



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly

Thursday 15 February 2024

10:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

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

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Daniel Clarke	Head of Innovation and Technology (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Tom Kelly	Service Director of Finance and Procurement (CCC)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Assistant Director of Inclusive and Sustainable Growth (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Annika Osborne, Heather Richards, James Rolfe and Kristin-Anne Rutter.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

While discussing the minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, it was proposed by the Chairperson, seconded by the Vice-Chairperson and agreed unanimously to:

- Amend the introductory paragraph preceding Agenda Item 1 (Apologies for Absence), as follows (addition in bold, removal in strikethrough):

He noted that the new university representative, subject to approval by the Executive Board, would be James Rolfe, and he had agreed for James ~~Wolfe~~ **Rolfe** to attend the meeting in an unofficial capacity.

- Amend Agenda Item 1 (Apologies for Absence), as follows (additions in bold, removals in strikethrough):

~~Apologies~~ **There were no apologies** for absence ~~were received from.~~

- Amend the final paragraph of Agenda Item 3 (Minutes), as follows (removals in strikethrough):

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 7 September 2023 ~~February 2023~~, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment, and were signed by the Chairperson.

- Amend the fourth bullet point of the discussion on Agenda Item 8 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways), as follows (additions in bold, removals in strikethrough):

Clarified that the Baulk Path in Grantchester was a ~~permissible~~ **permissive** path, and it was noted the GCP was trying to convert ~~permissible~~ **permissive** paths into bridleways, where it was possible.

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 11 December 2023, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the above amendments, and were signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that six 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 two questions related to agenda Item 7 (Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal), and four questions related to agenda item 8 (City Access Programme Update).

5. Petitions

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

6. Quarterly Progress Report and Budget Setting

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 GCP's budget strategy and allocations for 2024/25, including a request to align the budget timings with those of the accountable body. The report also clarified the delegated authority for approving Traffic Regulation Orders where objections had been received and provided an update on the Autonomous Vehicle project.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concern about the level of funding which had not yet been secured, such as Section 106 contributions, and queried how the delay or loss of planned funding could affect projects and the wider GCP programme. Attention was drawn to the difference between an overprogramming deficit at the end of the GCP's programme cycle and the cashflow needs throughout its duration, and members were informed that officers had always taken a cautious approach when budgeting for Section 106 funding. As the GCP's accountable body, the County Council provided borrowing headroom and the Joint Assembly was assured that the reported figures were within the scale of the Council's annual capital programme. A number of variables would continue to have an impact as the programme moved towards its end, and it was confirmed that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board would receive further updates in order to inform decision-making in autumn 2024.
- Clarified that the GCP worked closely with planning officers at the statutory planning authorities in the area to maximise the effectiveness of the way in which Section 106 agreements were drafted, negotiated and signed.
- Observed that the proposed budget strategy did not include an allocation for further spending on the skills programme beyond the completion of the current contract in March 2025, and sought clarification on the GCP's role in the sector

beyond that date. Attention was drawn to the fact that the initial City Deal targets for skills had been surpassed, which meant that it was difficult to allocate further funding when prioritising resources due to the overprogrammed nature of the GCP's wider programme, particularly when other bodies, such as the Combined Authority and County Council were responsible for delivering skills in the region. Notwithstanding, it was noted that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board could amend the proposed budget strategy, and it was agreed that the skills working group would consider the wider skills sector at its next meeting to ensure that the GCP's achievements were not lost in the future.

