

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on
Thursday, 8 February 2018 at 4.00 p.m.

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:

Cllr Francis Burkitt (Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in Attendance:

Councillor Kevin Price	Joint Assembly Chairperson
------------------------	----------------------------

Officers/advisors:

Peter Blake	Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Mike Soper	Head of Research and Performance, Cambridgeshire County Council
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Tunstall	Interim Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Professor Phil Allmendinger due to illness.

2. EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The Chairperson reminded the Executive Board that, at its previous meeting, Mark Reeve had announced that he was standing down as Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership and that this therefore created a vacancy amongst the Board's membership.

The Executive Board noted that the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) is currently being reconstituted by the Combined Authority; that the Chief Executive of the Combined Authority had informed the GCP that it would not nominate a LEP representative until this had taken place; and that the Chief Executives of the Combined Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) had agreed that the most sensible approach would be for Claire Ruskin, who is one of the LEP representatives on the Joint Assembly, to cover this role for an interim period as the representative of the business community upon the Executive Board, subject to the Executive Board's endorsement.

Claire Ruskin informed the Executive Board that Sir Michael Marshall had stood down as a LEP representative on the GCP Joint Assembly. Pending the reconstitution of the LEP and its ability to nominate a new representative, the Board agreed that the most sensible approach was for Claire Ruskin to make the nomination. She nominated Christopher Walkinshaw, a member of Cambridge Ahead.

The Chairperson declared that Christopher Walkinshaw was a personal friend but that this did not create a conflict. Claire Ruskin said that she had not been aware of this relationship in making her nomination.

Claire Ruskin said that she had not yet identified a representative of the business community to fill the vacancy on the Joint Assembly caused by her leaving it.

The Chairperson mentioned that this was the last meeting that Chris Tunstall, Interim Transport Director, would attend. He introduced Peter Blake as the new Greater Cambridge Partnership Transport Director. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Executive Board, thanked Chris Tunstall for all his hard work supporting the Board over the past year.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (1) Endorse the appointment of Claire Ruskin, CEO of Cambridge Network, as the representative of the business community on the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board.
- (2) Note that Sir Michael Marshall had stood down from the GCP Joint Assembly and endorse the nomination from Claire Ruskin, as the representative of the business community, of Christopher Walkinshaw, a member of Cambridge Ahead, to fill the resultant vacancy on the Joint Assembly.
- (3) Note the vacancy on the Joint Assembly caused by Claire Ruskin's appointment as a member of the Executive Board and endorse an approach whereby Claire Ruskin will identify and nominate a representative from the business community to fill the position.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest other than those already recorded on Members' Declaration of Interest forms. However, the Chairperson had made an earlier declaration as recorded in minute 2 above.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Executive Board confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 22 November 2017 as a correct record for signature by the Chairperson, subject to the amendment of minute 10 to include the words "will consider" between the words "December" and "his" in the second sentence of the minute.

5. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Three public questions had been received. The Executive Board **RECEIVED** and responded to public questions as part of agenda items 7, 9 and 10. The questions are included as an appendix to these minutes.

Additionally Councillor Tim Bick, a member of the GCP Joint Assembly addressed the Executive and asked a question on agenda item 7 and Councillor Simon Edwards, a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council, addressed the Executive and asked a question on agenda item 11.

6. **OVERVIEW FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT ASSEMBLY**

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint

Assembly which gave an overview of discussions from the meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly held on Thursday, 18 January 2018. He particularly noted that the Rural Travel Hubs report was the issue which had most divided opinion at the Joint Assembly's meeting with strong opinions having been expressed both for and against the approaches being recommended to the Executive Board. The Joint Assembly had been pleased to hear more about the findings of "Our Big Conversation" and welcomed the opportunity to make decisions in the future based on good evidence. The recommendation in the Cambridge to Ely A10 report to commend the study to the Combined Authority had been supported by the Assembly but members had not wanted to lose the opportunity to influence modal shift as this was a key part of the GCP's work.

