buses would play in such a strategy and welcomed the measures that had been proposed for consideration during the consultation.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the consensus of the Joint Assembly for bold and urgent action and expressed concern about how long it was taking to develop the City Access Strategy, calling for progress as soon as possible. It was argued that due to its complexity it would be impossible to develop a perfect strategy that would be supported by everyone, and that the need for progress, which required urgent action and commitment, was in danger of being held up by continuous debate.
- Welcomed the support indicated by Mayor Dr Johnson for the common understanding and purpose shared by the GCP and CPCA.
- Emphasised that the proposed development of the bus network would have a transformational effect on small villages, such as Rampton, and that they should therefore be considered throughout the planning process, including villages that lay outside the Greater Cambridge area.
- Highlighted the importance of making it clear that the proposed consultation would not be the final opportunity for members of the public and affected stakeholders to give input to the development of the City Access Strategy, with a further consultation on the more precise details to be arranged further down the line.
- Emphasised that for the consultation to be successful it would need to be structured in a way that ensured the level of improvements to the bus network were aligned to the level of funding that was made available, arguing that this would include seeking opinions from participants on both issues.
- Welcomed proposals from members of the public, such as for the introduction of a circular bus around the city, and encouraged such contributions as part of the consultation process.
- Observed that other cities and regions had already carried out similar work and argued that the GCP could learn from their experience and even look at implementing some of their projects that had proven successful. It was suggested that examples of such projects, as well as issues that they encountered, could be included for consideration as part of the consultation.

- Argued that one of the greatest challenges to achieving a change in travel behaviour was convincing people not to use their cars, despite the widespread support across Greater Cambridge for public and active transport. Noting that the temporary closure of the Mill Road Bridge in Cambridge had led to many local people making such a change, it was suggested that reducing the number of cars circulating in Cambridge was fundamental to increasing usage of public transport and active transport.
- Sought greater clarification on how the estimated £40m cost for improving the bus network would be spent. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth informed members that the figure included approximately £20m for improvements to the bus service, such as longer routes and targeted fare interventions, while a further £20m would include wider fare reductions across the network.
- Confirmed that free fares for all across the network would be unsustainably expensive.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Agree to 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 as outlined in the report;
- (b) Agree to the road map outlined in the report, commencing with a public consultation in the Autumn on a package which includes public transport improvements, proposals which prioritise road space for sustainable and active transport, and measures that provide an ongoing funding source for the enhanced public transport network and more of the cycling-plus network across Greater Cambridge; and
- (c) Agree to work with the CPCA and local bus operators, to reduce emissions on the local public transport network by allocating £2.25m to support the ZEBRA bid to Government for zero emissions vehicles across Greater Cambridge.

## 11. Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders

Four public questions were received from Steven Hollis, Linny Purr, Robert Rawlinson, and Martin Lucas-Smith (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 were presented for recommendation to the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee. Following the GCP's initial support and funding for the ETROs and consultations, the benefits and disbenefits of the schemes had been analysed, leading to the recommendation that they all be made permanent. The Transport Director highlighted

that the Luard Road scheme had been recommended for being made permanent following a discussion by the Joint Assembly at its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

Welcoming that the Joint Assembly's support for making the Luard Road scheme permanent had been acknowledged by the GCP, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted some of the supplementary concerns that had accompanied its support for making all the schemes permanent, such as further mitigation on streets neighbouring some of the schemes, and further fine-tuning of the Newtown scheme, including working with nearby schools that generated transport in the area. While the Joint Assembly had acknowledged that a certain level of traffic displacement was likely to result from all such schemes, it had argued that the benefits and widespread support of local residents generally outweighed such impacts. It had also been observed that one of the main objectives of the City Access Strategy was to reduce car journeys into and around Cambridge, which would in turn alleviate such impacts.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed that the ETRO schemes had been quick and affordable to implement, as well as overwhelmingly popular with local residents, and argued that consideration should be given to developing further similar schemes. Noting that the County Council had recently carried out consultations on a possible further set of schemes, the Transport Director informed members that discussions were being held as to how many schemes could be delivered in an affordable and timely way without causing excessive displacement of traffic. He confirmed that such schemes would be considered as part of the ongoing work with the City Access Strategy.
- Noted the benefits and subsequent popularity of the schemes and encouraged the supporters of such schemes to express their support in the discussions surrounding the GCPS's broader schemes that also sought to promote active travel and provide benefits to local residents.
- Acknowledged the Joint Assembly discussion that had led to the proposal for the Luard Road scheme to be made permanent, and paid tribute to officers for acting on the suggestion.
- Expressed concern about displacing traffic on to main roads, noting that many such roads were still residential, and argued that the implications of displacement should be considered throughout the process of making the schemes permanent. The Transport Director emphasised that the City Access Strategy aimed to reduce traffic, rather than relocate it, and argued that while the ETRO schemes played a role in the overall strategy, they were not a solution on their own.
- Argued that the decision-making process for the schemes was convoluted and suggested that it would be more efficient if the schemes did not have to be considered by so many different bodies.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Support the following recommendations to the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee:

