



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly

Thursday 16th February 2023

2:00 p.m. – 4:40 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Katie Thornburrow (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Claire Daunton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Paul Bearpark	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Annika Osborne	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Lisa Bloomer	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Daniel Clarke	Strategy and Partnerships Manager (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Chris Harte	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Ben Hathway	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Michelle Rowe	Democratic Services Manager (CCC)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alex Beckett, Karen Kennedy and Heather Richards.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 23rd November 2022, were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

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

It was noted that all three questions related to Agenda Item 6 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston).

5. Petitions

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

6. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston

Three public questions were received from Roxanne de Beaux (firstly on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign, and secondly on behalf of Camcycle), and Linda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Melbourn and Bassingbourn ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the importance of the Melbourn Greenway to provide a safe, active travel route for residents and the growing workforce employed along the A10, particularly in the Melbourn Science Park, Councillor Van de Ven drew attention to the section of the route connecting Melbourn and Meldreth train station. Currently a rudimentary footpath, the Greenways scheme would see the link widened and lit to increase safety,

including on the A10 underpass. Although Section 106 funding of nearly £250k had been secured for the upgrades, the funding remained unused after a number of years, and urgent remediation works to the underpass had therefore been funded locally from independent sources including parish councils and the Community Safety Partnership. She therefore requested that the Melbourn to Meldreth train station link be included in the early physical works proposed for 2023, to support and improve active travel options in the surrounding area. Acknowledging Councillor Van de Ven's comments, the Transport Director agreed to investigate whether the link could be included in the list of early physical works to be presented to the Executive Board for approval on 9th March 2023.

Councillor Brian Milnes, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Sawston and Shelford ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Drawing attention to the detrimental impact of poor quality road surfacing for active travel users, Councillor Milnes questioned the need for the proposed extension of the Sawston Greenway alongside the A1301 to the west of Sawston. He also suggested that few cyclists used the A1301, and that the Cambridge South East Transport scheme would provide a more attractive and safer alternative route between Sawston and Cambridge. However, it was acknowledged that the proposed extension could potentially be developed further south to Whittlesford Parkway.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out the Outline Business Cases for the Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston Greenways, as well as a proposed programme of delivery, with the construction of early works to commence in 2023. Following a public engagement, various changes were proposed for the schemes, as set out in Sections 2.4 to 2.11 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposed changes to scheme designs following feedback received during public engagement exercises, but expressed concern that some of the schemes were not as ambitious as when they were first proposed. However, members paid tribute to the innovative nature of the overall project and highlighted its importance for improving and supporting active travel in the region.
- Established that the target for the overall Greenways project to achieve a minimum 20% uplift in usage compared to current levels was a requirement set by the Department for Transport, and it was suggested that the GCP could set a higher target. Members agreed that the overarching priority of the schemes was to maximise modal shift and thus support efforts from all levels of local authorities in the region to combat the declared climate emergency and reduce car usage, and suggested that the timetable for works should be reviewed to ensure that the schemes with greater impact were prioritised. Members were informed that a report on prioritisation of the wider GCP programme was scheduled for the meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in September 2023.
- Encouraged the GCP to ensure the Greenways schemes aligned to the Government's LTN 1/20 guidance. Members were assured that the schemes would align with the guidance, although it was emphasised that on some parts of the

routes it would not be possible, but the rationale would be given for such circumstances.

