



## Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly  
Wednesday 16 October 2024  
2:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Present:

### Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Katie Thornburrow (Vice Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Claire Daunton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Graham Wilson	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Paul Bearpark	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Nitin Patel	Business Representative
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Kristin-Anne Rutter	University Representative

### Officers:

Kerry Allen	Senior Delivery Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Interim Director (GCP)
Anna Chylinska-Derkowska	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Daniel Clarke	Head of Innovation and Technology (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Head of Programme (GCP)
Ben Hathway	Senior Delivery Project Manager (GCP)
Stephen Kelly	Joint Director (GCSPS)
Tom Kelly	Service Director of Finance and Procurement (CCC)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Paul McGuigan	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Deputy Manager (CCC)
Paul van de Bulk	Senior Project Manager (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Annika Osborne, Councillor Simon Smith and James Rolfe.

The Chairperson welcomed Nitin Patel as a new business representative on the Joint Assembly.

## 2. Declarations of Interest

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report item (agenda item 6), as a board member of Cambridge Ahead.

Councillor Heather Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Waterbeach Railway Station item (agenda item 7), as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee.

Councillor Neil Shailer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Chisholm Trail Phase 2 - Next Steps item (agenda item 10), as a resident of Cromwell Road.

## 3. Minutes – 12 September 2024

While discussing the minutes of the previous meeting, it was proposed to amend the second paragraph detailing the debate on Agenda Item 8 (Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project), as follows (additions in bold, removal in strikethrough):

Raised various concerns about the proposed design, including **walking and cycling access from Teversham village and** how it would be accessed from the A1303 ~~and Teversham village, although~~ **and** it was acknowledged that such issues would be addressed during the design and planning stages of the project.

It was also proposed to amend the fourth paragraph detailing the debate on Agenda Item 8 (Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project), as follows (additions in bold, removal in strikethrough):

Observed that the Park and Ride bus provided an important service to residents of the ~~Marley~~ **Marleigh** development, although it was emphasised that current bus services along Newmarket Road would continue to operate due to demand from current and potential development in the area, while ongoing bus reform work being carried out by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPAC) could establish further opportunities. **It was confirmed that the provision of easy crossing access on Newmarket Road to bus services, following any relocation of the Park and Ride site, would be considered at the planning stage.** The Joint Assembly highlighted the importance of ensuring

the new facility was future proofed in line with the anticipated growth of the surrounding area, although members noted that some residents used the current site for general parking, rather than for its intended Park and Ride purpose.

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 12 September 2024, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the above amendments, and signed by the Chairperson.

## 4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that ten 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 one question related to agenda Item 7 (Waterbeach Railway Station), four questions related to agenda Item 8 (Better Public Transport - Waterbeach to Cambridge), two questions related to agenda item 9 (Waterbeach, Fulbourn and Sawston Greenways), one question related to agenda item 10 (Chisholm Trail Phase 2 - Next Steps), and two questions related to agenda item 11 (Cambridge South West Travel Hub - Next Steps).

## 5. Petitions

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

## 6. Quarterly Progress Report

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 set out the proposed multi-year budget strategy, including the detailed GCP budgets for 2025/26. The report also outlined plans to procure a provider to enable the continuation of the GCP's skills work and proposed an additional commitment for three further years of data from the Centre for Business Research (CBR) at the University of Cambridge.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the significant reduction in the GCP's projected deficit and overprogramming risk, but queried how inflation was considered in the budget process and what the implications would be of any overspends on larger projects in the GCP's programme. Members were assured that inflation rates were continuously monitored, with recent data suggesting that it would be contained with the estimates of individual schemes, while inflation in the construction sector was decreasing to earlier levels following a period of high uncertainty. It was confirmed

that the GCP carried out risk management across its whole programme, as well as on each individual project.

- Sought clarification on whether there could be additional borrowing costs as a result of the cashflow challenges outlined in the report. Members were informed that the figures in the report did not include any such potential borrowing costs, although it was emphasised that prudential borrowing by the County Council was only one of the options for addressing the cashflow challenges, with revisions to the timing of schemes or changes to the Government's approach towards funding examples of alternative options.
- Observed that the budget for the Waterbeach Station project was listed as £37m in Section 7.1 of the report, whereas Agenda Item 7 (Waterbeach Railway Station) included a recommendation to increase the project's budget to £43.35m, although it was clarified that the proposed increase would be funded by Homes England and there would therefore be no additional cost for the GCP.
- Highlighted the success and importance of the GCP's skills programme and welcomed the proposal to procure a provider to enable its continuation, particularly for outreach and career development in schools. although it was suggested that the procurement could be modified to ensure it focused on the more successful aspects of the previous skills work.
- Emphasised the importance of identifying an alternative source of funding to continue the GCP's skills work in the long-term, such as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), which covered a much wider geography than the Greater Cambridge region. It was suggested that once an organisation had been identified, the GCP could encourage it to develop a long-term plan and perhaps become involved with the provider in the second year of the proposed new two-year contract, to improve the transition and to reduce the likelihood of another cliff edge situation in two years' time.
- Suggested that work could be carried out to identify and map further gaps of talents and skills in the Greater Cambridge region that needed to be developed support education and growth in the area. It was noted, for example, that restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic had resulted in a cohort of biology graduates not benefitting from the usual level of laboratory work and subsequently finding it harder to find work, and it was suggested that some of the businesses in the region could support such people by providing opportunities that they were denied during the pandemic, although it was also acknowledged that there will skills shortages across many sectors, such as construction, plumbing and agriculture.
- Requested further information on the real time bus data audit and the guidance system review, as referenced in Section 9 of the report. Members were informed that a report resulting from the audit had been completed and was due to be published, while work was ongoing to identify how new technology could potentially be used on proposed new busways. Members noted that there were other factors to also take into consideration when developing the proposed new busways, such

