

## Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board  
Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2022  
4:00 p.m. – 5:55 p.m.

Present:

### Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Cllr Elisa Meschini (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Gough (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Austen Adams	Business Representative
Andy Neely (substitute member)	University Representative

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

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

### Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson:

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)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

## 2. Declarations of Interest

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

## 3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021, were agreed as a correct record, and were signed by the Chairperson.

## 4. Membership

The Executive Board confirmed the appointment of Dr Kristin-Anne Rutter as a University Representative on the Joint Assembly.

The Chairperson informed members that Phil Allmendinger had stepped down from his position as a University Representative on the Executive Board, and she paid tribute to his work and contributions to the GCP. It was noted that Andy Neely would attend meetings in his capacity as substitute until a nomination was made for the vacancy.

## 5. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that thirteen 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 four questions related to Agenda Item 7 (Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update), two questions related to Agenda Item 9 (Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review), and seven questions related to agenda item 10 (Milton Road).

## 6. 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 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022.

## 7. Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update

Four public questions were received from Councillor Robert McCubbin (on behalf of Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council), Iris Bostanci, James Talbot (on behalf of the Eversdens Cycling Campaign), and Matt Danish (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

A statement from Councillor Susan van de Ven, County Councillor for the Melbourn and Bassingbourn division, was read out to the Executive Board. Noting that there was an upcoming A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign meeting to provide local businesses, school commuters and cyclists with an update on Melbourn Greenway progress, she emphasised the importance of reassuring local stakeholders that there would be progress soon, particularly on the Melbourn-Royston path and bridge link. She also requested further information on what steps were planned outside of the anticipated upcoming public consultation. Noting that the planned public engagement exercise would be an ideal platform to discuss detailed design issues and delivery timelines in order to reassure local stakeholders in Melbourn and beyond who committed financially to the scheme, the Transport Director confirmed that the GCP continued to hold discussions with key stakeholders, such as Hertfordshire County Council, about the bridge's design and funding options.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress of the Greenways network, prior to an Outline Business Case and delivery programme being presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in September 2022. Noting that some network-wide workstreams were already underway, such as the development of the Outline Business Case and overarching design principles, he drew attention to specific work areas on individual Greenways that included design updates following topographical analysis of environmental constraints and deliverability, as set out in section 4 of the report. All the Greenways would involve a third stage of engagement to key stakeholders, community groups and parish councils over the next twelve months.

Noting the Joint Assembly's support for the general direction of travel with the Greenways schemes, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted concerns that had been raised about the lack of detail on the individual schemes in the report. He suggested that the GCP should ensure members of the public were able to track progress of the schemes as they developed, in order to provide greater transparency and allow them to be informed of any issues that may arise.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the requests that had been made by the Joint Assembly and members of the public for greater transparency and more detailed information on the individual Greenways schemes, including timescales.
- Expressed concern over the lack of progress on interim deliveries with the schemes, and it was noted by the Transport Director that further information on the delivery plan would be provided at the Executive Board's meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2022.
- Supported the use of land acquisitions to advance the Greenways schemes, although it was observed that the individual circumstances would be considered in each case.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the proposal to present the Outline Business Case and a delivery programme for Greenways to the September Board; and
- (b) Agree the proposed engagement with local communities.

## 8. Chisholm Trail: Phase 2

The Transport Director presented the report, which outlined proposals for Phase 2 of the Chisholm Trail, which would be delivered in several component parts rather than as a single project. The various sections would be progressed by either the GCP or partners, such as Network Rail, while others would be delivered through the planning process, and it was confirmed that the GCP was working with the developers and planning authorities on such parts.

Welcoming the completion of Phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly acknowledged the increased complexity of Phase 2, and conveyed members' concerns about ingress and egress along the length of the trail, but particularly in built-up areas. He also noted that the Joint Assembly had highlighted the design of the Coldham's Lane crossing as being of high importance, due to the already dangerous junction at that stage of the trail.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board welcomed the opening of the first section of the Chisholm Trail and expressed enthusiasm for completion of the route to Cambridge Central Station.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Endorse recommendations for public engagement on designs for Coldham's Lane Junction, and Cromwell Road in Summer 2022 to further inform the design;

- (b) Endorse recommendations for public engagement on designs for Great Eastern Street Car Park in Summer 2022 to further inform the design;
- (c) Approve the land acquisition at Clifton Road;
- (d) Approve plans for continued work in partnership with stakeholders and the landowners to develop a package of local mitigation to support the scheme;
- (e) Approve the negotiation of land and rights required for the early delivery of the scheme including Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders as appropriate;
- (f) Approve the further work on a Public Path Order to secure the links from Cromwell Road Shops into the Timber works development; and
- (g) Approve work for the further design of all other elements of the Chisholm Trail Phase 2.