- Argued that two-stage crossings often caused long waiting times for pedestrians and cyclists, and suggested that single-stage crossings would better prioritise non-motorised vehicles, particularly during peak hours. Members also expressed concern about the width of some sections of the Greenways schemes and emphasised the importance of ensuring the routes were safe, particularly when they were dual use. It was noted that some stretches of the Greenways were not segregated from the adjacent carriageway due to boundary constraints, and suggested that reducing the width of the carriageway where possible in such locations would allow for the cycleways to be segregated.
- Noted ongoing work with the County Council to ensure there would be adequate maintenance of the Greenways routes once the responsibility was assumed by the County Council.
- Suggested that the GCP could improve how it communicated with local members, particularly on issues relating to changes or delays to schemes in their wards or divisions, although it was acknowledged that there had been extensive consultation on the schemes since their initial development.
- Noted that conversations with affected stakeholders and local members would continue throughout the design process of the Greenways, providing opportunities for issues to be raised and investigated, such as the width of parts of the Horningsea Greenway and its location on the highway in the centre of Horningsea. One member expressed concern about how the GCP responded to some feedback received during public consultations and emphasised the importance of ensuring that consultations were genuine opportunities for residents and stakeholders to impact the development of schemes, although it was acknowledged that there were often issues that divided opinion.
- Considered the wider underlying issues of the region's highway infrastructure, and suggested that problems with some key aspects, such as the A10 and the A14/A10 roundabout, should be addressed by the relevant authorities, rather than the GCP continuously trying to fix more localised problems that arose as a result of those underlying failings. It was also acknowledged that expanding the capacity of trunk roads, as with the recent development of the A14, resulted in additional usage that increased pressure on the surrounding road network. Members noted that the Combined Authority and County Council were working to make improvements along the A10 corridor.
- Highlighted the importance of future-proofing the Greenways schemes, to ensure that potential developments could be considered in the future, such as expanding the Melbourn Greenway to connect to surrounding villages. It was also suggested that the GCP should consider school catchment areas when developing schemes, to maximise the opportunities to support students accessing places of education, particularly in areas with lower levels of public transport provision.
-

- Sought clarification on how the safety concerns raised in a petition related to the Grange Road crossing on the Barton Greenway had been addressed by the GCP. Members were informed that discussions had been held with the organisers of the petition and that the next stage of design would directly address the issues that had been raised.
- Expressed concern about the varying speed limits along the Horningsea Greenway, particularly the stretch with a 60mph speed limit that included a slipway on to the A14, arguing that cyclists felt unsafe alongside vehicles travelling at such high speeds. Members emphasised the importance of enforcing speed limits, including 20mph restrictions, observing that Fen Ditton Community Primary School sat alongside the route, and suggested that the speed restrictions should extend beyond the northern limit of Horningsea. It was acknowledged that enforcement of speed limits, as well as parking restrictions, was a necessary accompaniment to the schemes, and members were assured that discussions on both matters were being held with the relevant local authorities.
- Suggested that the Horningsea Greenway could have been more ambitious by including the development of a crossing over the River Cam at Baits Bite Lock, to further connect Horningsea residents to the travel, employment and education sites in the north of Cambridge. It was agreed that a technical note would be developed on the inclusion of such a crossing, in order to establish the benefits of the proposal.
- Supported the proposal from Councillor Van de Ven to prioritise work on the link between Melbourn and Meldreth train station, highlighting the importance of ensuring residents and employees across the region were able to access the train network through active travel. Members also emphasised the need to be flexible and progress important sections of the Greenways schemes instead of waiting for the whole route to be ready for building, with a desire for perfection potentially delaying the installation of urgently required infrastructure.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson highlighted members' support for prioritising modal shift across the Greenways schemes and developing appropriate targets to reflect this. He drew attention to the need for structured dialogue between the GCP and local members, and proposed a half-day conference for members with Greenways planned to pass through their divisions or wards. Officers had also noted the various issues raised on the individual schemes and would investigate them further, including, but not limited to, a proposed crossing at Baits Bite Lock on the Horningsea Greenway, the A1310 extension to the Sawston Greenway, and an addition to the proposed early works for the Melbourn Greenway.

7. Electricity Grid Reinforcements: Update and Next Steps

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented the report, which informed the Joint Assembly that Ofgem had approved the inclusion of the Greater Cambridge substations within UK Power Network's (UKPN) RIIO ED-2 bid. As a result, the infrastructure would now be built without the requirement of significant