- Suggested that budget tables should include the number '0' rather than blank entries to avoid confusion.
- Requested an update on the delivery of one thousand additional affordable homes. Members were informed that the figure was a nominal sum that had been agreed as part of the City Deal, and given that no further substantive work was proposed, a reallocation of this budget had been suggested as part of the prioritisation work to reduce overprogramming. Assurance was given that despite this proposed reallocation, it was anticipated that the total number of additional affordable homes would significantly exceed one thousand.
- Queried whether the mid term report being compiled by an Independent Evaluation Panel as part of the Gateway Review process would be shared with members. It was noted that the panel had been appointed by the government, with most of the information being sent directly to the government, although it was agreed that the GCP would share feedback with members when it was received.
- Highlighted the importance of showing original target dates for transport projects, in order to easily identify delays and learn from them to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrences in the future. Members were informed that delays had usually been a result of issues with planning and land acquisition. Changes in the way the GCP worked with local planning authorities had minimised the potential for future issues related to planning, while the time required for land acquisition depended on the complexity of each individual project and the number of land owners involved.
- Expressed concern about the impact that pausing the Cambridge South East Cambridge Transport Scheme could have on the effectiveness and efficiency of Cambridge South railway station when it opened in 2025, and it was agreed that the Joint Assembly would receive a report at its next meeting to consider this, as well as the walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure planned by the GCP, the County Council and the Combined Authority to support the new station.
- Expressed concern about delays with the Cambourne to Cambridge project due to planning issues with the developments along the route, as well as the potential impact of East West Rail on the project, and highlighted that residents of Cambourne continued to suffer from a lack of active travel infrastructure as a result. It was emphasised that East West Rail could not be treated as a material consideration as it had still not finalised its business case or route alignment and had not progressed to the planning stage. The GCP was led by the Local Plan and

therefore was required to develop the project in accordance with the developments that formed part of it.

- Confirmed that the Joint Assembly would receive a report on the Cambridge Eastern Access project and the proposed relocation of the Newmarket Road Park and Ride site at its next meeting in June 2024.
- Drew attention to water constraint issues in Greater Cambridge and sought clarification on the GCP's role in addressing them. Members were assured that the GCP was providing as much support as possible in the form of briefing notes and technical support to the relevant statutory authorities and would continue to do so as they sought to overcome the issues.
- Suggested there were currently insufficient resources in the construction industry to achieve the home energy efficiency targets set by local authorities in Greater Cambridge, noting that retrofitting skills were different to those required for new builds, and requested information on apprenticeships within the sector.
- Established that the GCP was investigating, as part of the Guidance System Review, whether an automated guidance system would be appropriate for the Cambridge Guided Busway.
- Suggested that it could be beneficial to increase public awareness and engagement in the smart signal trials that were held at Robin Hood, and it was confirmed that a report on the results of the trials would be published. Members were informed that the level of public awareness and engagement depended on the nature of the changes being made in each circumstance, as sometimes maximising the benefit to the network could be made without such notice.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson drew attention to issues that the Joint Assembly would consider again in the future, including a review of capital funding, deficits and cashflow, the impacts on Cambridge South railway station of pausing CSETS, and the future follow through of the GCP's skill programme.

7. Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal

Two public questions were received from David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Assistant Director of Inclusive and Sustainable Growth presented a report to the Joint Assembly on progress to date in achieving the City Deal's objectives, which set out its potential wider benefits and identified opportunities to augment or enhance these through a framework of institutional, human, natural, physical and social capitals. The report also set out proposals for the creation of a Greenways Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that greater attention could be given to how the GCP's projects helped to address inequality in the region, including by improving equal access to opportunities for education, employment and healthcare, although it was argued that such impacts needed to be evaluated on a deeper level. It was also suggested that greater emphasis could be placed on the City Deal's original objective to promote, sustain and enable further growth across the region.
- Highlighted the importance of the GCP working with other local authorities in the region to ensure spending and strategies were aligned across different bodies, in order to minimise duplication and maximise the efficient use of public funds. It was also suggested that the GCP could consider commissioning its constituent authorities to implement some of its objectives, such as the delivery of electric vehicle charging points in car parking spaces by the City Council.
- Drew attention to the ongoing development by the County Council of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and the need for a more coherent network of cycleways within the city of Cambridge, noting current uncertainties about how the Greenways would connect to the urban cycle network when reaching the city, as well as to rural areas that currently had no active travel infrastructure at all. Members also highlighted the need to consider how active travel routes connected to railway stations in Cambridge and across the wider region.
- Highlighted the effectiveness of Figure 3 in the report for demonstrating the impact of work undertaken by the GCP, and suggested more emphasis could be given to the continuous smaller interventions.
- Noted the importance of reviewing projects and whether they achieved their expected outcomes, in order to learn from them to improve future projects, although it was acknowledged that this was routinely carried out by the GCP and would inform submissions for the forthcoming Gateway Review.
- Argued that the City Deal and GCP had developed an increased awareness of the inter-related nature of the Greater Cambridge region, strengthening connections and working relationships between the various local authorities, businesses and the universities, by providing a platform to combine strategy and resources to develop projects that would otherwise not have been achieved.
- Welcomed the proposals for the creation of a Greenways Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and agreed that it would be developed into an individual report and presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at a future meeting for more detailed consideration.