## 9. Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review

Two public questions were received from David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge) and Matt Danish (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 initial ideas for the development of a new road network hierarchy in Cambridge that sought to reallocate road space in favour of public transport and active travel. Highlighting that such a process had not been carried out since the 1980's, he noted that road usage had changed since then and would continue to evolve in the future. Attention was drawn to the review's underpinning role for the GCP's wider strategic objectives and priorities, and it was highlighted that the proposals were a starting point that would lead to a public consultation process and broader discussion throughout the Greater Cambridge area and beyond.

Highlighting that the Joint Assembly had welcomed the proposals set out in the report, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly acknowledged that the review would establish a strategic context for the GCP's individual schemes and projects. He emphasised the importance of ensuring the public consultations were effective and inclusive, and suggested that the GCP should emphasise the relationship between the road network hierarchy review and other projects and strategies, particularly the ongoing Making Connections exercise.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the road network hierarchy review, the discussion that it would provoke in the Greater Cambridge area, and the opportunities that it could lead to for future improvements to the road network.
- Noted the importance of publicising the public consultations to encourage a broad participation, including people from outside the Greater Cambridge area, and

attention was drawn to the significance of the data that would be collected from the process. It was also suggested that the depth and wide-ranging scope of the public consultations should be emphasised, to ensure people did not misinterpret them as merely technical consultations.

- Suggested that it could be beneficial to instal signage around Cambridge to remind drivers of their responsibility to give way to pedestrians and cyclists at junctions, arguing that it would be a relatively easy and cheap way to emphasise the message following recent updates to the Highway Code. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and observed that infrastructure and signage on certain roads would need to be changed, subject to the outcomes of the public consultations.
- Expressed concerns about the colours used to indicate the different street categories in Appendix 4, and suggested that a more appropriate colour scheme could be used. Noting that the Joint Assembly had also raised similar concerns, the Transport Director assured members that further consideration would be given to the colour scheme prior to the public consultations.
- Queried whether simulation modelling had been carried out on the displacement of traffic based on the proposed network, and what the impacts would be on the different roads. The Transport Director confirmed that some high-level modelling had been undertaken, although more extensive modelling would be carried out following the public consultations to ensure that the wider network could cope with the proposals that emerged from the engagement exercise.
- Observed that involvement in public consultations was often higher when details of specific roads or areas were given, instead of a city-wide focus, and emphasised the importance of attracting participation during the public consultation phase, rather than provoking reactions from the subsequent proposals.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the project objectives and outputs; and
- (b) Support the draft proposals set out in appendices 2-4, as a basis for public consultation.

## 10. Milton Road

Seven public questions were received from Lilian Rundblad (Chair of the Histon Road Area Residents' Association), Maureen Mace (on behalf of the Milton Road Residents' Association), Charles Nisbet (Chairman of the Milton Road Residents' Committee), Rosalind Lund (Chair of the Arbury Road East Residents' Association), Dr Susan Jackson (on behalf of the Windsor Road Residents Association), Councillor Jocelynn Scutt (Chair of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF)), and Matt Danish (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

A statement from Councillor Cheney Payne, Cambridge City Councillor for the Castle ward, was read out to the Executive Board. Drawing attention to a faulty sensor that was causing significant congestion and queues around the traffic lights at the Histon Road / Victoria Road / Huntingdon Road junction, Councillor Payne highlighted that the issue needed to be resolved before the proposed night-time diversion route for the Milton Road project was implemented.

Councillor Jamie Dalzell, Cambridge City Councillor for the West Chesterton ward, was invited to address the Executive Board. Expressing concern about the project's potential impact on businesses along Milton Road, particularly around the Arbury Road junction, he queried whether the project schedule could avoid the seasonal period in December. He also raised concerns about the potential safety issues from cars using alternative routes in the surrounding area, and emphasised the need to mitigate such risks, particularly around schools. Noting the value of continued engagement with the local liaison forum, he encouraged the GCP to request that the contractors maintained communication with the group. Acknowledging the importance of effective communication between the project team, the contractor, residents and local businesses, the Transport Director confirmed that safety issues would be evaluated and mitigated along the entire route.