Councillor Bates and Claire Ruskin had been in attendance at the Assembly's meeting and gave their feedback on the Assembly's debate.

The Chairperson noted that he had detected a strong degree of enthusiasm for the concept of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) and, with respect to the Rural Travel Hubs, support for the GCP Executive Board's "bottom up" approach to developing community led hubs and to initially developing a number of pilot sites.

7. RAPID MASS TRANSIT STRATEGIC OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The Chairperson invited Roger Tomlinson to ask his question. Details of the question and a summary of the answer given are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

Councillor Tim Bick, a member of the GCP Joint Assembly addressed the Executive Board under this item. He asked, in view of the Combined Authority's adoption of a lead role in developing a Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), how in practice the Board proposed to ensure an integrated approach to the development of this and other schemes? He believed that it was right that the CAM concept should be taken further but that it was important that CAM did not become "the only show in town" as it was unlikely that it would be able to deliver the solution for all transport needs in the area. He felt it was vital that local transport strategy did not become dominated by the CAM scheme and commented that Greater Cambridge needed a full integrated public transport system in which CAM was part of the solution, but that there was also a need for an upgraded bus service, a demand management scheme, encouragement for modal shift and a street environment that was conducive to the growth of safe cycling and walking. In his view, it had never been intended that the GCP would just be an infrastructure delivery vehicle, rather that it would develop an integrated system and bring together local interest groups and opinion formers in Greater Cambridge. He also felt that the GCP now had a professional officer team who were taking a more holistic approach to their work. Councillor Bick accordingly asked what approach the Board envisaged taking to ensure an integrated approach, given the role of the Mayor and the Combined Authority?

In response to the question, Executive Members made the following points:-

- The comments about the professional team supporting the GCP were welcomed.
- They agreed that whilst CAM would be an important element in addressing the transport needs in Greater Cambridge, it must not become "the only show in town" and referred to the wider programme of schemes the GCP was considering.
- They emphasised the importance of all parties, along with the wider community in Greater Cambridge, working together collaboratively.
- They suggested that CAM presented an opportunity for a transformational change in the City Centre, but that a duality was needed from GCP so that it delivered whether or not CAM was achieved.

- Whilst there might be technical issues to address, the biggest obstacle was likely to be funding.
- It was important that the GCP continued to work on other projects and it would be necessary to link up rail, bus and other options with CAM; to consider measures to reduce the number of vehicles coming into the city; to improve air quality and look at urban design.
- It will not be possible to operate a CAM scheme that needs a large long term subsidy.
- Partnership working would be vital in the future. The GCP had a strong record in delivering schemes in the “zone 2” routes into the city and out into South Cambridgeshire and those were not being addressed with tunnelling options. The GCP therefore needed to hold a discussion with the Combined Authority on how CAM would link to those schemes and what role the GCP would play in this.
- The Mayor has overall responsibility for transport strategy, but the Executive Board hoped that he would recognise the strengths of the GCP in delivering on the current programme and would address issues by collective decisions involving communities, business and the University.
- All parts of the “jigsaw” need to fit together, including walking, cycling, residents’ parking, off street parking and rail. CAM would only be one part of the “jigsaw”.
- It was important that the GCP worked in partnership with the Combined Authority, the City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council, communities, business, Highways England and Network Rail. Moreover there was a need for a common understanding of the objectives that all partners were trying to achieve.
- There was apparent general support for reviewing the opportunities presented by CAM and analysing its viability. However there was also a need to look at behavioural change to manage the growth. People wanting common good could work together, so the key was to get the main stakeholders together.

The GCP Interim Director of Transport presented the report which set out the key findings from the study and updated the Board on the next stage to develop a Strategic Outline Business Case for the CAM proposal. The report also considered how the current schemes proposed by the GCP could transition to form part of the proposed CAM network. In introducing the report, the Interim Director of Transport explained that, whilst the report recommended that the GCP commend the scheme to the Combined Authority, this should be against the background of the GCP continuing to deliver its current schemes with an eye to how those schemes could transition to connect with the CAM network. He noted the advantage of CAM was that it could run on segregated or existing on-street infrastructure. Whilst the study concluded that CAM represented the best overall mass transport solution for the area, significant further work was required to develop the proposal and make a robust case for investment. Therefore the next stage would be to develop a Strategic Outline Business Case as indicated in paragraph 3.21 of the report. However whilst CAM might form the backbone of the system, it should not mitigate against other schemes under consideration by GCP, rather it should be regarded as an integral part of an overall network of schemes.