In summarising the discussion, the Chairperson highlighted the Joint Assembly's support for the development by the County Council of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and the need to support partners in work that the GCP could not carry out itself. A further report on the Greenways Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy had been requested, along with further consideration of improving active travel access to railway stations. Members had also highlighted the effectiveness of

the GCP as an institution and had emphasised the importance of post-project appraisals.

8. City Access Programme Update

Four public questions were received from Tina Riches (on behalf of Mill Road 4 People), Sarah Hughes (on behalf of Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance), Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle), and Richard Wood (on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users Group, and read out by Sarah Hughes). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on the City Access programme and the wider transport strategy from the County Council and the Combined Authority, including bus reform and the ongoing development of a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy. The report also included an update on the Road Network Hierarchy Review, proposed a set of refreshed City Access objectives, and identified opportunities for further quick win and demonstrator projects.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Highlighted the importance of working together with other organisations and local authorities to ensure connectivity across different networks, such as bus, train and active travel networks, with one member expressing concern about the potential reluctance of private operators to connect their services to those of other operators.
- Established that the GCP would play a supporting role to the County Council in the development of a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy beyond 2030, which would consider issues such as congestion and the road network hierarchy, with members emphasising the importance of ensuring the work already carried out by the GCP, alongside the evidence it had collected through multiple consultations and programmes, was considered as part of this. It was also suggested that the strategy's development should involve public consultation.
- Requested further information on the wider impacts of not progressing with the Making Connections proposals, including on the integrated parking strategy, how more space could be created for buses, and the development of the emerging Local Plan. It was suggested that the GCP could promote on its continued objective to simultaneously reduce the level of non-resident parking in Cambridge and increase the number of alternative, sustainable travel journeys.
- Drew attention to the role of the GCP in continuing to support the Park and Ride sites in the region, through further investment and wider improvements, although it was acknowledged that the outcome of the Combined Authority's ongoing consideration on bus reform would inform such work in the future. It was suggested that bus connections to the sites could be expanded to destinations beyond the city centre, such as North Cambridge railway station.

- Noted the continuously changing nature of the road network and the necessity to consider the entire network over a period of time as part of a transport strategy, to decide whether to make changes that had a wider impact across the whole network, rather than gradual, separate changes. However, it was argued that the educational, research and residential activities of the universities and colleges in Cambridge, along with their access and transport needs, were not adequately represented in the existing Road Network Hierarchy Review. It was also suggested that it would be beneficial to provide further evidence justifying some of the decisions that it made, although it was acknowledged that further work was being undertaken on the review.
- Drew attention to the significant increase in train usage since the previous transport strategy in 2014, noting it was the only form of transport that had achieved all its targets in the region. It was argued that any local rail strategy should include Cambridge on all its main routes, while also considering the transportation of freight. However, it was emphasised that despite upgrades to the trainline between Cambridge and Norwich being one of the most urgent transport priorities in the region, the GCP did not have responsibility for rail improvements, although it did have a role in improving infrastructure around railway stations.
- Drew attention to projects that had been carried out in Ghent and Norwich, and suggested that the GCP could consider whether any such schemes would be appropriate for Greater Cambridge, although it was acknowledged that the GCP only had delegated responsibility for its defined programme rather than future work.
- Highlighted the importance of future proofing all the GCP's projects to ensure that they could adapt to evolving and new technologies, noting that the Smart workstream worked towards this objective.
- Observed that there were a significant number of people with accessibility issues that were not covered by the Blue Badge scheme and emphasised the importance of ensuring additional support was made available to them whenever possible.
- Welcomed the proposals for further quick wins and demonstrators, noting how many of them were closely related to ongoing development of an integrated parking strategy. Nonetheless, it was argued that quick wins should be part of a wider coherent strategy, rather than isolated projects.
- Emphasised the importance of ensuring that councillors from the City Council were consulted whenever possible in the development of resident parking schemes, as well as councillors from the County Council.
- Observed that the report only referred to freight consolidation in the city of Cambridge and highlighted issues related to freight across the wider region. Members expressed concern about the difficulty in convincing businesses to consolidate freight locally, particularly those that operated nationally, and suggested that the GCP could focus on stimulating demand for such practices, given that freight consolidation was most successful when it was seen to be in businesses interests.