Councillor Jocelynn Scutt, Chairperson of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum, was invited to address the Executive Board. Paying tribute to those that had contributed to the development of the project, Councillor Scutt also emphasised the importance of maintaining communication between the contractors, local residents and the LLF throughout the construction phase, particularly in the event of major issues arising. She requested a schedule of when work on the different stretches of Mill Road were planned to take place, notwithstanding probable changes to the timeframe as the project progressed, and suggested that signage could be installed on Arbury Road to minimise the impact caused by HGVs. She also welcomed work being undertaken by the GCP to deal with issues that had been raised related to resident parking, as well as access for deliveries and visitors during the construction.

The Transport Director presented the report, which contained a budget estimate for the Milton Road project, proposed construction and traffic management plans, and a proposal to award the construction contract to Milestone Infrastructure. The Transport Director noted that the budget estimate had increased from £23.04m to £24m due to widespread inflationary pressures. Milestone Infrastructure had successfully managed and carried out similar works in and around Cambridge, including the Histon Road and Greenways projects for the GCP, and it was emphasised that little had changed in the overall design since it had been agreed in 2019 beyond some minor amendments following feedback from the LLF.

Noting that the Joint Assembly had not raised objections to the recommendations, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised concerns about the sufficient provision of residents' parking in the surrounding area during and after construction. He also suggested that it would be beneficial for measures to be put in place to encourage use of the Milton Park and Ride facilities.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the increase to the budget estimate, and queried whether there was a risk of a further increase. Acknowledging the residual risk of projects that involved the moving of underground utilities' infrastructure, the Transport Director informed members that detailed analysis of the works had been carried out with Milestone, and confirmed that the budget was not expected to increase beyond £24m.
- Welcomed that the project had reached the construction stage, and highlighted the benefits that it would provide to the local community, as well as public transport and active travel.
- Acknowledged that it was not possible to overcome all the potential problems prior to construction commencing and that there would inevitably be some disruptions. Members emphasised the importance of maintaining dialogue with local residents and businesses, and responding efficiently to any issues that arose.
- Noted that work was being undertaken to consider residents' parking in the area during and following completion of the construction.
- Highlighted that the contractor would be required to ensure segregation and safety for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the construction phase.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Approve the construction and traffic management plan;
- (b) Approve the award of the construction contract to Milestone Infrastructure under the terms of Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Service Framework: and
- (c) Approve an increased budget of £24M for the Milton Road project that follows the target cost proposal developed by Milestone Infrastructure.

## 11. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, and which also included the multi-year budget strategy. The wider programme continued to be over-programmed, although it continued to be refined as it moved into a period of significant delivery. The Executive Board was also asked to delegate authority to the Director of Transport to appoint a land agent to represent the GCP Programme, and it was confirmed that the County Council had approved such an arrangement.

Drawing attention to a request that had been made by the Joint Assembly for a report on the GCP's overprogramming strategy and the risks that it involved, the Chairperson



of the Joint Assembly welcomed that this request had been acknowledged in section 2.6 of the Quarterly Progress Report, although he emphasised that it should be presented before any of the risks became a concern.

While discussing the Quarterly Progress Report, the Executive Board:

- Suggested that it would be beneficial for a future report to consider how the Smart workstream interfaced with the City Access Strategy, Road Network Hierarchy Review and other GCP projects and strategies.
- Queried whether the GCP maintained a formal risk register, and if so, how often it was reviewed. The Assistant Director confirmed that there was a strategic risk register that was reviewed on a quarterly basis, as well as a transport-specific risk register and individual risk registers for all the projects that were reviewed more frequently.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Endorse the multi-year budget strategy as outlined in Section 14, including the detailed GCP budgets for 2022/23. The budget strategy will continue to be updated annually; and
- (b) Delegate authority to the Director of Transport to appoint a land agent to represent the GCP Programme as set out in Section 5.6 of this report.