as the CPCA's ongoing bus reform work and the interaction with modern modes of transport, including electric bicycles and scooters.

- Noted that the autonomous vehicles currently being used in trials would be available for wider use in 2026 and queried whether the current infrastructure was prepared for such a change and when it could happen, although it was acknowledged that the trials were still ongoing and were assessing whether such developments would be feasible.
- Highlighted the value of the data provided by the Centre for Business Research (CBR), particularly given its low cost, emphasising its importance in being able to challenge nationally produced statistics. It was suggested that the CBR could be asked to include some additional information, such as the region's gross value added and to what extent Greater Cambridge created jobs across the wider country.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson welcomed the reduced projected deficit and noted that various assurances had been provided to the Joint Assembly around the budget. Members had supported the proposals to extend the GCP's skills work, although emphasis had been made on identifying a future source of funding and transitioning to that new process, while also mapping the current skills shortages in the region, in order to ensure an appropriate provider was found in the procurement. The Joint Assembly also supported the proposals for additional data from the CBR.

## 7. Waterbeach Railway Station

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly on the Outline Business Case for the new Waterbeach station. It proposed an increased budget of £43.35m for the project, to cover the delivery of the station, closure of the existing station and construction of a haul road, although the additional budget would not be funded from GCP resources. It also proposed that, subject to the agreement of the County Council's Strategy, Resources and Performance Committee, the GCP agree the funding from Homes England for a repayable grant of up to £23.35m to forward fund the delivery of the station and haul road, to be repaid by the developers of the Waterbeach New Town.

One public question was received from Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Anna Bradnam, the County Councillor for the Waterbeach division and South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Milton and Waterbeach ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Acknowledging the need to relocate the station to reduce the number of additional private vehicles using the A10 as a result of the ongoing expansion of Waterbeach, Councillor Bradnam paid tribute to the GCP's involvement in local engagement. Highlighting the importance of ensuring current residents of Waterbeach were able to easily access the station following its relocation, she argued that the new station should provide a wider range of facilities than the current station, such as ticket purchasing options, electronic signage, toilets, a waiting

room and a retail outlet, while also emphasising that it would need to be fully accessible for disabled people.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the forward funding that would reduce the possibility of the planned houses not being built after the station was relocated, and which would enable a haul road to divert construction traffic from passing through the village.
- Emphasised the importance of the timing of opening of the new station and closure of the current station alongside the wider construction in the town, to ensure that the current station was not closed before new houses were ready to be occupied. Members also highlighted the importance of future proofing the station to ensure that it could be adapted to population growth in the surrounding area.
- Expressed concern that the new station could be used less if it did not include sufficient facilities, arguing that the current station was unsuitable for the number of passengers that used it, and sought clarification on what the new station could include, noting that the planning permission included provisions for associated facilities when it was granted. Members were informed that the final proposals and costs had still not been decided, but it was emphasised that the wider Waterbeach Masterplan envisaged the relocated station as one of the key locations within the town, driving the land use, densities and configuration of spaces around the station in the future, where such facilities and amenities were likely to be provided separately but alongside those at the station.
- Emphasised that the station should act as a travel hub and support changes between as many modes of transport as possible, including active travel and buses. It was confirmed that the GCP was exploring potential links with the proposed busway and Greenway, although it was acknowledged that additional features to the project would require further resources and design consideration. It was clarified that the County Council would manage the new station's car park.
- Suggested that the current station could be mothballed instead of being demolished, alongside the allocation of surrounding land, in case future developments in the wider region required an additional station or turnback facilities. Members were informed that this was a decision for the Department for Transport (DfT) rather than the GCP, and that it therefore did not represent any of the project's budget, although it was acknowledged that the GCP could make suggestions to the DfT. Notwithstanding, it was emphasised that Waterbeach station was being relocated rather than being closed.
- Expressed concern about the use of public funds for the project, particularly when the GCP had been required to reprioritise its wider programme due to a lack of resources, arguing that such investment should be made by developers and other profit-making entities. Members were assured that public investment of this kind was common for infrastructure projects of this size, and it was emphasised that Homes England had already committed over £1.2b to facilitate the delivery of housing in the region. It was noted that the return on investment would not necessarily be secured through Section 106 agreements, but rather through tax

revenues and other normal processes in which the government secured its funding. Members were also informed that if no public funding was provided, the only available variable would be a renegotiation of the Section 106 agreement, in terms of where the infrastructure costs rose, which would likely result in a reduced proportion of affordable housing on the developments.