financial support from the GCP. Given that the GCP would therefore no longer be able to influence the process as much, it was proposed to establish a formal arrangement with UKPN that would allow the GCP to maintain a facilitatory role in the project's delivery, and to continue to provide support where possible.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the announcement of funding for the additional grid substations, and highlighted the importance of expanding the electricity grid capacity in Greater Cambridge. Members paid tribute to the GCP for initially agreeing to provide the funding, but welcomed that it could now be reallocated to other projects, although one member suggested that it could be considered reallocating the funds to a third additional grid substation to expand the grid capacity even further. It was emphasised that the GCP did not have responsibility for ensuring there was sufficient electricity grid capacity, and members argued that the current processes and regulatory framework for assessing and expanding grid capacity were ineffective.
- Supported the proposal to maintain a facilitatory role in the delivery of the substations, noting that the current grid capacity constraints would continue to represent a barrier to growth, jobs and new homes across the region, as emphasised in the emerging Local Plan. Members considered whether the GCP should develop an energy strategy and delivery plan for Greater Cambridge, to identify and overcome the electrical supply constraints that were also affecting the region's decarbonisation efforts.
- Noted that the Combined Authority held a larger role and remit on the issue across the wider region, and welcomed the joint working between the GCP and the Combined Authority.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly welcomed that UKPN would fund the new grid substations, paying tribute to the GCP for its facilitating role in obtaining the funding. Notwithstanding, he emphasised that members supported maintaining this facilitatory role throughout delivery of the substations, and highlighted the suggestion that the GCP should consider its longer-term role in energy provision.

8. Smart Cambridge Innovation Prospectus

The Head of Innovation and Technology presented the report, which proposed the development of an innovation prospectus that would formalise how new and emerging technology could support the GCP's wider programme, strengthening collaboration with other organisations and businesses, as well as the GCP's reputation for innovation.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposal to develop an innovation prospectus, paying tribute to the Smart Cambridge team's achievements with few resources. Members noted that the development of an innovation prospectus was innovative in itself, with the only

other known example of an area undertaking such a project being via Transport for London.

- Considered the use of public funds to support private companies, with one member expressing concern about its effect on public sector services and the wider economy. However, other members argued that the GCP should encourage innovation in the private sector if it created local, public value, as it strengthened collaboration while aligning public and private sector efforts. It was also suggested that this form of public support to the private support was already widespread and that it proved effective.

9. Quarterly Progress Report and GCP Budget Strategy

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, and which also included the 2023/24 budgets and the multi-year budget strategy. It was highlighted that overspend had been forecast for some complex areas, such as planning and land acquisition, in order to be prudent, and members were assured that the GCP would mitigate such costs wherever possible.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Endorsed the proposed budget and multi-year budget strategy, having clarified that £8.295m had been allocated for the Greenways Programme for 2023/24, rather than £8,925m, as written in Paragraph 3.16 of the report.
- Drew attention to the impact of inflation on operational budgets, and expressed concern that aligning such issues with the review of the Future Investment Strategy later in 2023/24 could be too late. Notwithstanding, it was acknowledged that the outcome of the Making Connections consultation would also need to be taken into consideration, and it was suggested that it was a suitable time to assess the availability of resources for projects that had moved from concept to design and delivery.
- Confirmed that the estimated Section 106 receipts of £120.9m, while subject to continuous change due to project variations and delayed submission of receipts, represented the total amount of Section 106 receipts over the course of the City Deal. The figure was reviewed annually, but monthly reviews were also carried out with the County Council.
- Reiterated concerns that target completion dates for projects had been changed, noting that it had been agreed at previous meetings that only forecast completion dates would be changed in order to ensure transparency on the delivery of projects. It was confirmed that while some dates had been amended in the past, no further target completion dates would be changed without explicit approval from the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