Carlyle Road

- a) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent the experimental road closure point;
- b) Support joint work with the GCP to explore the need for further experimental measures to reduce motorised through traffic movements in neighbouring streets in the area and to improve safety at the zebra crossing on Chesterton Road with funding made available by the GCP for implementation;

Luard Road

- c) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent the experimental road closure point;
- d) Authorise the funding of improvements to the traffic signals at the Long Road/Hills Road and Addenbrooke's roundabout junctions to mitigate the effects on Long Road;
- e) Support longer term monitoring of the situation in Long Road by the GCP;

Newtown Area

- f) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent all the experimental measures introduced in both phases of the Newtown area scheme;
- g) Support joint work with the GCP to review the location of the closure point in Panton Street in association with the highway improvements planned by the County Council in Saxon Street;
- h) Support joint work with the GCP to explore changes to parking arrangements in Trumpington Road to provide more opportunities for school drop off and pick up for schools in the Newtown area;
- i) Support a joint County Council/GCP review of highway signs in the area;
- j) Support further work by the GCP to consider how bus service improvements can best support access to the cluster of schools and colleges along the Trumpington Road/Hills Road corridors;

Nightingale Avenue

- k) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent the experimental road closure point;

- l) Support further work by GCP to consider mitigation measures for Queen Edith's Way;

Silver Street

- m) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent the experimental 24 hour/7 day a week operation of the bus gate;

Storey's Way

- n) Make/advertise a traffic order to make permanent the experimental closure point; and;

General

- o) Support joint work with the County Council on designing and implementing permanent layouts for those closure points with the GCP providing funding.

## 12. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was due be held on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

Chairperson  
9<sup>th</sup> December 2021

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

Questioner	Question	Answer
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 9 – Quarterly Progress Report</b></p> <p>Camcycle would like to thank officers for the response to the questions on this topic we asked at the Joint Assembly. We have one more query on cycling projects.</p> <p>We know from the government’s Gear Change report that building up the active travel capabilities of local authorities will be an important focus of the new funding body and inspectorate, Active Travel England. With this in mind, why have the GCP chosen to relinquish the expertise of the county’s cycle projects team?</p> <p>In February 2020, you told us that the GCP was committed to employing the appropriate expertise with the local knowledge to deliver cycling projects. With an increased number of schemes planned for the future we believe it is essential to retain and build on this team of locally-based experts who have the everyday cycling experience to truly understand the needs of Cambridgeshire communities.</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership is committed to employing appropriate expertise with local knowledge to deliver all of the projects in the integrated programme.</p>
<p>Lynda Warth County Access &amp; Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>We endorse the statement at 4.5 which highlights the need for leisure access for all active travel modes. The GCP must be congratulated on its forward thinking proposals within the CSETs project for a green bridleway alongside the bus</p>	<p>The GCP is investing over £150m in enhancing the active travel network across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>Space reallocation proposals will consider the safety of all users, as appropriate to the location and type of scheme.</p>

<p>Society</p>	<p>route with links into the existing PROW network and for the Greenways proposals, if not their actual delivery thus far. Recognising the need for flexibility and the inclusion of provision for leisure journeys in its post pandemic approach, will the Board confirm its continued support of providing safe, appropriately surfaced, transport corridors for all active travellers in line with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan's definition of Active Travel – walkers, cyclists and horse riders?</p> <p>Whilst we support the creation of safe space for walking and cycling referenced in paragraph 7.11, this must be extended to all Active Travellers including equestrians, particularly in semi urban and rural locations and on routes which link communities or the PROW network.</p> <p>This Board has previously been advised of the danger created for equestrians by on road cycle lanes and the consequences of extinguishing the right of equestrians to use safe verges when shared cycle / pedestrian paths are created.</p> <p>Will the Board please confirm that the safety of all active travellers (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) will be considered equally in the space reallocation proposals?</p>	
<p>Sharon Dence Councillor, Rampton Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Looking at the current plan for bus services in the agenda papers I can see no plan to include Rampton in any of the proposed routes or even a recognition of its existence on the maps. Leaving the village with absolutely no public transport options is clearly unacceptable at a time when we are trying to reduce emissions, get people to leave cars at home and encourage people into the City.</p>	<p>The bus network proposals set out in the report will offer significantly more rural services, with many places seeing more than ten times the number of buses they have currently.</p> <p>It is intended that smaller villages where there is lower demand for services will have opportunities to 'plug into' the bus network whether that be through a regular connecting bus service, access to a travel hub or in future through options such as demand responsive transport – the Combined Authority are</p>