- Suggested that a viability clawback agreement would ensure that the developer would pay the money back to the GCP if it made a profit. Members were informed that there was a viability assessment process built into the Section 106 agreement, which ensured the developer's contribution for strategic transport would rise from £17m to £45m in such circumstances.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly welcomed the inclusion of a haul road for construction traffic and supported the proposals in the report. He highlighted concerns about the facilities that would be provided at the new station and emphasised the need to future proof it for potential future development. Acknowledging the suggestion that the old station could be mothballed rather than demolished, he also highlighted the importance of the timing of when the old station closed and the new station opened.

## 8. Better Public Transport - Waterbeach to Cambridge

Four public questions were received from Sarah Nicholas (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, and read out by Sarah Nicholas), Lynda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society), and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Anna Bradnam, the County Councillor for the Waterbeach division and South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Milton and Waterbeach ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the importance of the project to support the future population growth of Waterbeach, Councillor Bradnam welcomed changes that had been made to the proposals following the public consultation and emphasised the importance of engaging with residents along the A10 throughout the construction process. Expressing concern about the potential access to the proposed busway by motorised vehicles, motorcycles and scooters, she suggested that the GCP consider planting hedges alongside parts of the route, both to provide security to adjoining residential properties and to protect the view from the Tithe Barn in Landbeach. Councillor Bradnam also emphasised the need to address potential surface water drainage issues resulting from the project. Members were assured that the surface water drainage issues that had been identified by the drainage assessment would continue to be taken into consideration as the scheme progressed.

The Interim Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly on the Waterbeach to Cambridge project, which presented the outcome of an environmental impact assessment consultation, and a non-technical summary of the Environmental Statement and its contents. The report also set out the recommended final route alignment and travel hub design, as well as a proposal for the County Council to

approve the submission of a Transport and Works Order. Members also received an additional presentation, which was published on the meeting website and will be attached at Appendix B of the signed minutes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Queried whether the proposed busway would be adaptable to potential alternative modes of transport in the future. Members were informed that such considerations were taken into account throughout the design phase of all schemes, and that less engineering would be involved to make the busway more adaptable in the future. Other busways were also being analysed to identify possibilities, while the GCP's Smart workstream continued to monitor and inform on the development of automated vehicles and regulatory issues.
- Expressed concern about objections raised by various organisations and groups, and suggested that the GCP should taking learning on consultation and engagement from previous experiences. Members were assured the GCP always identified lessons learned from previous consultations, and it was emphasised that many of the concerns that had been raised would be addressed in the later design stages of the project.
- Established that Active Travel England (ATE) had not reviewed the proposals, and it was agreed that the GCP would query whether the project would fall within ATE's remit.
- Argued that although the report included examples of responses to the consultation, it did not provide a steer on the general level of support or opposition to the proposals. It was also observed that the map in Appendix A of the report was out of date and should be updated for the Executive Board.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposals set out in the report. Highlighting concerns about future proofing of the scheme, he also noted that specific issues with the design would be addressed at a later stage.

## 9. Waterbeach, Fulbourn and Sawston Greenways

Two public questions were received from Lynda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society), and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Anna Bradnam, the County Councillor for the Waterbeach division and South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Milton and Waterbeach ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the broad local support for the project, Councillor Bradnam nonetheless emphasised that there were concerns about specific aspects of the design. With regard to the northern section of the proposed route, she drew attention to issues related to drainage and flooding, while noting security and privacy concerns raised by residents living alongside the proposed route, particularly those living in Cosy Nook Park. With regard to the middle section of the



Greenway, Councillor Bradnam highlighted the increasing number of bicycles and pedestrians travelling along High Street and Cambridge Road and welcomed the proposal to undertake further design and consultation on this section of the route, arguing that it was important for parking spaces for customers of local businesses to be retained along this section. Suggesting that bicycles should use the road when the pavement was too narrow to share safely with pedestrians, alongside the implementation of speed and weight limits throughout the village of Milton, she argued that without such measures the scheme could increase the risk for pedestrians. Members were informed that there was overall local support for the northern section of the scheme to progress, and it was emphasised that environmental concerns would continue to be investigated, as would engagement with residents of Cosy Nook Park and the wider community.