## 12. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on Thursday 30th June 2022.

Chairperson  
30<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 17<sup>th</sup> March 2022  
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

No	Questioner	Question	Answer
8	Robert McCubbin Parish Councillor Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom	<p><b>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</b></p> <p>Little Wilbraham, Great Wilbraham &amp; Six Mile Bottom have no active travel possibilities, with no cycle paths and only narrow, unlit roads connecting our communities to basic amenities such as schools, GP surgeries, shops, leisure facilities and places of work.</p> <p>Although the Greenways scheme will provide sustainable connections to key sites and centres of population, it does not provide any radial routes to allow villages such as ours to connect to this network, leaving dangerous sections preventing anything but a car trip. This is despite our being within easy cycling distance of Cambridge and other centres. There is no bus service except once in the early morning and back in the mid evening yet are within easy distance of Fulbourn and Bottisham both of which will be on Greenways routes and are on regular bus routes. Our roads are also used extensively by HGVs travelling between the A11 and the A14, adding significantly to the difficulties for cyclists.</p> <p>A survey of residents here in December 2021 had a 31% response rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 98% wanted a safe cycle path from the villages</li> <li>• 45% have household members that currently rely</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Greenways network is extensive, with 12 routes covering approximately 150km of active travel provision. The routes and alignments were consulted on publicly in 2019/20, with Executive Board approval given in 2020 to proceed with development of the current network.</p> <p>Currently there are no plans for a subsequent phase of Greenways or additional links.</p> <p>However, the GCP is in discussions with partners including the County Council and District Council, regarding how we could integrate the Greenways into the wider active network, including potentially expanding the Greenways programme.</p>

		<p>on others to drive them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 89% enjoy and are willing to cycle</li> <li>• 92% currently don't cycle because parts of the cycle route feel too dangerous/ unsafe</li> <li>• 97% said safer cycle routes would increase the chances of their cycling</li> </ul> <p>The recent death of a local cyclist from injuries suffered at the junction of the Wilbraham Road and the A1303 where there is no safe cycle crossing is reported here:</p> <p><a href="https://www.elystandard.co.uk/news/little-wilbraham-road-crash-cyclist-dies-8693206">https://www.elystandard.co.uk/news/little-wilbraham-road-crash-cyclist-dies-8693206</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2022/03/camcycle-calls-for-safer-rural-routes/">https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2022/03/camcycle-calls-for-safer-rural-routes/</a></p> <p>Website: <a href="https://cyclewilbrahams.wixsite.com/cycleway">https://cyclewilbrahams.wixsite.com/cycleway</a></p> <p>There has been another cyclist fatality in February near Little Wilbraham. Will the links between the Bottisham and Fulbourn Greenways via The Wilbrahams and Six Mile Bottom be prioritised as part of the next phase of the Greenways project?</p>	
9	Iris Bostanci Meldreth	<p><b>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</b></p> <p>Three years ago, I went to Cambridge GP to ask how old I would be by the time the bike path to Royston is finished. I am now 10 and going to secondary school next year. It feels like there has been no progress. How old will I be when I can ride my bike safely to Royston? I don't really want to have to buy a car when I'm older.</p>	<p>The Melbourn Greenway is part of a wider network of 150km of active travel routes connecting South Cambridgeshire villages Cambridge.</p> <p>The Greenways report outlines the progress made to date, and, in the case of the Melbourn Greenway, the next phase of engagement planned for September this year.</p>

			The Greenways programme remains on track to complete by the target date of 2025.
11	James Talbot  The Eversdens Cycling Campaign	<p><b>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</b></p> <p>Whilst we recognise that the focus of the current work is the agreed Network, we agree strongly with the view that the Greenways do not extend far enough, there being too much focus on the improvement of existing corridors rather than the development of new ones. The Eversdens, with their growing population, lie in a 10 mile square patch with no cycle paths and no bus services. Please may I ask when the next opportunities may arise to provide us with much-needed safe cycling connections to locations such as our catchment schools, in Comberton, and to Barton, from where we may safely access the Greenways and Cambridge.</p>	<p>The proposed Greenways network is extensive, with 12 routes covering approximately 150km of active travel provision. The routes and alignments were consulted on publicly in 2019/20, with Executive Board approval given in 2020 to proceed with development of the current network.</p> <p>Currently there are no plans for a subsequent phase of Greenways or additional links.</p> <p>However, the GCP are in discussions with partners including the County Council and District Council, regarding how we could integrate the Greenways into the wider active network, including potentially expanding the Greenways programme.</p>
12	Matthew Danish  Camcycle	<p><b>Agenda item 7: Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</b></p> <p>On Friday, Camcycle placed a ghost bike at the junction of Little Wilbraham Road and the A1303, where a collision led to the death of a man who was cycling there earlier this year. Three years ago, responding to the GCP Bottisham Greenway consultation, the local Cycling UK group - CTC Cambridge - called for a safe crossing here. Locals from the Wilbrahams and Six Mile Bottom have also asked for safe connections to the Greenways as the villages are less than 10 miles from Cambridge but fall</p>	<p>The proposed Greenways network is extensive, with 12 routes covering approximately 150km of active travel provision. The routes and alignments were consulted on publicly in 2019/20, with Executive Board approval given in 2020 to proceed with development of the current network.</p> <p>Currently there are no plans for a subsequent phase of Greenways or additional links.</p>