- Highlighted the potential benefits of having major logistic centres located near train stations so that cargo could be transported on the railway network rather than the road network, expressing particular concern about to the significant planned increase of imports arriving at Felixstowe. Members also acknowledged the benefits of last-mile delivery being carried out by sustainable methods, such as cargo bikes, and emphasised the importance of having minor logistics sites across the region to support such initiatives. It was suggested that safeguarding land for logistic centres in the future could be considered in the development of the emerging Local Plan.
- Suggested that the refreshed City Access objectives could be more explicit about increasing total access, increasing the effectiveness of public transport, and increasing demand for sustainable alternatives to car travel. It was argued that the objectives should emphasise the underlying objective of enabling more people to move into and around the region, and it was also suggested that the mitigation of any negative impacts from the decision to not continue with the Making Connections proposals could be included as an additional objective.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 6 June 2024.

Chairperson
6 June 2024

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 15 February 2024
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">David Stoughton (Chair) Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 -Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal</p> <p>Living Streets welcomes GCP’s recognition, finally, that walking and wheeling is ‘the most common mode of transport in the city’. We now need a GCP strategy to translate that evidence into action.</p> <p>The National Walking Survey (2019) found that 31% of over 65s has stopped walking and 48% would walk more if pedestrian environments were safer. We find it offensive that GCP will fund expensive technological fixes, such as Starting crossings, but not invest in improving key walking routes across the city.</p> <p>Designating some ‘Key Walking Routes’ as ‘Investment Routes’ will enable GCP to resurface key sections of pavement as well as installing micro gardens and benches and remove pavement obstructions. This aligns with GCP investment work elsewhere that has included resurfacing roads in the course of developing new projects. It would not undermine the relationship between GCP as infrastructure and County Highways as maintenance.</p> <p>GCP could pioneer a response to National Living Streets research (2023) exposing economic costs of outdoor falls to the NHS and social care, costs difficult to assess because a defined ‘road traffic injury’ must include a vehicle. RTI statistics don’t include pedestrian accidents and they often go unreported to local authorities and in hospital admissions.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback on the paper.</p> <p>The paper suggests that – although GCP schemes will greatly benefit people walking and wheeling – more could be done to enhance the general environment in particular, as proposed by Mr. Stoughton, on key routes such as around access to stations, schools and other locations. This is important for everyone but especially for vulnerable road users and as such there will be an overlap between this and the proposed work on accessibility.</p> <p>Subject to the discussion at the Joint Assembly, and the decision of the Executive Board, officers would look to develop quick win options for potential improvements, including for example access to our main rail stations.</p>

	<p>Living Streets has existing case studies of need and benefit to contribute to a 'quick wins' programme and welcomes constructive discussion with GCP.</p> <p>Our question is whether GCP will take up the challenge to respond to what people struggling to walk in our city have clearly stated that they need: decent walking routes to stations, to workplaces, to shops and other amenities? And will you ensure that your ideas for 'quick wins' are grounded in people's walking and wheeling lived experience, so that GCP becomes a champion and a model for transforming the pedestrian environment?</p>	
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal</p> <p>Agenda item 7 focuses on positioning the GCP favourably as it approaches the second gateway review. There are some positive aspects within this agenda item, and this holistic approach and is something Camcycle and others has been calling for all along. However, when reviewing progress, it must also review its failures. The GCP and the bodies it represents must examine what is not working and what can be improved. organisationally, there will be little room for growth without reflection and learning.</p> <p>Within this agenda item, we are surprised to see the inclusion of the Green and Blue Infrastructure strategy, with only two short paragraphs dedicated to explaining its purpose and content. Across the three documents seeking approval, there are nearly 200 pages of detail and very importantly a design code. This document is a critical document for how the Greenways will be delivered.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback on the paper.</p> <p>With regards to the Greenways GBI strategy this document has been developed with input from stakeholders on the GCP Landscape Heritage and Environment forum which includes the relevant technical specialists at the Shared Planning Service. The document provides guidance to designers but, as has been emphasised previously, the key principle is that designs have to be tailored to the local environment that they go through.</p> <p>On lighting, this document seeks to ensure designers consider lighting that is sympathetic to its surrounding environment whilst supporting pedestrian and cycling movements. It is not a document that sets out technical standards. The overarching principle has always been as a minimum to incorporate solar studs unless there is a specific environmental reason not to,</p>