The Head of GCP Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly on the proposed next steps of the Waterbeach, Fulbourn and Sawston Greenways. The report proposed the development of the northern section of the Waterbeach Greenway to a completed detailed design and the construction of Phase 1 of the Fulbourn Greenway, alongside a consultation on Phase 2 of the Fulbourn Greenway. It also proposed an extension of the early works section of the Sawston Greenway in Great Shelford and Stapleford, as well as the early delivery of a section of the Sawston Greenway on Francis Crick Avenue to link with the Cambridge South East Travel Scheme Phase 2 (CSETS). Members also received an additional presentation, which was published on the meeting website and will be attached at Appendix C of the signed minutes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposal to progress the northern section of the route, noting that the new developments in Waterbeach were starting to be occupied and there was therefore an urgent need to commence construction to avoid an increase to the number of cyclists using the A10. It was argued that additional measures should be considered to discourage passing traffic from driving through Milton. Members were informed that concerns that had been raised about the flooding, privacy and security, among other issues, would be addressed in the design stage of the northern section.
- Expressed concern that undertaking work on some sections of the route before the whole design had been finalised could restrict the flexibility to make changes to the design of the remaining section that was yet to be finalised. Members were informed that the northern and southern sections of the route had high levels of support and would have immediate positive impacts, and were assured that such concerns had been taken into consideration when proposing they progress before the middle section had been finalised.
- Acknowledged that the most practical route for the Greenway through Milton was along High Street and Cambridge Road, suggesting that cyclists would use that route regardless of whether the Greenway followed it, although it was argued that it was inappropriate for pedestrians and cyclists to share the pavement and that it would be safer for them to use the road on that stretch of the route.

- Welcomed the GCP's approach to public engagement on the Waterbeach Greenway and that it had responded with adjustments accordingly, including to the alignment and timescales. Notwithstanding, members expressed concern that Paragraph 2.6 of the report indicated that the consultation identified more opposition than support and suggested that the report could have provided greater context on the nature of the objections and which part of the route they related to. It was clarified that most of the opposing feedback related to the section of the Greenway in the village of Milton, which is why that part of the route was undertaking further design and consultation in order to address issues and try to achieve wider support.
- Noted the security concerns raised by residents living alongside the Waterbeach Greenway and queried whether the police had been consulted on the proposals. It was agreed to consult such statutory authorities as the schemes were developed.
- Clarified that 11,000 journeys per week were recorded on the completed section of the Chisholm Trail and suggested that the Waterbeach Greenway should be designed to serve as many as people as possible from the new developments in Waterbeach.
- Welcomed previous engagements organised by the GCP with local members and stakeholders throughout the development of the Fulbourn Greenway, but requested further public engagement on its final design, and for the GCP to keep local members informed throughout its future development.
- Suggested that further consideration should be given to including Mill Road in Phase 3 of the Fulbourn Greenway following the County Council's decision to implement a modal filter on Mill Road bridge, which would result in a more attractive environment on the road for active travel. Notwithstanding, members supported earlier progress with other sections of the route to improve active travel in those parts of the city.
- Noted the potential development of the railway line to Newmarket and argued that any provisions for the Fulbourn Greenway should not hinder such future aspirations.
- Clarified that the cost benefit of the proposed extension of the early works section of the Sawston Greenway in Great Shelford and Stapleford had been included in the project's Business Case. Members queried why it had not initially been included for early work and were informed that the inclusion of a new toucan crossing in Stapleford had required additional design, and while it had been approved as part of the Greenway, it hadn't been included in early work stage, but it was now possible to be included. It was confirmed that there would not be any financial consequences in terms of delivering the wider Greenways programme or other projects.
- Queried when the Genome Path section of the Sawston Greenway would be carried out. Members were informed that due to issues related to land acquisition, that section of the route had been slightly delayed, and it was anticipated that it would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in spring 2025.

- Suggested that similar future reports should include maps to provide greater context.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposals in the report, noting that concerns raised on the specific aspects of the routes would be addressed at the design stage of the relevant scheme. He also highlighted the suggestion that the inclusion of Mill Road to the Fulbourn Greenway should be considered.