	<p>To that end I wonder whether the ambitions of the transport delivery programme for South Cambridgeshire considers smaller isolated villages? Can Rampton, and other smaller villages, have any confidence that there will be a bus service even with the public transport improvements being discussed. The vision will fail if the focus is solely on larger villages thereby condemning people living in villages like Rampton to be largely car dependent. Buses at peak times need to be offered making a viable service which will then be supported. Could some of these options be provided to improve the situation in line with the Mayor's position and the GCP's mission to increase use of public transport into the city?</p> <p>My question is how can smaller villages like Rampton be confident that they will benefit from the Public Transport vision in this agenda item if they are not even worthy of a dot on the map?</p>	<p>planning a trial of the latter in West Huntingdonshire next month.</p> <p>We will pass your suggestions for changes to current services to the Combined Authority who are the public transport authority and would welcome your involvement in the proposed upcoming consultation.</p>
<p>Edward Leigh Smarter Cambridge Transport</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>With the exception of the recommendation to co-fund 30 electric buses (which, though desirable, will do nothing for modal shift), it seems that none of the officer recommendations will lead to change on the ground within the next twelve months. The proposals, which have been six years in the making, are still highly conceptual, with critically important foundation work still ongoing, even for measures that are uncontroversial, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing the future bus network</li> <li>• Revising the road network hierarchy</li> <li>• Developing an integrated parking strategy</li> <li>• Installing city-wide smart traffic signals and integrated control systems</li> </ul>	<p>Greater Cambridge faces significant challenges in tackling the issues of congestion, air quality and the climate challenge.</p> <p>The paper sets out a clear process to bring forward a public transport, active travel and road space management package over the next 2-3 years.</p> <p>The level of change proposed is transformational and it is important that people have a chance to give their views on the proposals.</p> <p>Clearly – if public transport capacity is to double – bus routing in the city and access to the city centre will need to be considered. The GCP will continue to work with partners such</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone</li> <li>• Designing a complete in-city cycle network</li> <li>• Locating logistics hubs to promote efficient, low-emission deliveries</li> </ul> <p>The future bus network does not propose any changes to city-centre bus routes, even though it is clear that changes will be needed, both to reduce conflicts with people walking and cycling, and to create additional capacity for the planned expansion in bus services.</p> <p>So, our questions to the board are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the GCP formally evaluate ideas proposed by Smarter Cambridge Transport, bus operators and any other groups for re-configuring city bus routes to increase capacity, facilitate interchange, and improve safety?</li> <li>2. From which budgets will local authorities fund the expansion in bus services (estimated at £40 million/year) until the proposed “flexible charge” produces sufficient surplus revenue to cover it?</li> </ol>	<p>as CPCA and bus companies as part of detailed scheme design.</p> <p>If a sustainable funding source can be identified to secure the medium term viability of the proposals, then City Deal could forward fund the expansion in bus services.</p>
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Once again, we thank officers for the responses to our questions at the Joint Assembly. Given the many risks from a car-based recovery from Covid and the deepening climate crisis, we remain concerned about the slow timescale. Bath’s Clean Air Zone has been in operation since March this year, Oxford’s Zero Emission Zone will be implemented in February 2022 and the London Ultra Low Emission Zone will be expanded next month. Our city is way behind in its plans.</p>	<p>The paper sets out a clear process to bring forward a public transport, active travel and road space management package over the next 2-3 years. It builds on wider progress to date such as the six ETRO schemes discussed later on the agenda, the e-cargo bike scheme and the electric bus pilot.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The GCP is working with County Council to make progress on residents’ parking this year. The Combined Authority’s expression of interest for Mini Holland funding did not specify a location for a scheme – should they be successful they will continue to work with partners to identify suitable location(s).</li> </ol>