In response to questions from members of the Executive Board, the GCP Interim Director of Transport:-

- Confirmed his understanding that the Combined Authority was working on the development of a more tightly drawn brief and that he hoped that the GCP would be invited to comment upon that revised brief.
- Concurred that it was important that the GCP was clear about the nature of the brief and advised that he was working closely with the Combined Authority to ensure that any schemes being developed by GCP had regard to the CAM proposals.

- Confirmed that 2026 was the anticipated completion of the construction period, rather than the start. Other dates shown in the report were predicated on the current programmed schemes and therefore the work on the GCP schemes impacted on this timetable

The Executive Board discussed and debated the report and made the following points:-

- There appeared to be an enthusiasm about the project and the step change it could achieve. It seemed that the project was technically viable but the Strategic Outline Business Case needed to demonstrate that it was also commercially viable.
- Paragraph 3.9 set out the benefits and risks of the proposal. It was important that a further update on the proposal was presented to future Executive Board meetings indicating how the project could be developed jointly by all relevant partners.
- The Vice-Chairperson highlighted four main issues:-
 - GCP already had a focus on “zone 2” routes going out west to Cambourne, south east towards Babraham and there was also consideration of improvements around the A10 where the GCP’s role was likely to be leading on non-road options, together with several other projects, including Histon Road and Milton Road. It was important to ensure the ability to deliver the linkages with CAM and tunnelling; and to focus on GCP’s existing programme and on future schemes, subject to consultation and further community input. GCP’s role was to deliver the surface network which would connect with the CAM tunnelling.
 - There was a need to look at interchanges on the edge of Cambridge, including continuing to investigate park and ride and other options to get people out of cars, and an overall strategy was needed.
 - With reference to the late publication of consultants’ report, there should be an opportunity for dialogue on some of the options, including community input. GCP officers were requested to work with the Combined Authority and facilitate discussion as part of the scheme’s development as there had not yet been an opportunity for proper discussion on the proposals.
 - The next phase of the programme needed to highlight the deliverability and fundability of the scheme. Whilst leadership of the core project was the responsibility of the Mayor, it was important that the brief specified the need for clear conclusions on the fundability of the project. Whilst it was laudable to have an ambitious timescale, this had to be predicated on the affordability of the project and the ability to raise funding.

The Vice-Chairperson requested that these four points should be recorded as part of the GCP’s input into the brief and that it should be noted that the GCP was the potential deliverer of surface routes. He further concluded that the GCP needed to work in partnership with the Mayor and Combined Authority, but noted that the GCP had already invested significantly in projects and that it was important that it continued to be the voice for Greater Cambridge.

- The Chairperson welcomed the proposals in the report and supported the recommendations. He suggested it would be regrettable if no further progress was made until the publication of the Strategic Outline Business Case and questioned whether it might be possible to progress any parallel processes, such as testing potential vehicles, in the interim.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- (a) To welcome the findings of the Cambridgeshire Mass Transit Strategic Options Assessment.

- (b) To commend the findings to the Combined Authority with a view to developing a Strategic Outline Business Case.
- (c) That the Greater Cambridge Partnership builds on the Mayor's plans for the next stage of developing a CAM Metro network by ensuring GCP's current and future plans for high quality public transport corridors are consistent and readily adaptable with the emerging proposition (subject to the future business case for CAM being agreed by the Combined Authority).