## 10. Chisholm Trail Phase 2 - Next Steps

One public question was received from Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Interim Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly on the next steps of Phase 2 of the Chisholm Trail. Members also received an additional presentation, which was published on the meeting website and will be attached at Appendix D of the signed minutes.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Argued that the Chisholm Trail's crossing of Coldhams Lane was the most problematic section of the route, and highlighted the importance of ensuring it was safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Members were informed that progress had been made with rail companies, and that further work was being undertaken on the design. It was also suggested that the Chisholm Trail's crossing of Mill Road should be reconsidered following the County Council's decision to instal a modal filter on Mill Road bridge.
- Clarified that Great Eastern Street car park was an existing car park with a play area alongside it, which would provide access to the Chisholm Trail, and it was noted that the GCP was working on improvements to the facilities with the City Council.
- Noted that a significant number of people would use the Chisholm Trail to reach Cambridge train station, emphasising the importance of ensuring the northern section was fully integrated to the wider route, and queried whether the Carter Bridge and its surrounding area would be improved as part of Phase 2. Members were informed that improvements were not planned as part of the Chisholm Trail project, although it was acknowledged that there was interest for improvements to be made separately.
- Established that although the Chisholm Trail would pass through the redeveloped Beehive Centre, subject to ongoing planning applications, it would not run alongside the railway on that section of the route.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposals and welcomed the agreement in principle that had been reached with the rail industry, although emphasised the agreement should be completed as soon as possible. He also highlighted concerns that had been raised about the section of the route crossing Coldhams Lane.

## 11. Cambridge South West Travel Hub - Next Steps

Two public questions were received from Mal Schofield, and Sarah Nicholas (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Head of GCP Programme presented a report on the next steps of the Cambridge South West Travel Hub to the Joint Assembly, which provided an update on progress of the project and proposed a phased delivery of the scheme, with an enabling works package delivered as Phase 1.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that it would be beneficial for additional facilities to be provided at the Travel Hub to support the GCP's encouragement of active travel and multi-modal travel, including a café and a drop-off/pick-up point for school children. However, members also expressed concern about expanding the site and including additional facilities due to its location in the greenbelt. It was emphasised that there were greater restrictions on potential developments due to the greenbelt location and it was noted that planning permission had only been originally granted due to the site's special circumstances as a transport facility.
- Supported the proposal to deliver enabling works separately, noting that the alternative would be to undertake a lengthy procurement process which would create delay and increase the level of commercial risk due to various contractors relying on each other for different aspects of the scheme.
- Suggested that as many car parking spaces should be included as possible, to cope with current and potential demand.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson.

## 12. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 25 February 2025.

Chairperson  
25 February 2025

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 16 October 2024  
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

	From	Question	Response/Answer
9	Josh Grantham Camcycle	<p><b>Agenda Item 7 - Waterbeach Railway Station</b></p> <p>In the Netherlands, half of all train journeys begin with a cycle ride. The Dutch understand that cycling can triple a station's catchment area. Waterbeach offers a fantastic opportunity to achieve this in the UK. The active travel network for Waterbeach New Town is exemplary, and there's further potential for the existing village. This station should therefore be a clear destination station for these communities.</p> <p>However, scrutiny of the Outline Business Case raises concerns. It focuses heavily on car parking with demand calculated using mode splits from the 2001-2005 National Rail Travel Survey which is not reflective of current access patterns or those based on future sustainable development. Current capacity is nearly tripled to 200 car parking spaces, despite the fact that access is only from Waterbeach village, not the new town. Other tools used in the modelling of demand are also biased in favour of people driving: not reflective of existing changes in population and travel behaviour or sustainable aspirations for the future.</p> <p>The need for a new station is clear. However, we need a business case based on the unique opportunity here, on the edge of the UK's leading cycling city. Scenario testing around different mode share targets should be included, exploring what could be achieved with higher</p>	<p>This OBC has been developed in accordance with Department for Transport requirements. It demonstrates a strong strategic rationale, that the proposals are economically and financially sound and that they can be procured and delivered.</p> <p>The proposals reflect the significant increase in population of Waterbeach as outlined in the local plan.</p> <p>One of the overarching objectives of the scheme is to increase the proportion of active travel mode access journeys to the station, reflected in the 450+ cycle parking spaces to be provided.</p> <p>Finally, the station is one element in the sustainable travel plan for Waterbeach. A new Busway and Active Travel link, a Greenway and the Mere Way active travel proposals outline the extensive local cycle provision associated with Waterbeach New Town.</p>

		<p>levels of active travel and public transport use. Cycling is mentioned just seven times in the business case.</p> <p>The business case also glosses over the planning application adopted from RLW Estates, which is, frankly, dreadful. If the GCP pursues this, it will further reinforce a car-centric mentality.</p> <p>The GCP and its partners have an opportunity to deliver a station that serves both existing and future communities. We urge members and officers to review the station plans and ask themselves: is this really the rail station of the future?</p>	
3	<p>Sarah Nicholas Principal Planning Officer Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>When the option of bus lanes adjacent to the A10 was considered, the poor performing section was on the approach to the A14 roundabout. This is because of the delays caused by the traffic lights at the roundabout and queuing traffic. The central and northern sections perform much better for bus lanes because there are no junctions or roundabouts on this section that would require a bus to stop. It was the poor performance of the southern section which led to the bus lane option being discarded in favour of a road through the countryside. However, following changes to the scheme, the preferred alignment for the off-road route now involves buses travelling to the Milton P&amp;R, adjacent to the A10, and then travelling along Butt Lane and avoiding the A14 roundabout.</p>	<p>A bus lane option on the A10 sections to the North of Butt Lane would not meet the project objectives particularly with in regard to securing more reliable public transport journey times, and the ability to provide additional sustainable transport capacity to meet the demands of planned economic and housing growth.</p> <p>Between the proposed southern access roundabout at Waterbeach New Town and Butt lane, there are currently 6 junctions and a signalled pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>All would need to be upgraded, including signalisation, alongside widening of the A10. This would add to congestion on the A10 and associated unreliability of Public Transport services. There are also a number of pinch points that cause significant difficulty with regard to buildability, impacts on property, and cost.</p>