		<p>between the Fulbourn and Bottisham routes.</p> <p>It is a scandal that in 2022, so many people from rural communities have to weigh up the risk to their lives before walking and cycling for everyday journeys because there are no safe routes for them to use.</p> <p>We'd like to ask the GCP if they could include a safe crossing from Little Wilbraham Road to the Bottisham Greenway and to add in safe routes from the Wilbrahams as part of forthcoming active travel projects?</p>	<p>However, the GCP are in discussions with partners including the County Council and District Council, regarding how we could integrate the Greenways into the wider active network, including potentially expanding the Greenways programme.</p>
7	<p>David Stoughton</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 9 - Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</b></p> <p>As you know Living Streets Cambridge campaigns for pedestrians and you may be aware of our current campaign to curb the bane of pavement parking. The recent publication of the revised Highway Code is a big step forward for walkers and we are pleased that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is committed to reviewing the road user hierarchy with a view to seeing the provisions of the new code implemented.</p> <p>However, it will require significant change to driver knowledge and behaviour if benefits such as priority for pedestrian and cyclists heading straight on at side road junctions are to be realised safely. The transition could easily increase the danger to pedestrians as the hierarchy and relative priorities change. Long-standing patterns of behaviour will adjust at different rates among road users and individuals. So pedestrians and cyclists who are, so to speak, early adopters may find that some motorists have not yet made the adjustment. Care and</p>	<p>A communication strategy will be developed as part of the new network hierarchy, supporting local and national road safety initiatives including the recent changes to the Highway Code.</p>

		<p>respect between road users of all kinds will be required. To ensure that the transition is both safe and rapid will require a number of measures. These could include road markings, signage, public information and speed restrictions. Consideration should be given to zebra crossing markings at key junctions, speed limits of 20 miles an hour or less on all urban streets and a substantial public information campaign.</p> <p>Will this partnership ensure that sufficient funds are allocate to clear visual and informational communication and guidance for all users to embed the adjusted priorities implied by the revised hierarchy?</p>	
13	<p>Matthew Danish Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 9 - Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</b></p> <p>Camcycle would like to thank officers and the Joint Assembly for their helpful feedback on our questions last month. We welcome this review of the road network which will ensure active and public transport journeys are prioritised within Cambridge.</p> <p>We support the comments made for the need to overlay sustainable transport routes with the plans for changes to the road network so that local people can understand the overall vision of this project, and the call for clearer explanation and mapping of the proposed street categories.</p> <p>We have additional questions on this report:</p> <p>Under the characteristics of a Civic Street, there is the suggestion that, where possible, alternative routes would be provided for cycle trips. It is essential that there are</p>	<p>As part of work to expand the current area of pedestrian and cycling priority in the city centre, consideration will be given to developing alternative routes to allow cyclists the choice of avoiding busy pedestrian footfall streets; these routes need to be safe and convenient to be an attractive alternative for cyclists. The proposals that emerge from this work would be the subject of further consultation.</p> <p>Priorities for implementing a new road network hierarchy will be determined in due course following the consultation process.</p> <p>Funding is available to start the delivery process for any identified quick wins, if this follows the outcome of the consultation.</p> <p>The road network hierarchy review and the Making Connections proposals are intended to complement each other but they will be the subject of separate public consultations given the</p>