8. A10 FOXTON LEVEL CROSSING BYPASS AND TRAVEL HUB

The GCP Interim Director of Transport presented a report which recommended that the "A10 Foxton level crossing bypass and travel hub" be approved for further development as part of the Future Investment Strategy. The scheme had been included in the list of priority schemes for support agreed by the GCP in 2015 but with a zero budget, on the assumption that Network Rail would fund it (which they subsequently declined to do). Whilst the original scheme had only considered a level crossing bypass, the revised proposals would also consider a more extensive 'travel hub' with the provision of additional parking facilities to complement both the existing Park and Ride and Rural Travel Hub proposals. The Interim Director of Transport reported that the number of passenger trains using the route was due to increase from four to six trains every hour, with at least two stops per hour at Foxton. This would increase the closure time at the level crossing. Discussions had taken place with Network Rail who did not regard the upgrade as a safety issue and had declined to fund the project. Further discussions with regard to funding would accordingly be needed both with Network Rail and the Department for Transport.

During discussion, Executive Board members made comments as follows:-

- Whilst this scheme may have appeared previously to have had a lower priority than some of the other schemes promoted by the GCP, this report made the case for progressing the scheme having regard to the growing volume of traffic on the A10 and the additional number of trains passing through Foxton. However it was important that the scheme was closely integrated with the travel hub work and the Junction 11 improvements. Additionally, there was a need for involvement by Network Rail in the scheme, including by way of financial contribution.
- When the scheme had been reviewed in 2015 there had been an indication that Network Rail were possible funders. The level crossing was acknowledged to be a travel blockage, but there was a serious question as to whether the GCP should be the only body contributing to the funding of such a scheme. The Executive Board accepted that the scheme should go forward to the next stage of consideration, but commented that this should not infer that the GCP was making a firm commitment to the scheme at this stage. Further discussions were needed with Network Rail with a view to supporting the scheme in the interests of safety.
- Whilst supporting proceeding to outline business case stage in respect of the project, the need for Network Rail's involvement and financial support for the project was again reiterated by the Executive Board. Further discussions were needed between the GCP and Network Rail with regard to securing a financial contribution to the project before the Executive Board would be able to determine whether to commit formally to the scheme.
- Safety was a major consideration in considering the scheme. In addition to risks associated with the level crossing, reference was made to discussions with the community and Parish Council relating to a safety issue concerning a small gate near

to the level crossing which had given rise to incidents in the past. The GCP's new Director of Transport was asked by the Executive Board to raise this safety issue with Network Rail. The Executive Board was also concerned by a safety issue relating to rights of way in the area of the level crossing.

- It would be interesting to establish from Hertfordshire County Council the extent of development proposed for Royston as this would also impact on traffic volumes in the area and have implications for the number of parking places being proposed at the travel hub.
- The Chairperson acknowledged that the situation had moved on since the Network Rail GRIP2 (Governance for Railway Investment Projects) assessment in 2013, most notably, the increased in traffic on the A10 and safety considerations associated with the level crossing. What the GCP could add was the concept of modal shift by providing a rural travel hub and it was acknowledged that the Network Rail GRIP2 report proposal for 85 parking spaces was unrealistically low and that the extent of car parking provision required would need to be re-evaluated upwards based on GCP objectives. There would also be a need for consideration of cycle routes feeding into the travel hub. The more holistic approach to the scheme now being proposed was welcomed by the Executive Board.

In moving the recommendations, a proposition was made and unanimously supported by the Executive Board to amend recommendation 2.1(b) by the addition of the words "in collaboration with Network Rail" at the end of the recommendation.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (1) Note the assessment work and review of the options presented in this report and Appendix 1.
- (2) Approve the development of an 'Outline business case' for a preferred option in collaboration with Network Rail.
- (3) Explore the opportunity for Foxton Station to act as a Travel Hub with a Park and Ride facility for onward rail trips into Cambridge and Cambridge North stations and the proposed future Cambridge South station.

9. CAMBRIDGE TO ELY A10 TRANSPORT STUDY

The Chairperson invited Maureen Mace to ask her question. Details of the question and a summary of the answer given are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

The Interim Director of Transport introduced the report which presented the findings of the Ely to Cambridge A10 Transport Study and proposed next steps.