		<p>Therefore, before you make a decision to proceed with building a £110m road through open countryside please explain why there has not been a reassessment of the bus lane option along the A10 to Butt Lane.</p>	
5	<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>Building this road through the countryside will have a major impact on the landscape, nature and archaeology. These impacts are significantly worsened by providing a maintenance track next to the road. Because the optical guidance system is essentially a road it doesn't require a maintenance track, otherwise we would be building maintenance tracks every time we build a road.</p> <p>The maintenance track is proposed to serve as an active travel route, however there is no need for this because there are already 4 active travel routes, either completed or being planned, to connect Waterbeach to Cambridge.</p> <p>Please can you explain why a maintenance track is needed for an optical guidance busway and justify the need for a 5th active travel path? Please can you also say whether any analysis has been carried out to assess the benefit of this extra infrastructure against the harm it would cause and the extra cost?</p>	<p>As outlined in the applicable design standards, the emergency and maintenance track forms a fundamental aspect in the design of a guided busway system.</p> <p>Such design standards include the General Principles for Design Development (Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), January 2023) that requires accordance with the Department for Transport – Design Manual for Roads and Bridges in regard to signalised junctions and links between such junctions. British Pavé have also published a Guided Busway Design Handbook which sets out complimentary guidance.</p> <p>In emergency situations, the track allows a safe route for stranded passengers in any incidence that requires, and also an additional route for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The business case, environmental impact assessment, financial assessment et al consider the impact of the essential aspects of the proposed route in full.</p> <p>Finally, the provision of active travel routes to / from the New Town of Waterbeach is an essential part of the sustainable future of Greater Cambridge.</p>

6	<p>Lynda Warth County Access &amp; Bridleways Officer Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>At the recent online consultation on this project, the GCP Officer stated that the route alongside the busway ‘is going to be delivered as a bridleway’. At the GCP NMU Working Group Meeting on 24th July 2024 and recorded in the Minutes, the BHS were promised a meeting with the officer to discuss the project details. It was reconfirmed that the officer / BHS meeting would be set up as a matter of urgency at the 12th September, 2024 meeting of the Group. The meeting has still never taken place.</p> <p>The BHS has not had the opportunity to input into the current project. Equestrian interest has not been recorded nor represented in this document. There is no reference to equestrian access nor to the delivery of the NMU route as a bridleway. Yet there is a claim that this project will improve connectivity between PRoW’s in the area – the Mere Way is a byway, the route being delivered by U&amp;C is an NMU route to include equestrians, this project links to the Guided Busway bridleway (incorrectly labelled on the drawings) – all routes available to equestrians. There is nothing to even recognise the fact that the busway twice crosses routes used by horses.</p> <p>Can the Assembly please confirm that the new route will be available and suitable for equestrians as promised? If not, the BHS would like to object on the grounds that they have been misled and not had the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Where appropriate and where possible, sections of the route alongside the guided sections of the busway will be designated as Bridleway. The details will be confirmed following further discussion with the County Council, as the Highway Authority, who would eventually manage operation of the busway.</p> <p>Officers will meet the BHS to discuss the project details.</p>
---	--	--	--



10	Josh Grantham Camcycle	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>The latest designs for the Waterbeach to Cambridge busway still present a number of issues for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>Firstly: at the junction with the existing busway we would like to see the existing busway path approach improved so that people can cross the new busway without significant inconvenience and with good visibility.</p> <p>Secondly: the eastern junction on Butt Lane requires people who are walking and cycling to detour over 50 metres east of the junction to cross Butt Lane, only then to return west to the busway. The designs should enable people walking and cycling to cross west of the proposed junction to meet the clear desire line.</p> <p>Thirdly: it is unclear how the Mere Way route will interact with the busway designs. The crossing of the busway is not shown, and the alignment of the Mere Way route makes little sense in light of the proposed Park &amp; Ride site. We would like to see a rationalised design brought forward that better integrates with the Park &amp; Ride.</p> <p>Will the GCP commit to reviewing these items to improve the active travel links for people of all ages and abilities?</p>	<p>At this stage the designs at the junctions along the route are not fully developed and work will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to ensure that people can cross with good visibility and without significant inconvenience. This work will also be subject to appropriate safety audits.</p> <p>It is planned that the Mere Way route will pass to the south of the new Travel Hub with a direct link proposed into the travel hub cycle parking area which is planned. Mere Way will cross the busway to the South of the Travel hub.</p>
----	---------------------------	--	---