	<p>Within it are meant to be greenway-specific requirements. Under design elements, there is section 3.6 on lighting. However, there is almost no meaningful guidance provided. It does not establish preferences for lighting, when it should or could be suitable, and it doesn't even mention solar studs, whose use in areas that will not be lit will be vital.</p> <p>The discussion around how the greenways will be lit has persisted for years. Now is the moment to resolve it, and this is the document that should address it.</p> <p>Does the Joint Assembly believe this guidance sets out a clear way for lighting to be designed on the greenway network?</p>	<p>this is in line with the County Council's Active Travel Design guide.</p>
<p>Liz Walter Mill Road 4 People</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Mill Road 4 People is a campaigning organisation with over 1,000 signed-up supporters. Our question has two parts.</p> <p>1. Quick Wins</p> <p>Are you aware that the campaign group Mill Road 4 People has done a lot of work around suggestions for 'quick win' improvements to Mill Road?</p> <p>A document detailing our proposals was sent via email on 23 June 2023 to Cllrs Shailer and Howitt. (it is attached to this question). Can you confirm that its contents have been or will be passed to the relevant officers and that its recommendations will be given serious consideration in any planning for Mill Road, bearing in mind that Mill Road 4 People now represents over 1,000 mainly local signed-up supporters?</p>	<p>The County Council is seeking to progress the closure of Mill Road to general motor vehicles, by way of a modal filter. That decision is the subject of legal challenge, and an outcome is awaited.</p> <p>Officers are aware of the public realm proposals cited and will review them further with County Council colleagues following the outcome of the judicial process.</p>

	<p>2. Pavement Parking</p> <p>Mill Road 4 People has also been conducting a hugely popular campaign called PaveMeant for People, aimed at tackling illegal pavement parking. We are calling for individual bike racks to be installed at the pavement edge, parallel to the road, in all places where the pavement width is sufficient. This would both create a barrier to pavement parking and provide much-needed extra bike parking. Could you confirm that at least one of your 'demonstrator projects' will be aimed at tackling pavement parking on Mill Road, and that our proposal will be given serious consideration?</p>	
<p>Sarah Hughes Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance Officer</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance is deeply disappointed that the GCP is recommending setting aside the road reclassification project, substantially reducing the budget for the City Access programme and reorienting City Access away from the transformation of transport infrastructure the City Deal was established to bring about.</p> <p>Changing the way Cambridge's roads are classified could have transformed the city for the better. It could have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allowed buses to run on time - over half of bus users we interviewed in Cambridge thought non Park&Ride services were late or unreliable • made walking, wheeling and cycling much easier, safer and more pleasant • given us cleaner air to breathe • made the city a much more attractive place. 	<p>The paper does not propose cancelling or pausing the road network hierarchy project. Rather, it recommends that further work is necessary to ensure that consultation responses can be accurately reflected in the emerging proposals, particularly in the context of the decision not to proceed with Making Connections proposals .</p> <p>In December, the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee agreed to develop a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy. This will update and supersede the adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, supporting and in step with the emerging Local Plan. The road network hierarchy review rightly forms part of that work.</p> <p>In terms of the 15% traffic reduction target, the paper is clear there is still a need to do something to resolve congestion in the long run given projected growth in demand for travel.</p>