	<p>safe, direct routes via the city centre at all times of day, therefore we welcome the suggestion of finding better options for streets with high footfall provided that cycling access is maintained and any alternative route ideas are brought forward for genuine consultation beforehand. Could the GCP confirm that safe, direct cycle routes will be maintained and access for disabled people using cycles as a mobility aid will not be affected?</p> <p>Item 10.1 says that quick wins arising from this project will be met from the 2022/23 budget. What does that mean in terms of timescale for installation of new roadspace reallocation trials?</p> <p>Item 7.2 says that a consultation on road hierarchy will coincide with a second Making Connection consultation with links between the two.</p> <p>Is there any reason why these can't be joined into one consultation to better reflect the holistic nature of the City Access programme?</p> <p>Following on from that, are the public transport improvements still on track to be delivered next year as shown in the City Access timeline presented in Sept 2021?</p>	<p>different legislative processes that each are being developed under.</p> <p>Work continues on developing improvements to public transport services and a further update will be considered by the Executive Board at a meeting later this year.</p>
--	--	--

2	<p>Lilian Rundblad</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>HRARA</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>This is a revised version, now showing the diversion via the A14 instead of Kings Hedges Road. As a result, pressure will come directly down Histon Road and perhaps increase HGV numbers (page 83).</p> <p>To ensure that the road signage is set up, thereby reducing speeding, noise and air pollution, and ensuring safety for the residents along Histon Road it is imperative that the actual signs are in place. PRO 763 and 764 impose a 20mph limit between Akeman Street and the Victoria Road Junction plus 30mph from Kings Hedges Road to Akeman Street, both recently approved. They are essential and should be set up before the Diversions start. With the very positive recommendations at the 8th March Highways meeting regarding 20mph, its funding and also additional staff to be hired, there should be no hindrance to having this work done urgently.</p> <p>The enforcement of the speed limits also needs to be improved urgently. The MVAS sign in the northern part of the road was removed at the start of construction on Histon Road and the Speed Camera near Carisbrooke Junction is out-of-order. Both the MVAS sign and the Speed Camera are important deterrent features preventing speeding and should be reinstated urgently and before the Diversions start.</p> <p>Both the speed limit signage and the reinforcement of speeding are an important factor to reduce the congestion and pressure on the Huntingdon/ Histon/Victoria Junction as the Signalling System at the Junction is not working properly due to damage to the loop under the junction.</p>	<p>The GCP will be looking to install the 20mph signage in the coming months in accordance with the recent Traffic Regulation Order. GCP is targeting implementation before construction begins on Milton Road.</p> <p>The project manager is in discussion with the County Council with regard to whether or not the speed camera on Histon Road that is currently out of commission, can re-commissioned in its current position.</p>
---	--	--	---



		<p>HRARA asks that GCP make every attempt to have in place at the time of the Milton Road Project start in April-May 2022 both the speed signage, the speed enforcement tools and the signalling system at the Victoria Road Junction.</p>	
4	<p>Maureen Mace</p> <p>Milton Road Residents' Association</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>a) Woodhead Drive will be used as a base for the contractors when Milton Road is constructed. Could you ensure that a footpath and cycleway remain between Milton Road and Woodhead Drive. This is the main route for schoolchildren from East Chesterton over the pedestrian crossing to the rear of the North Cambridge Academy through the car free zone of Downhams Lane. This route is also a well-used cut through by residents in the Woodhead Drive and Arbury areas to cycle and walk to local shops, the pub, the Post Office, the Science Park, Business Centre and Cambridge North.</p> <p>b) At the Joint Assembly I asked if there will be advertising displays on the new bus shelters as one was awaiting approval by the planning authority.</p> <p>Mr Blake's answer was that he would be in discussion regarding this with the planning authority. The advertising on this particular bus shelter has since been removed. Thank you. Can you confirm that there will be <b>NO digital</b> or other advertising on any of the new glass bus shelters anywhere along Milton Road after the reconstruction, including in front of both sets of shops. Not only is digital advertising very distracting but any advertising stands will block views of residents</p>	<p>a) It is not planned to close the route between Woodhead Drive and Milton Road to pedestrians and cyclists during construction. The GCP project team will ensure this access is maintained.</p> <p>b) The bus shelters planned for Milton Road are not designed to include advertising panels or to contain digital advertising. The GCP project team will not add any advertising displays to the bus shelters before handing these assets to the City/County Council when the scheme is complete.</p>