During discussion upon the report:-

- With reference to the map on page 186, the Executive Board noted that there was an existing underpass under the A10, close to the existing guided busway, in the vicinity of Cambridge Regional College, not far from Cambridge North Station and the Histon Road improvements, which, could be relevant to the consultation in respect of an off-road route. In response, the Interim Director of Transport confirmed that the proposals in the report were predicated on the achievement of an integrated approach linking into existing busways and would also be mindful of potential links into CAM in the future.
- Reference was made to the diagram on page 145, which graphically illustrated the

- costs and benefits of the five options in the report.
- The Executive Board stated that it was important to review the whole package of measures, not just modal shift. Whilst the focus for the GCP might be those travelling from the A10 to the Cambridge hubs, which in itself would be a valuable project, there was also a need for measures to address the traffic travelling along the A10 to somewhere beyond the North of Cambridge, and it would therefore be important to work with partners to examine the various options identified in the report.
 - The Executive Board noted that an indication of scheme components was given on page 209 but it was not clear whether these were at 2010 or 2017 prices. In that context and given that certain aspects of the scheme were not within the remit of the GCP, reference was made to the importance of identifying the cost of the various components which it was anticipated would be the responsibility of the GCP.
 - The Portfolio Holder for Transport noted that the study had been discussed by the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee that morning, and that he supported the earlier comments about the need to break down the various components of the scheme and to identify which body was responsible for each of those components, bearing in mind also that certain aspects of the project fell outside the Greater Cambridge area.
 - The Executive Board asked the Chief Executive to liaise further with the other partners involved in the project with a view to bringing a report back to the Executive Board and Joint Assembly with an indication of the cost of the various parts of the project and which schemes would be the commitment of the GCP.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (1) Endorse the recommendations set out in the study.
- (2) Commend the multi-modal package of measures to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for approval and further development.

10. OUR BIG CONVERSATION

The Chairperson invited James Littlewood to ask his question. Details of the question and a summary of the answer given are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

Mike Soper, Head of Research and Performance at Cambridgeshire County Council, introduced the report which presented the interim findings from the GCP's autumn 2017 public awareness and engagement programme "Our Big Conversation". The exercise had aimed to strengthen the evidence-base needed to inform GCP's Future Investment Strategy (FIS) by generating public dialogue on the Greater Cambridge growth story; testing emerging GCP proposals with the public and undertaking a comprehensive travel survey to refresh 2011 census data. A copy of the summary report "Our Big Conversation – Key Findings" was circulated at the meeting.

During discussion:

- The Chairperson noted that "Our Big Conversation" had generated more than 10,000 individual responses and comments and, as such, was probably one of the most comprehensive engagement exercises of residents in the City and South Cambridgeshire. The summary report presented the key findings but there was a significant amount of further data available to inform future development of the GCP's FIS.
- Attention was drawn to confirmation given at the Joint Assembly that the research was

- statistically relevant.
- Reference was made to the further analysis to be undertaken on options to tackle cars coming into the City Centre at peak times and the need to integrate this with the work on ANPR. The importance of linking the assessment of public views and priorities that had been identified in this study with the data gained from other analysis was highlighted. Moreover, it was pointed out that there would be differences of opinion between residents living in the City Centre and those living on the edge of Cambridge in respect of whom the aim was to achieve mode shift.
 - Reference was made to Theme 8 – The Trouble with Housing – on page 20 of the summary document and interest was expressed in seeing further detail at the appropriate time with regard to the findings relating to housing and how this interfaced with transport.
 - The Executive Board acknowledged that the survey findings represented a rich and valuable evidence base which would be of benefit to other partners such as the Combined Authority, the city and district councils, parish councils and communities generally. The Chairperson commented that the GCP Communications team would no doubt be reviewing the extent to which the findings were communicated to partners. However he suggested that the summary report could be sent to City and District Councillors; that perhaps FeCRA could be requested to circulate it to residents' associations; and that the District Council might be able to assist in distribution to Parish Councils.
 - The Executive Board concluded by recognising that "Our Big Conversation" had been an excellent exercise which had provided an invaluable quantitative and qualitative research evidence base; and placed on record its thanks to Beth Durham, Niamh Matthews, Mike Soper and all officers involved in the exercise.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:-

- (1) Welcome the broad level of public engagement in Our Big Conversation.
- (2) Note initial findings ahead of the final report published as a supplement to the Future Investment Strategy (FIS) reports in March 2018.