7	<p>Lynda Warth County Access &amp; Bridleways Officer Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Waterbeach, Fulbourn and Sawston Greenways</b></p> <p>The British Horse Society (BHS) wishes to object to these proposals for the following reasons.</p> <p>For years, the BHS has been seeking reinstatement of the original agreed equestrian inclusion on the section between Stapleford and Sawston, inclusion which was only rescinded after the opening of the route. The promised inclusion meant that the BHS did not object to the project and lost the opportunity to lobby for changes to ensure that the design was inclusive.</p> <p>The Stapleford to Dernford Cottage section of this path, a route to school, is overgrown with stinging nettles and other herbage. The useable path space has been reduced for everyone. The verges are inaccessible. With proper maintenance and a couple of mounting blocks, there would be sufficient space for equestrian inclusion without changes.</p> <p>Discussion with Active Travel England on 10th October 2024 confirmed the design of the existing A1301 signalised crossing, the second barrier for equestrian inclusion, would not have their support – not even for cyclists. Equestrian crossing designs, like the one at Babraham on the A1307, are user friendly for cargo bikes as well as recumbent and hand propelled cycles often used by disabled cyclists – all equestrians need is an extra high-level button.</p> <p>A long-promised BHS meeting with the GCP officer in charge of the project has still not taken place.</p>	<p>The design of the Sawston Greenway (a 3.5 mile route) is currently at detailed design stage. Current proposals do contain provision for equestrians at the A1301 where an equestrian crossing is proposed. Once the design is complete, we will engage with the relevant organisations and it will be subject to a Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>In terms of the section between Stapleford and Sawston, further discussions are taking place with the County Council as the Highways Authority to understand how shared space can be used by all non-motorised travel modes where sections are adjacent to the highway. This includes this section as a specific example.</p> <p>The GCP will continue to engage with the BHS on the development of these sections.</p>
---	--	---	---

		<p>The proposed crossing designs could further support equestrian exclusion from these publicly funded, safe off-road paths on a road where there is literally, no sane alternative. Please will the GCP take these facts into account in making their decision?</p>	
8	<p>Combined question being asked by Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle and David Stoughton Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Waterbeach, Fulbourn and Sawston Greenways (revised wording)</b></p> <p>Not all Greenways are created equal. In the case of the Waterbeach Greenway, the scheme is an opportunity to provide 4,000 people in Milton, 5,000 in Waterbeach and 25,000 future residents in Waterbeach New Town with a safe, convenient and direct route to Cambridge, only 5 kilometres away from the edge of the city. A distance we know that many people are comfortable cycling if suitably provided for.</p> <p>This potential makes the Waterbeach greenway unique in its ability to change people’s travel behaviours, unrivalled among not just the Greenway projects, but probably of any rural cycle route in the UK. The decision goes beyond active travel, the scheme is a vital component to reducing traffic levels on the already heavily congested A10.</p> <p>Based on this observation, we have long stated that the standard Greenway approach of a 3m shared surface is wholly inappropriate. The national walking and cycling design guidance in LTN1/20 states that 3m is inappropriate if there are over 300 cyclists per hour.</p> <p>Based on the importance of this route, wherever possible</p>	<p>If the Executive Board agrees to the northern section of the Waterbeach Greenway being taken forward to the next stage, then officers will review whether segregation is appropriate and deliverable in this section.</p> <p>Where possible, larger areas of segregation will be provided, however the balance of budget and environmental impact must to be considered alongside other routes being proposed, or already existing, between Waterbeach and Cambridge.</p> <p>We will engage with key local stakeholders once the outputs of the initial environmental and forecasting work are concluded.</p>