		exiting from their drives.	
6	Charles Nisbet Chairman Milton Road Residents' Committee	<p><b>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>If all goes according to plan, once the reconstruction works on Milton Road are completed, there will be attractive grass verges/swales along much of the road. Unfortunately, it will not be long before large lorries and delivery vans find it convenient to park on these verges while delivering to properties on the road, and much of the good work will be undone.</p> <p>Would the Board therefore please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct the relevant officers to ensure that some form of physical barriers to inhibit parking on verges are included in the detailed plans, e.g. high kerbs and substantial, short, wooden, boundary posts; and</li> <li>• investigate the possibility of legally enforceable penalties for parking on such verges, including the cost of making good any damage.</li> </ul>	<p>The current design does not include physical barriers, but includes double yellow lines along the length of the carriageway. This allows for loading and unloading of vehicles, but parking is prohibited both on carriageway and on verge.</p> <p>The introduction of more restrictive loading bans on Milton Road has been raised by stakeholders and is worthy of further consideration.</p> <p>Public consultation on the final Traffic Regulation Order proposals will be undertaken as scheme delivery progresses.</p>

10	Rosalind Lund Chair Arbury Road East Residents' Association (ARERA)	<p><b>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>In our view, Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) looks likely to be the most appropriate vehicle to ensure that residents of Milton Road and adjoining streets are kept regularly informed of progress on the road so that problems are dealt with quickly and effectively. Arbury Road East Residents' Association (ARERA) came into existence after the LLF was set up.</p> <p>We therefore ask that ARERA be treated as a full member of the LLF for the duration of the project and that communications between the contractors and residents are facilitated through the Chair and Secretary of ARERA whenever issues which will impact on residents come up, for example road closures. As well as residents, we include a number of traders on Arbury among our members.</p> <p>If for any reason the LLF is discontinued, please ensure that the contractors deal directly with all three local residents associations including ourselves.</p>	The GCP project team will be setting up a line of communication between the contractors, Community Liaison Officer (CLO) and the 3 main Residents Associations in the area (MRRA, HPERA and ARERA).
15	Dr Susan Jackson  Committee member  Windsor Rd Residents Association	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>The present signalling system at the Huntingdon Road Junction has not yet been repaired, and this is already leading to un-necessary queueing along both Histon and Huntingdon road, with increased air pollution, before the traffic can move forward to Castle Street and Mount Pleasant.</p> <p>We join with others in asking that the damaged Loop be</p>	<p>The broken sensor at this junction is due to be repaired in the coming fortnight. It has taken a little time to obtain the road space permit for these remedial works.</p> <p>The GCP have also asked the County Councils signals team to initiate a small piece of work to monitor the flows at this complex junction and to make the required optimisations.</p>

		repaired <b>before</b> the Diversions from Milton Road start in April-May.	
5	Dr Jocelynne A. Scutt Chair Milton Road Local Liaison Forum	<p><b>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</b></p> <p><b><u>Public Art</u></b> Public art was from the outset part of Milton Road Project plans. May a proper and adequate sum be set aside, determined in conjunction with Milton Road and associated roads residents recognised by the art community.</p> <p><b><u>Construction Compound – Milton Road Project</u></b> Woodhead Drive is proposed as main construction compound, for storage, administrative offices, rest-area, blocking off Woodhead Drive. Residents request alternatives be explored – for example Cowley Park/Way security there includes CCTV and a secure perimeter fence. If a Woodhead Drive compound is required, could the scale be reduced for traffic and privacy requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Woodhead Drive closure means sole use of Downhams Lane for Milton Road access, an intersection already highly congested.</li> <li>2. Provision will be required for utility vehicles to Citygate (cnr Woodhead Drive and Milton Road) and nearby properties, adding to Downhams Lane congestion.</li> <li>3. Emergency vehicle access to Woodhead Drive will be affected time-wise by going via Downhams Lane.</li> <li>4. Residents' privacy, particularly of Citygate flats will</li> </ol>	<p>The GCP project team will have set aside a sum for a public art project and will work with Milton Road and Hurst Park Estate Residents' Associations in order to define and deliver this.</p> <p>The contractor has identified Woodhead Drive as the most suitable space to locate mobile office, storage, and welfare facility's. It is important that this are located within the site area of Milton Road in order to provide easy access for those working on the projects. Consideration has been given to the points raised in the question.</p> <p>The construction management plan also sets out that this area will be used to store aggregate materials. The project team is actively looking for an alternative, larger area to store these materials with Cowley Road being a suitable option if access can be obtained.</p> <p>The Milton Road project team has (along with the local Councillors) begun work on the consideration of a larger area residents parking scheme covering the area from Gilbert to Arbury Road. An introductory public meeting has been arranged.</p>