11. **RURAL TRAVEL HUBS**

The Chairperson invited Councillor Simon Edwards to ask his question. Councillor Edwards stated that he was addressing the Executive Board in his capacity as a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Cottenham ward, although he was also a member of Oakington and Westwick Parish Council. He noted that the report at paragraph 2.1 invited the Executive Board to take account of parish consultation with residents and of local knowledge and in that context, rather than asking a question, he wished to use the opportunity to bring Board members up to date with the views of the Parish and local community. He said that the Parish had been encouraged by the "bottom up" process adopted by the GCP to the potential development of rural travel hubs and had been keen to examine the opportunity presented. Councillor Edwards reported that a workshop had been hosted locally involving both the Parish Council and the local transport action group in order to try to establish what measures would be acceptable and what would not be acceptable to the Parish and local community in order to guide the GCP. He said that universal agreement had been achieved between the two parties on a number of measures (including lockable cycle storage; a path and cycleway to Oakington; real time information and wi fi access). However two key issues had been hotly debated. In terms of parking, consensus had not been achieved at the workshop and had been further considered at the Parish Council, which had taken the view that it would be willing to accept the level of parking indicated in the report before the Executive Board. The other

key issue agreed by both parties was the need for the Citi 6 bus service to be extended up to the site. He therefore wished the Executive Board to be aware at this stage, that Oakington would not support an option that did not include the Citi 6 bus link. Finally, Councillor Edwards noted the indication given in the report that the construction at the pilot sites would initially be more temporary in nature and following monitoring, if deemed successful, a more permanent design solution would be developed. Whilst recognising the merit in opting for a temporary solution pending demonstration of the success of a site, Councillor Edwards urged the Executive Board to make the construction of the pilot sites permanent, prior to bringing any other sites on board.

The Chairperson thanked Councillor Edwards for his contribution and commented on the value of adopting the “bottom up” approach and being attuned to community feedback about proposed schemes. In terms of the specific point raised, he noted that Mike Hill, Director of Health and Environmental Services at South Cambridgeshire District Council, who was present at the meeting, was leading on this aspect and asked him to take the points raised by Councillor Edwards on board. Mr Hill said that he would.

The Interim Director of Transport introduced the feasibility report on the development of Rural Travel Hubs in South Cambridgeshire. The report sought approval to proceed to phase two of the project. Phase two would involve the preparation of full business cases for the pilot sites; a detailed analysis of planning considerations; refined costings of construction and an outline of the evaluation method to review the success of the pilots.

He referred to the expectation that the allocation already agreed by the Executive Board should be sufficient to complete Phase 2, and said that if it appeared that this would not be possible, officers would come back to the Board to advise accordingly.

During discussion upon the report:-

- The Executive Board drew attention to the considerable work put into reviewing other potential hub locations and said that it would be regrettable if that work was lost.
- The Chairperson concurred that these should be regarded as the first wave of pilot travel hubs and that the work done on other potential locations should be held in reserve in the expectation of investigating development of further hubs in future.
- A question was raised as to whether the Citi 6 bus was subsidised or a commercial service as this might influence the business case for Oakington. The Transport Director was asked to get back to the Transport Portfolio Holder with the answer.
- It was acknowledged that the outcome of the Combined Authority’s bus review might also be of relevance.
- Following comments regarding the Executive Board’s earlier discussion about the further exploration of a travel hub at Foxton, the Chairperson indicated that, regardless of the differing terminology used in the reports, it was his view that the GCP was exploring the development of four travel hubs; namely Oakington, Sawston, Whittlesford and Foxton.
- Whilst noting that there had been some reservations expressed at the Joint Assembly about the potential for rural travel hubs to create additional traffic, the Executive Board referred to the potential positive advantages of the hubs in securing better public transport provision.
- Building on the previous comment, The Executive Board referred to the aspiration for the rural travel hubs to enable public transport to spread further out, rather than to just start at the edge of Cambridge.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

