



**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 8 June 2023

12:00 p.m. – 5:55 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 Annika Osborne	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Kristin-Anne Rutter	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

### Officers:

Kerry Allen	Senior Delivery Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Daniel Clarke	Strategy and Partnerships Manager (GCP)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Programme Manager (GCP)
Ben Hathway	Senior Delivery Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Lynne Miles	Director of City Access (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

## 1. Election of Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Thornburrow, duly seconded and resolved unanimously that Councillor Bick be elected Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the 2023/24 municipal year.

## 2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Shailer, seconded by Councillor Daunton and resolved unanimously that Councillor Thornburrow be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the 2023/24 municipal year.

## 3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Williams and Heather Richards.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Wilson to the Joint Assembly, and expressed thanks to former Joint Assembly member Councillor Alex Beckett, noting that he had been appointed as the County Council's substitute representative on the Executive Board.

## 4. Declarations of Interest

Kristin-Anne Rutter declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy (agenda item 10), as an Executive Director of CBC Ltd.

## 5. Minutes

While discussing the minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, it was proposed and agreed unanimously to amend the first sentence of the last bullet point to the Joint Assembly's discussion on agenda item 6 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Barton, Horningsea, Melbourn and Sawston) as follows (addition in bold):

- Supported the proposal from Councillor Van de Ven to prioritise work on the link between Melbourn and Meldreth train station, highlighting the importance of ensuring residents and employees across the region were able to access the train network through active travel, **including access to the Waterbeach station on the Horningsea Greenway.**

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 16 February 2023, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment, and were signed by the Chairperson.

## 6. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that twelve 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 three questions related to agenda Item 9 (Greater Cambridge Greenways – Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives), and six questions related to agenda item 10 (Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy).

## 7. Petitions

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

## 8. 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 included details of a proposal to undertake a procurement exercise to provide the GCP with specific legal support for the programme.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Sought clarification on why the Chisholm Trail Cycle Links Phase 2 project had been marked with a red status in the table in Section 6.1 of the report. It was confirmed that the delay was due to ongoing discussions with the rail authority to obtain access to its land to finalise the route alignment.
- Expressed concern that the budget status for the Waterbeach Station had been marked with a red status in the table in Section 7.1 of the report, noting that the development of Waterbeach New Town was contingent on delivery of the train station. Members were informed that the matter related to in-year spend which would be picked up in the current year, and that the impact was minimal.
- Observed an underspend of £8.4m this year and sought reassurances that the GCP had sufficient capacity to deliver the levels of increased spending over the next year that were detailed in the report. It was clarified that spend would increase significantly over the next few years due to construction stage commencing on various large projects, and that capacity had been increased accordingly to ensure this could occur. Spend specifically related to the City Access programme was subject to the ongoing considerations by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on the development of the project.
- Highlighted the need for apprenticeships in the construction and retro fitting sectors, acknowledging that the programme had been developed to include

flexibility on the provision of courses that were required and for which there was demand.

- Emphasised the importance of ensuring the GCP's work and achievements in the skills sector received sufficient prominence alongside the transport and infrastructure projects.
- Paid tribute to the successes of the GCP in the smart workstream, noting the opportunities for further developments with the construction of Cambridge South train station, and clarified that there were no public information campaigns planned beyond press releases and community engagement on individual projects.
- Clarified that Mobility as a Service, referenced in Section 9.10 of the report, was a project that sought to join different layers of the transport system together to simplify the planning of multi-modal journeys. Once established, it would provide insight into behavioural changes, as well as opportunities to incentivise further changes.
- Established that the deployment of up to thirteen automated vehicles on the Biomedical Campus and the West Cambridge campus was anticipated for April 2024.
- Suggested that the table of strategic risks listed in Section 5 of the report should include a risk for negative public opinion of the GCP and a risk for projects having to be taken through separate governance processes at the County Council as the GCP's accountable body. It was noted that both these risks were included in a separate, wider risk register, but it was agreed to also consider their inclusion in the one that was part of quarterly progress reports.
- Welcomed and supported the proposal to undertake a procurement exercise for legal support to the GCP, emphasising the importance of ensuring the highest quality support was obtained.