		<p>there should be separate space for people walking and cycling. Whether that be in Milton as we have proposed as part of our alternative vision, or the off-road route between Milton and Waterbeach.</p> <p>In our alternative vision for the Waterbeach Greenway and our detailed consultation response we proposed a linear park between Milton and Waterbeach and the vital ingredient for that link is a minimum 3m cycle track and separate 2m path for pedestrians.</p> <p>Why is the GCP not delivering separate space for walking and cycling between Milton and Waterbeach given the potential high levels of use and the space to do so?</p>	
12	Josh Grantham Camcycle	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 - Chisholm Trail Phase 2</b></p> <p>In 2022, Camcycle provided a detailed response to the Chisholm-Trail phase 2 consultation. In which we pointed out major issues with the proposals for the Coldham's Lane junction and for Cromwell Road.</p> <p>Since then, the GCP has not progressed any work on either of these issues, even though, whatever happens with the railway section, thousands of people using phase 1 of the trail still have to navigate either down Cromwell Road or over the bridge.</p> <p>For Cromwell Road, we pointed out the complete inappropriateness of a shared-use path in a city street. Cromwell Road isn't actually difficult. It is however constrained. There are only two LTN1/20 design</p>	<p>The biggest risk to the Chisholm Trail Phase 2 project, and impact on timeline, is the interface with rail industry land, and we have limited control over this aspect of the programme.</p> <p>Nevertheless we will seek to expedite the design process for Cromwell Road and Coldham's Lane, and will engage with stakeholders as part of that process.</p>

	<p>compliant options that can be delivered without removing trees.</p> <p>The first option is a two-way cycle track on the northern side of the street. This approach requires some additional carriageway space. Therefore, in order to enable cars to pass each other along Cromwell Road, there would have to be restrictions on parking on the public highway to allow cars to pass each other by waiting between the existing trees.</p> <p>The second option is to create a cycle street. This approach means promoting safe on-road cycling, as is being taken forward by the GCP on Adams Road. To do so, you need to ensure a safe level of vehicular traffic and speeds. This approach requires an understanding of the existing traffic situation and a willingness to act to reduce traffic levels and speed if necessary.</p> <p>For the Coldham's Lane junction, we set out a number of ambitious schemes which could work with both of the potential designs for Cromwell Road.</p> <p>We ask the GCP to expedite the design development for Cromwell Road and the Coldham's Lane junction and provide a clear timeline for doing so. This must allow for engagement with key stakeholders.</p>	
--	--	--

1	Mal Schofield	<p><b>Agenda Item 11 – Cambridge South West Travel Hub – Next Steps</b></p> <p>Item 1.2 states:</p> <p>"The GCP programme has been developed using extensive evidence base and is designed to support sustainable economic growth and the accelerated delivery of the Local Plan."</p> <p>What is the evidence to support this "high opportunity cost" project?</p> <p>It would help to know:</p> <p>A. The present comprehensive* traffic statistics for the M11/J11 junction arriving both from the north and south.</p> <p>B. The anticipated traffic flows towards Cambridge on the A10 in Harston after the opening of the new P&amp;R.</p> <p>C. The demand impact upon cyclists and walkers presently using the M11 off road "agricultural" bridge.</p> <p>D. The closure of the present P&amp;R and its future.</p> <p>E. The final City destination of P&amp;R buses and their use of the finite space in the City Centre narrow streets.</p> <p>F. Plans for cycle lanes both sides of Trumpington Road.</p> <p>* last five years and forecasts to 2030.</p>	<p>By way of context, it is notable that the number of bus passengers across the Park and Ride network is 25% higher than 2019. At Trumpington the number 24% higher. The growth trend amply demonstrates the wider requirement for more capacity, which this Travel Hub will help to provide.</p> <p>Taking each of the specific questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On A and B: A full Traffic Assessment was published as part of the Planning Application, this is available online,</li> <li>- On C we are delivering a new active travel bridge, which also forms part of the Melbourn Greenway, this will be routed through the new Travel Hub and meet the required standards for the Greenways network. This route will be an upgrade on the existing provision.</li> <li>- On D, the Trumpington P&amp;R site is to remain in operation. We are not aware of any discussions related to its future.</li> <li>- The City centre is to be one of the new bus routes' destination, as well as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</li> <li>- We are not aware of any active scheme looking at cycle lanes either side of Trumpington Road.</li> </ul>
---	---------------	--	---

4	<p>Sarah Nicholas Principal Planning Officer Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 11 – Cambridge South West Travel Hub – Next Steps</b></p> <p>I note that the report explains that the construction works are to be split into two phases, namely the enabling works and the main construction works. I also note that the Executive Board will not be asked to review and approve the Full Business Case including construction costs until after completion of the procurement process for the main works which will be after commencement of the enabling works.</p> <p>Please explain why officers are seeking the approval for the enabling works before the Board knows the full project costs and before it has had the opportunity to scrutinise the Full Business Case to ensure the project will deliver good value for public money.</p>	<p>This scheme is significantly advanced in its development, and the Outline Business Case demonstrates that the scheme has a strong case. In common with other GCP schemes, in particular Greenways, the Board has been asked to bring forward works to manage risk and bring forward benefits.</p> <p>In seeking to complete enabling works such as ground works and utilities, we are ensuring that the scheme is delivered efficiently, in particular to mitigate the lead in times for critical activities such as the movement of utilities.</p> <p>It is notable that the GCP Board has previously agreed to bring forward activities for the CSWTH project, when purchasing the land required for the scheme.</p>
---	---	--	---