1. To note and take into consideration the results of the feasibility report, future parish consultation with residents, local knowledge and planning considerations to approve Oakington and Sawston as pilots to be taken into Phase 2 as part of the Rural Travel Hubs project.
2. That, in respect of Whittlesford:-
 - (a) A Master Transport Planning exercise be undertaken at a cost of £50,000 which can be met out of existing funding.
 - (b) A contribution of £70,000 be made for the provision of additional cycle parking for 200 bikes.
3. To note that the three villages referred to above will be pilots and based on the evaluation of the success of these pilots that further waves of Rural Travel Hubs could be investigated in the future.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting will take place on Wednesday 21 March 2018 at 4.00pm in the Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge.

The Meeting ended at 6.13 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.

No.	Questioner	Question	Responder	Response
For Agenda Item 7				
1	Roger Tomlinson	<p>Context: The Mayor of the Combined Authority has confirmed to the Cambridge News that his office leaked the Steer Davies Gleave report in December, and quotes were obtained from County transport officers and some Executive Board members to accompany press reports; and the chairman has written pieces extolling the potential of the schemes to parish community newsletters. However, the consultation on Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys: Phase One was still running, and the Mayor confirms he intended effectively to disrupt this process by advising the public that there were more options; we can confirm that some residents did find the new proposals very confusing.</p> <p>However, no route has yet been decided upon by the Executive Board formally, though it looks increasingly, as officers have repeatedly suggested, that the decision is pre-determined. Now Chris Tunstall, GCP Interim Transport Director, in his report to you points out that the Cambridge Area Metro scheme is predicated on an off-road guided busway, and indeed the comparison of costs for metro options assumes for the preferred bus option that the busway will be built and paid for outside the preferred bus scheme. He reports that legal discussions are under way on how to progress this, with the potential to assist early delivery. The relevant two paragraphs are 3.18 and 3.19.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">• <i>3.18 Existing schemes, such as Cambourne</i></p>		<p>The timetable for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme was set out and approved by the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board in a report presented on 20th September 2017. This report also confirmed the basis for public consultation on the scheme. The consultation is now complete and is currently being analysed with the outcomes being used to inform the business case being presented to the Board in July 2018. This business case will consider the full range of issues which amount to the widest evaluation of the public benefit of each option and provide a recommendation to the Board on the preferred scheme for Phase 1 of the project.</p> <p>At this time the Board will be updated re the implications of Cambridge Area Metro and any potential impact on the options and any decision by the Board will take this into consideration. The decision will only be taken by the Board at this time based on the information presented to it.</p> <p>The specific ‘approval mechanism’ for any scheme proposal will to some extent depend on what scheme is taken forward. In the case of an ‘off road’ scheme it is likely that a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application is made to the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of a road based scheme it may be that local highway powers are needed although again this depends on the elements of that scheme. Should a TWAO be sought then at the point at which this application is made, the proposed transport mode will have to be set out and been subject to prior public consultation. As such</p>

		<p><i>to Cambridge and the Cambridge South East Corridor Transport Study, create the opportunity to transition in the future to provide key parts of the CAM infrastructure. The SDG integrated network proposition is predicated on these planned interventions being part of the solution.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.19. <i>Discussions are currently being undertaken with our legal advisors as to the most appropriate way of transitioning the existing schemes and subsequently procuring the necessary approvals/orders. The implications will be dealt with in future reports in respect of the individual schemes, subject to the Combined Authority progressing the detailed feasibility work for CAM. At this time it is not envisaged that this will delay the current programmes, but could potentially assist with early delivery of parts of a CAM network.</i> <p><i>(quoting of paragraphs to be removed in publication)</i></p> <p>Question: What exactly are the Transport Officers trying to achieve by these legal discussions and how does this impact on the Executive Board decision-taking timetable and process for Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys: Phase One?</p>		<p>engagement with the Department for Transport is underway in terms of the wider implications of CAM under the current regulatory regime for approval of guided transport systems.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