	<p>If the road reclassification project is cancelled as well as the Sustainable Travel Zone road charge, and there are no plans by the GCP or others to pursue a workplace parking levy or other transformative options, in 2030 - the year in which Cambridge City aims to reach net zero - Cambridge will still largely have its 1980s road system that on the whole prioritises motorised transport over sustainable travel.</p> <p>In contrast, many other UK cities are planning or have taken bold steps to transform transport - Edinburgh will experiment with restricting traffic through its city centre, Oxford is going ahead with traffic filters and LTNs, Bristol has a Clean Air Zone, London has an effective congestion charge and recently brought in ULEZ, and Nottingham has a Workplace Parking Levy.</p> <p>Page 103 of the agenda pack references the GCP objective to reduce traffic by 15% compared to the 2011 baseline. To what extent does the GCP think it will meet this objective with neither a transformational transport plan like a road charge, nor a reclassification of Cambridge's roads?</p>	<p>Questions of what is needed in the context of that growth to reduce traffic and support more people to travel by bus, cycle or walking will be considered through the development of that wider transport strategy.</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Political indecision continues stifle Cambridge, affecting business, residents, health, and the environment. Eighteen months after the consultation on the road hierarchy, this paper does nothing but reflect the statistical facts of the consultation response; and passing off of responsibilities to the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy at an unknown date in the future.</p> <p>Many will speculate this procrastination reflects an inability to reduce congestion, and downgrading roads is indeed more</p>	<p>The paper does not propose cancelling or pausing the road network hierarchy project. Rather, it recommends that further work is necessary to ensure that consultation responses can be accurately reflected in the emerging proposals, particularly in the context of the decision not to proceed with Making Connections proposals.</p> <p>In December, the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee agreed to develop a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy. This will update and supersede the</p>

difficult without first reducing traffic. However, it is definitely not impossible, and as proposed, the road hierarchy was never intended to be a scheme to be implemented all at once.

Our 18-page response, compiled with the help of our 1,700 members, questioned the car-centric approach, starkly highlighted by the fundamental misunderstanding of the word "road", when in fact what was being discussed were streets.

We set out a user approach and looked to the content for inspiration. We drew attention to how other cities manage circulation, taking specific inspiration from those that do it without a road charging scheme.

One of the best examples of this, in a small city is Ghent, Belgium, which controls the vehicle movements of its 300,000 residents through a circulation plan. Introduced in 2017, it was delivered in under three years for less than €5 million. Results have included a 60% increase in cycling, 55% increase in public transport use, 35% decrease in road collisions and a 15% increase in greenery, replacing previously paved areas. 71% of inner-city residents say that it is a more pleasant place to live.

While it's important to have a quick wins package, it could be described as a band-aid on a bullet wound. We've always needed a bigger scheme too.

Why doesn't the GCP believe that such a scheme could be delivered as part of the City Access Programme?

adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, supporting and in step with the emerging Local Plan. The road network hierarchy review rightly forms part of that work.

It was always the case that road hierarchy proposals would ultimately be fed through to the County Council as Highways Authority to take the final decision, so it is right that the project is taken forward alongside that wider strategic work.

<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has recently engaged extensively with a wide range of stakeholders as part of its 'Bus Network Review', in order to assess local needs and identify new opportunities.</p> <p>Stakeholders included community groups – several Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance member organisations took part – as well as businesses, local leaders and councillors, parish councils, educational institutions and healthcare providers. The engagement not only enabled CPCA to review the existing tendered services it supports; it also generated ideas for many new services CPCA could support, some of which will in all probability go ahead due to the increase in the mayoral precept.</p> <p>While Cambridge Area Bus Users is disappointed that the potentially most impactful City Access projects will likely not proceed, we believe that localised improvements can still be made through a programme of 'seeding' quick wins and demonstrator projects, coupled with a behaviour change programme.</p> <p>How is the GCP planning to engage with stakeholders, including Residents' Associations and community groups such as ours, to identify quick wins and demonstrator projects to which the GCP could commit 'seed-corn' funding enabling them to be delivered within the lifetime of the City Deal?</p>	<p>Subject to the Joint Assembly discussion, and the decision of the Executive Board, the paper proposes exploring a series of quick wins and demonstrator projects. There is a rich resource of feedback and ideas from previous engagement on the City Access project – including the Making Connections consultations, the Road Hierarchy engagement, the Cycling Plus engagement, the Citizens' Assembly – as well as project specific engagement and engagement by partners such as the CPCA. This would support initial technical and feasibility work on quick wins.</p> <p>Emerging proposals would be subject to Joint Assembly and Board oversight and stakeholders, community groups, residents associations and the wider Greater Cambridge public would be engaged and consulted in line with the usual GCP practices.</p>
---	---	---