- Clarified that the GCP was not planning to progress any scheme related to a train station in East Cambridge.
- Highlighted that the location of the park and ride site in the project had not been decided, and that input was still sought as part of the ongoing consultation.
- Sought clarification on why the new smart signals being trialled at the Robin Hood junction were not proving as effective as the signals that were previously used, as detailed in Paragraph 9.12 of the report. Members were informed that the ongoing initial phase only involved trials with smart signals on one junction, and that improvements were expected in the second phase, when the smart signals would work together across multiple junctions along Hills Road. This second phase of trials would commence shortly and would be monitored for a year to assess any advantages of the new technology. It was suggested that an additional trial be included in the second phase on the Long Road / Hills Road junction.
- Clarified that the GCP had appointed SQW to support the first Gateway Review process because it had been a requirement to appoint an independent consultant, whereas the government had subsequently itself appointed SQW to support all Gateway Reviews across the country. Notwithstanding the different way in which SQW was appointed, the support it provided to the GCP remained similar to the previous appointment.
- Observed that growth in Greater Cambridge would continue beyond the end of the City Deal in 2030, and suggested that consideration should begin to be given to extending the programme into the future beyond that date, particularly given the development of the emerging Local Plan and the length of time it would take to secure additional funding.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held on Thursday 8th June 2023.

Chairperson
8th June 2023

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 16 February 2023
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

	From	Question	Answer
1.	Milton Cycling Campaign Question to be asked by on their behalf by Roxanne De Beaux	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston</p> <p>Milton Cycling Campaign is very disappointed with the greenway proposal for Horningsea. This proposal lacks ambition, in particular the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modal shift: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We believe the Benefit Cost Ratio provided of 2.3 to be incorrect, as it assumes modal shift which will not be achieved. o The proposals for Horningsea will do nothing to encourage modal shift from the village to Cambridge and vice versa. The quiet road/street treatment is not recommended for roads with the amount of traffic Horningsea Rd/Clayhithe Rd have according to LTN 1/20 Figure 4.1, even with a 20 mph speed limit, as the last traffic count from 2008 (https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/manualcountpoints/941026) indicates that there are already close to 6000 vehicles travelling on that road per day. If a modal filter cannot be installed, and no space exists within the highway boundary, then an alternative off-road route must be found instead. o Horningsea Rd is a high-speed road. The path not only needs to be widened but separated from the road by a 	<p>The Greenway proposals follow those agreed by the GCP Executive Board in October 2020 and have not changed.</p> <p>The 2020 proposals have now been developed into technical designs following consultation with residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Business Case development following Department for Transport Guidance demonstrates that the BCR is high value for money o The core extents of the Greenway extend from Wadloes Path to Southern edge of Horningsea Village. o The Greenways proposes to also proposes to improve conditions of cycling within Horningsea village by introducing a 20mph zone, as a complimentary proposal to the Horningsea Greenway. o The Greenways network will be delivered in accordance with LTN/120 requirements

		<p>verge which meets the desirable minimum separation of 2 metres for a 60mph road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost vs Benefit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capital expenditure should not be diverted to regular maintenance. o The proposal fails to create any new links, and merely improves very slightly on what already exists. - Lack of new links: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We would rather see a project which creates a fully usable link with Milton, Waterbeach and Cambridge North, as per the original consultation response. <p>For these reasons we ask the GCP to take this proposal back to the drawing board and deliver a set of proposals which provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A safe cycling route in Horningsea village - An improved active travel link with Milton, Waterbeach and Cambridge North - An LTN 1/20 compliant route from Horningsea to Cambridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o As part of the scheme the Horningsea Road is due to be reduced from 50mph to 40mph therefore the desirable separation should be between 0.5m and 1.0m. Private land take is not proposed therefore we are working to provide the maximum shared path and buffer width as possible. o We are in discussions with the County Council on maintenance of these schemes, at this stage the budget is only for capital construction delivery. o Other active travel links between Waterbeach and Cambridge, including the Waterbeach Greenway and Waterbeach Busway continue to be developed and will be the subject of future Assembly reports
2.	Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer - Cambridgeshire British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston</p> <p>Wadloes Path update to bridleway' - upgrade rejection. CCC has created a precedent of a bridleway with a useable width of less than 3 metres at Wilsons Road, Longstanton. Pinch points on bridleways are acceptable. This path, with its adjacent verges providing a mixed surface path would meet this standard and more. It would require no changes other than maintenance of hedging and potentially removal of some</p>	<p>Upgrading Wadloes path to a Bridleway was not part of the original scope of this project as agreed by the Executive Board in 2020.</p> <p>Road Safety Audits are an independent process to check that the proposed scheme is safe for all users, they are rightly independent. We will continue to actively engage</p>