<p>We have been told that City Access plans will reduce traffic levels to the point where the roadspace could be used for something different e.g. space for pedestrians, cyclists and bus routes. However, Camcycle believes that action on safe streets cannot wait for a flexible charge to be in place. Measures that will help as many people as possible switch from driving to active travel must be prioritised now to support the overall goals of the City Access Scheme and the proposed bus improvements.</p> <p>Therefore, our questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Point 4.4 talks about integrating a Residents' Parking strategy with a Liveable Neighbourhoods approach. What is the timescale for this work and does the Combined Authority's expression of interest for Mini-Holland funding include any areas in Greater Cambridge?</li> <li>2) We still don't have a clear answer on what the 'revised network hierarchy' mentioned in point 7.9 refers to – previous papers have suggested it was scheduled for adoption in 2022. When will this hierarchy be published?</li> <li>3) What progress has been made on the workplace travel scheme and city centre freight pilot referred to in the baseline package?</li> <li>4) We've seen the benefit of experimental schemes from the Active Travel ETROs (agenda item 10) – what happened to the idea of car-free days proposed as part of the baseline interventions in February 2020?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The current classification of Cambridge's road network dates from the 1980s. The GCP and County Council are working together to review the network hierarchy. Draft proposals will be consulted on in 2022.</li> <li>3. The workplace cycle parking match funding scheme is due to launch next month. A feasibility study is underway for the freight pilot with work undertaken to establish appetite for and viability of a consolidation scheme in the city centre.</li> <li>4. Given uncertainty during the pandemic around government advice for using public transport, the GCP and partners have not advanced plans for a car-free day in 2020 or 2021 but will return to this next year.</li> </ol>
--	---

<p>Steven Hollis</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Newtown Road Closure</p> <p>1 Why has no consideration been given to the effect on traffic and pollution caused by residents and visitors having to drive around the closure areas in order to access the area from the other side. I now spend 10 minutes or more on Lensfield Road and Hills Road that I would not otherwise enter. This will become worse in winter and as more people stop WFH?</p> <p>2 Why has no consideration been given to the effect on businesses in the area by the disruption caused to customers visiting their premises? The current traffic issues are discouraging a lot of trade</p> <p>3 Why has no proper consideration been given to emergency vehicles becoming stuck in gridlocked traffic? No ambulance would be able to exit Newtown along Union Road from 4pm to 6pm. The gridlocked traffic in front of it would not be able to get out of the way.</p>	<p>1 The ETRO report recognises that some level of vehicle displacement is inevitable with schemes of this type which may result in more congestion and delay. Studies of similar schemes across the UK suggest that issues associated with vehicle displacement may diminish over time. These issues of any scheme need to be weighed against the benefits achieved for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>2 A public consultation was held during both stages of the Newtown scheme which invited feedback from all users of the area so that all viewpoints could be taken into account. Information leaflets advising of the consultations were hand delivered to all properties and premises in the area including local businesses.</p> <p>3 The various closure points introduced as part of the Newtown scheme are enforced using removable bollards fitted with a standard padlock used at all similar closure points across the city road network. The emergency services have keys to allow their vehicles to use these closure points for access and egress, if deemed necessary.</p>
<p>Linny Purr</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Data shows longer delays on side roads from displaced traffic from GCP modal filters.</p> <p>Is it your duty to:</p>	<p>Through the Greenways programme, Chisholm Trail and other initiatives, the GCP has and will continue to invest in improvements to make walking and cycling more attractive and convenient.</p> <p>Modal filters, such as those introduced through the ETRO schemes, also contribute to the GCP's objective of delivering a</p>

- secure the “expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network” (Traffic Management Bill Clause 16[1])?
- respond to the climate crisis and Britain’s targets of reducing emissions - 68% by 2030, 78% by 2035 and net zero emissions by 2050?
- safeguard people with protected characteristics and their important services?
- ‘build back fairer’ and contribute to ‘levelling up’?
- protect businesses and the local economy?
- listen to citizens harmed rather than the politically organised vocal minority of the seemingly fanatical cycling lobby and self-interested residents’ associations?
- oppose this crude government policy to enforce behaviour change that comes with the threat of risking losing central funding if not implemented?

Closing roads is wonderful for improved air quality, Active Travel and increasing house prices within the private enclaves created for the privileged few who get quieter roads for themselves and their children. Families and children, who live, cycle, walk, work, go to school and wait for buses along roads that take the displaced traffic are expendable for their ‘greater good’. So too are the elderly, disabled and those with mobility issues.

Higher time and transport costs harm businesses, deliverers, doctors, district nurses, carers, social services transport, taxis etc.

Even if some journeys ‘evaporate’, longer journeys and increased traffic in fewer roads, creates congestion and more emissions than previously.

step change in active travel provision – and they support delivery of the Government’s agenda.

The GCP also has the ambition to invest in enhanced public transport as set out in the meeting agenda.