		<p>be impacted by the Compounds needs.</p> <p><b><u>Parking Mitigation and Milton Road Project</u></b></p> <p>An undertaking was made to residents from Milton Road Project outset that parking mitigation would be included. Will the Executive Board honour that undertaking affecting Ascham (has residents' parking) and Hurst Park Estate and Elizabeth (no residents' parking) by supporting its proceeding, so as not to await an outcome of any GCP overall plan, which will take time to be devised.</p> <p>The GPD overall plan will necessarily take account of existing residents' parking schemes, including the Romsey scheme (proceeding under existing rules), so including Elizabeth/Hurst Park would not inhibit the overall plan.</p> <p>Requiring Milton Road Project residents to await an overall plan ignores the undertaking to Milton Road Project residents.</p>	
14	<p>Matthew Danish</p> <p>Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Milton Road Development</b></p> <p>The Milton Road project has been a case of the good, the bad and the ugly.</p> <p>First, the good: the project team worked well with the community to design a tree-lined road that will be a genuine improvement for everyone living, working or passing through, along MOST of its length.</p> <p>The bad: north of Lovell Road, the designers have shoehorned in a bus lane, cutting to the bone the space</p>	<p>In terms of area north of Lovell road - the crossing at Seeley's Court, the designers are working on adjusting the kerb line in this area to reduce the narrowing of the footway and cycleway through this pinch point.</p> <p>The project team do not intend to shorten this stretch of bus lane which is an important link to the guided busway – a key driver behind the Milton Road scheme.</p>

	<p>for active travel. They needed extra land to make the bus lane fit, but they didn't get it. Instead of reversing the decision to extend the bus lane, they've chosen to prioritise bus company convenience ahead of people's safety, like the fiasco on Histon Road.</p> <p>When the land negotiation failed, and the extended bus lane conflicted with the necessary safe space for walking and cycling, why didn't you choose safety? How will you fix this?</p> <p>The ugly: during construction, everyone walking and cycling will be jammed into the narrow north-western pavement. This will be very hard, especially for the numerous families that currently walk or cycle their kids to school here.</p> <p>Will you instruct the officers to work out a construction plan that has more space for walking and cycling? And how?</p> <p>It's not enough to say some cyclists will mix with motor traffic. If the usual number of cars tries to push through the work zone, junctions like Arbury Road will be gridlocked. We've recommended convening a working group to find traffic reduction measures, but the project team has resisted this so far. It's a pity: the Milton Road design worked well because of successful collaboration between residents, stakeholders and the GCP.</p> <p>Why is the GCP now afraid of such collaboration with local residents' associations and stakeholders, which has worked so well before? How will you fix this?</p>	<p>The contractor, Milestone, will ensure that construction works are well segregated from local residents and travelling public.</p> <p>There will be clearly defined zones for cyclists and pedestrians to travel along which will be kept clear from construction risks and activities.</p> <p>Milestone will look to moving plant/ site vehicles away from sensitive areas at sensitive times of the day, e.g. at School drop off/ pick up times</p> <p>All modes of transport will be accommodated for during the construction works for e.g. the length of the works will be regulated so shared lengths are not excessive and once the area is passed there is an opening up of the area to allow safe overtaking by vehicles.</p> <p>Additionally, the contractor will seek to ensure that cyclists will be accommodated in their own travel lane as far as practicable (could be shared with pedestrians).</p> <p>The traffic management plan will be a live document that will be updated appropriately</p> <p>The project team will manage the Arbury Road junction in line with the Construction Management plan.</p> <p>As with all areas of the site, the Arbury Road junction will be regularly assessed and if necessary, changes made to the traffic management layout and operation, following the successful approach recently taken on Histon Road.</p> <p>As with Histon Road, assessment of the traffic management solution will take into account feedback from members of the</p>
--	---	---

			public using the road.
--	--	--	------------------------