	<p>low branches. This is an essential, safe route for local horse riders some of whom are liveried along the path. Please can the upgrade be reinstated?</p> <p>Horse riders have taken part in Greenway consultations on the designs presented, assuming them to be correct. Yet access to sections of Greenway routes is caveated by 'subject to RSA approval for equestrians.' Subsequent exclusion on this basis means horse riders have been misled into providing their support for the scheme and lost their opportunity to object. Please can the Board require close cooperation between the RSA and the Greenway Teams so that, unlike the Sawston Greenway, designs meet not only cycling requirements but also those for inclusion of, and therefore the safety of, equestrians prior to consultation and construction?</p> <p>There are two roundabouts, one either side of the M11 bridge, at Barton. Equestrians are included in the proposals for the bridge but not the roundabout crossings. The GCP analysis of the Barton Greenway shows that 18% of respondents to the crossings were equestrians, the same number as the M11 bridge. Cambridge Polo Club with 60 horses is right next to M11N slip road and Mill Iron Cobs with 6 young horses, that require regular moving to their fields, is on the other roundabout. These road users must be included in the proposals prior to approval of the route for the safety of all road users.</p>	<p>with the Road Safety Team to understand the rationale as to why recommendations are made and use this to incorporate changes in future designs.</p> <p>As noted in the Paper, the design of both roundabout crossings will be considered further. Input will be sought from CCC highways and signals colleagues. The final design will reflect the output of highway modelling, safety audit, levels of existing and forecast use, and the physical constraints at these localities. Engagement with local members and stakeholders will continue through the process.</p> <p>For the Roundabout leading to M11N Slip Road, the location of the Polo Club is noted.</p> <p>The location of Mill Iron Cobs is also now duly noted for further consideration.</p>
--	--	--

<p>3.</p>	<p>Roxanne De Beaux on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn, and Sawston</p> <p>For many years Camcycle, along with other stakeholders and local residents, has repeatedly raised concerns about the length of time and delays involved in developing Greenways proposals. The response has always been that this was the time required to ensure quality delivery of the greenways routes. However, with each new greenways consultation, it is apparent that as more time passes, the quality of the greenways proposals is diluted.</p> <p>Shared paths of inadequate width, routes that lack accessibility for users of adapted cycles and wheelchairs, 'quiet routes' on roads with too much car traffic travelling too fast, poor junction design, compromises on crossing and loss of promised connections like bridges are all issues that undermine what were good aspirations for our Greenways. For example, removing proposals to update Baits Bite Lock bridge to allow trikes/cargo and other non-standard cycles and wheelchairs in line with LTN 1/20 will make the Horningsea Greenway inaccessible to many potential users. How can the GCP justify these designs, which, due to poor quality, will fail to deliver the modal shift you claim to seek?</p> <p>How will the GCP ensure that proposals are brought up to standard, including LTN 1/20, which is applicable to rural areas, so that Cambridgeshire residents get the quality of infrastructure they deserve?</p>	<p>The aspiration for the Greenways remains unchanged, and we will achieve LTN 1/20 compliance in design and delivery. We have already set out the programme for the Greenways in September 2022 and as of now this remains unchanged.</p> <p>Widths for shared use paths have been based on those set out in LTN 1/20, along with current and estimated future usage, and all routes include consideration of accessibility requirements as a key design principle, this includes for wheelchair and adapted cycle users.</p> <p>Proposals to update Baits Bite Lock were ruled out at an early stage for this Greenways Programme. The agreed scope of works that was budgeted for in the October 2020 paper did not include development of that scheme.</p> <p>The current route alignments being progressed follow those agreed by the GCP Executive Board in 2020. They will result in a significant increase in capacity and quality of active travel infrastructure in Greater Cambridge. At the same time we have to keep in mind other considerations, particularly in the more rural environments where we have to consider other road users such as agricultural vehicles as well as environmental and landowner considerations which will help shape the design in specific locations.</p>
-----------	---	---	--

			We will continue to engage with local members and key stakeholders such as Camcycle throughout the process.
--	--	--	---