For Agenda Item 9			
2	Maureen Mace	<p>The widening of the A10 is by its nature a road orientated approach. At the present time 60% of people working at the Science Park arrive by car and the new widened road will encourage more. How will parking be restricted at the Science Park and in the North of Cambridge and how will you get the modal shift onto other forms of transport especially to the train as the relocated station will not be near the A10 and is situated to the north east of Waterbeach?</p>	<p>The dualling of the A10 was one of the headline recommendations from the study. However, it was also clear that to provide additional travel capacity, demand on the highway network created by the new developments would need to be managed using policy, planning and regulatory tools. To complement this and to encourage a shift away from the private car, public transport, pedestrian and cycling enhancements should be delivered ahead of any major new highway capacity.</p> <p>Considering the Science Park specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of parking at the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe will be critical to determining the scale of development that can be accommodated on the transport network in the future. • Car mode share at the Science Park is particularly high, primarily due to the availability of unrestrained parking on the site, much of which is underutilised. • Much lower car mode shares have been achieved elsewhere in the City through tighter restrictions on parking levels <p>Parking can be restricted at the Science Park and Northern Fringe through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning process as planning applications are determined. Parking levels can be established as a planning condition. • The use of existing highway powers to create Controlled Parking Zones around the sites, to discourage people from parking off site. This is

				<p>consistent with one of the eight points of the City Access project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting a site-wide approach to car parking management and using ambitious travel planning to encourage a shift to non-car modes. <p>In conjunction with active parking restraint and the relocation of Waterbeach Railway Station, to promote mode shift away from the private car the study recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early implementation of the cycle measures Early progression of the segregated public transport corridor from Waterbeach to the Northern Fringe, together with Park and Ride facility provision at Waterbeach just off the A10. The precise location of the Park & Ride site will be determined through the master planning process, however to intercept vehicles from the A10 the site will need to be located as close to the highway as possible. The relocated railway station will need to be highly accessible by cycle and foot to enable maximum use by people living or working in the new development and the existing village. The exact detail of this and level of any associated parking at the station will be developed through the masterplanning process.
--	--	--	--	--

For Agenda Item 10

3	James Littlewood CEO Cambridge Past, Present & Future	<p>One of the more encouraging findings of the Big Conversation is the apparent willingness of commuters to ditch their cars in favour of public transport, provided a high quality public transport service was made available. The report sets out the improvements in public transport that would be needed – more bus routes, reliability to timetable, cheaper fares, frequency of service, free parking at P&R etc.</p> <p>We know what needs to be done to encourage modal shift – but herein lies the problem for all these measures will greatly increase operating costs. So where is this additional operating revenue going to come from? If substantial long-term funding to subsidise an improved public transport system cannot be secured, then all these ideas will just remain dreams.</p> <p>The only realistic source for sustainable long-term funding is for drivers to pay if they chose to drive rather than use an upgraded high quality public transport system. In the light of the Big Conversation, is it not now time that the GCP Board faced up to realism and commissioned the research to devise a fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory charging system, possibly in combination with a pollution charge to improve air quality, which could then be the subject of a public consultation? And for those who still believe that charging would be unfair, divisive and unpopular, it is interesting to note that some form of road charging system scored the highest of the demand management measures proposed in the</p>	1	<p>Work is currently ongoing in respect of potential demand management options. There will be a Report on the progress of this work coming to the February Joint Assembly and the March Executive Board.</p>
---	---	--	---	--

Appendix to Minutes - Executive Board Questions and Responses 8th February 2018

		<p>survey.</p> <p>Without a secure long-term source of revenue, the ideas for modal shift expressed by the public will just remain wishful thinking. The inertia of the GCP will then condemn Cambridge to worse and worse gridlock.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--