Ensuring free-flowing traffic will only be possible if the demand for car based travel in the city is reduced and managed. ETRO schemes are part of a programme to achieve that.

	<p>Will the GCP re-examine road closures and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Stop modal filters, improve public transport and offer incentives to encourage more cycling and walking instead?</li> <li>2) Ensure free-flowing traffic (enabling necessary journeys to get to, through, and round, Cambridge) to cut emissions and aid the economy?</li> <li>3) Say, "No" to government coercion?</li> <li>4) Give us justice and 'Healthy and Safe Streets for ALL Not Just the Few'?</li> </ol>	
<p>Robert Rawlinson *</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>The GCP Joint Assembly meeting on Thursday 9th September unanimously agreed to recommend keeping the road closure permanent 'The GCP 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.'</p> <p>The question below is being jointly raised by the residents and non-residents listed below, and are presented as a single request for the convenience of the Executive Board.</p> <p>On the basis the officers report states no negative evidence to support the proposal to rescind the current experimental order, and furthermore, there is clear evidence the objectives have been met, as well as the proven popularity of the scheme with residents and non-residents alike, what would be the justification for re-opening the road and going against</p>	<p>The ETRO report highlights the strong support expressed for retaining the closure of Luard Road to through motorised traffic but also identifies increased delays on Long Road during the trial period when overall traffic levels were lower than normal.</p> <p>Having weighed up these issues the Joint Assembly has supported the scheme being made permanent whilst also requesting further work to improve the operation of traffic signals in the area to address the situation in Long Road.</p> <p>Today, the Executive Board is being asked to support the view of the Joint Assembly and recommend to the County Council that the experimental closure is made permanent.</p>

the unanimous decision made at the GCP meeting of September 9th?

On 'whether it should be retained', the Luard/Sedley Taylor scheme scored more highly in responses from non-residents than it did from residents - both groups were overwhelmingly in favour, i.e. the consultation results were not skewed by any sort of neighbourhood campaign.

We urge the Executive Board to support the recommendation to make the Luard Road closure permanent which received unanimous support at the Joint Assembly. Not to do this would make the roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians.

The officers report states the scheme has been 'successful in improving walking and cycling and making the area safer' with this view based on 700 cycle trips per day.

\* Questions presented on behalf of the following residents and non-residents: Aldo Marion, Alethea Ato, Alex Robson, Angus & Nicky Runciman, Ayesha Ahmed, Chris Fox, Clare Martinson, Daphne Fowler, David Clary, Elizabeth Hart, Emma & Fergus Duncan, Gail Jenner, Hakon Martinsen, Henry Howarth, Janet Edwards, Chris Parkins, Susan Hegarty, Doreen Hodgson, Braden Howarth, Jim Metcalf, Heather Warwick, Juliet Barclay, Jumbo Jenner, Martin Rowland, Micelle Pearl, Paul Rudin, Peggy Maxwell, Pete Fox, Peter Hewkin, Polly Holme, Richard Ogden, Rob Foale, Rosie Bridge, Sandrine & Chris Parkins, Susan Rushton, Heather Clary, Peter Hewkin, Rory Powe, Don Broom, Sally Broom, Vivien Perutz, Emma Duncan, Tim Dodkin, Tim Palmer, Yolande Orr, Anne Lyon, Richard Lyon, Robert Rawlinson, Militza Callinan, Nick Flynn.

<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Camcycle would like to reiterate our support for this report and we welcome the Joint Assembly's recommendation to add Luard Road to the list of schemes to be made permanent.</p> <p>The data shows that all the GCP's experimental active travel schemes have been successful with routes rebalancing transport in favour of walking and cycling and the majority of respondents to the consultation agreeing that the areas are safer and more pleasant in terms of noise/pollution and general ambience. We support further work by the GCP and its partners to improve the schemes where necessary and design and implement permanent layouts.</p> <p>Our question is: given the success of these experimental schemes, what work is the GCP doing to build on and extend this project? The county council's consultation website on the second phase of Active Travel Schemes says that 'that projects relating to initial ideas for Cambridge Historic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Grange Road and Sidgwick Avenue are being considered separately by the Greater Cambridge Partnership'. What is the status of this work?</p>	<p>The GCP is working closely with the County Council and other partner authorities to review the city road network hierarchy. This will facilitate a more strategic approach to road space reallocation in the city to deliver a step change in active travel provision and to improve the reliability of public transport.</p> <p>The City Access paper considered today has transformational implications for Greater Cambridge, offering the potential to secure a significant shift away from the private car, to sustainable modes including active travel schemes.</p>
---	--	---