## 9. Greater Cambridge Greenways – Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives

Three public questions were received from Al Hanagan, Professor Sir David Spiegelhalter, and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Alex Bulat, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Abbey division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Welcoming the Greenways project and the level of consultation that had been conducted with local residents and members, Councillor Bulat drew attention to longstanding safety issues along Riverside, which formed part of the Bottisham Greenway. Noting that various proposals over the past thirteen years to resolve such issues had not been successful to date, including pedestrianisation of Riverside, she urged the GCP to develop the Greenways scheme in a holistic way that

reflected these ongoing concerns over the safety of both cyclists and pedestrians along the Riverside section of the route.

Councillor Jean Glasberg, Cambridge City Councillor for the Newnham ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Welcoming the support for active travel provided by the Greenways project, Councillor Glasberg nonetheless expressed concern over the safety of some aspects of the scheme and highlighted her assertion that pedestrians were above cyclists in the hierarchy of road users. She also paid tribute to the consultations that had been carried out for the Grantchester Greenway, and emphasised the importance of ensuring all consultations were conducted to such a standard. It was clarified that independent road safety assessments were carried out before, during and after the development of all the Greenways schemes, and that the same approach was taken to all the consultations across the different routes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out the Outline Business Cases for the Bottisham, Swaffham and St Ives Greenways, as well as a proposed programme of delivery. Following a public engagement, various changes were proposed for the schemes, as set out in Sections 2.4 to 2.9 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed and supported the proposals that would be presented to the Executive Board on 29 June 2023.
- Suggested that connecting the Bottisham Greenway to High Street in Bottisham would increase access to the cycle route for villages in the surrounding area, and it was acknowledged that officers were considering the costs and deliverability of such an extension.
- Highlighted the inherent dangers for cyclists at road junctions and requested that the design of the Bottisham Greenway at the Newmarket Road / High Ditch Road junction and the Ditton Lane crossing be reconsidered to maximise the safety of the route, with one member suggesting that controlled crossings could be beneficial at these locations, particularly during peak hours.
- Drew attention to significant maintenance issues on the Bottisham Greenway, including a section of the route where exposed tree roots currently made usage difficult, and clarified that the GCP would look to resolve such issues before completing the route and handing over responsibility for maintenance to the County Council. Members also expressed concern that they were not kept informed of the ongoing discussions with the County Council about how the Greenways would be maintained once responsibility was handed over, and it was agreed that a report on the issue would be presented at the next meeting.
- Drew attention to the need to protect the high number of listed trees and hedges along the Swaffham Greenway. It was suggested that keeping the Greenway behind hedgerows, wherever possible, would further protect cyclists from the nearby road.

- Expressed concern about the narrow width of Green Bank Road on the Swaffham Greenway, although it was acknowledged that the report stated that alternatives would be considered for that section of the route. It was noted that cycleways needed to be 3 metres wide (or 1.5 metre if only one-way) to be compliant with LTN 1/20 guidance. While the local environment and adjoining roads sometimes restricted the width of cycleways, members were assured that all routes were subject to road safety audits.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring safety at that the section of the St Ives Greenway that connected to Over, which involved a crossing of the guided busway. The Joint Assembly acknowledged the wider safety concerns that had been raised by members of the public and local members, and it was emphasised that clear signage would be a necessary feature along all the Greenway routes.
- Highlighted the importance of future-proofing the Greenway routes, for example using high-quality materials, to increase active travel in a sustainable, long-term way.
- Welcomed the high level of engagement with residents and local stakeholders that had been carried out and highlighted the importance of ensuring such engagements continued throughout the development and construction of the Greenway routes, to explain why particular decisions or changes were made, such as to route alignment and surface materials. Members also requested for such engagements to include local parish, district/city and county councillors in acknowledgement of their knowledge of local areas.
- Clarified that after the Executive Board considered the changes proposed in the report, the GCP would refine the design of the schemes, in continuous dialogue with local residents and members, before a final report would pull all the issues together and seek approval for the construction of the Greenways.
- Suggested that the GCP support the Combined Authority and County Council in their efforts to obtain guidance from the Government on how to classify the various modern modes of transport, such as electric bikes and scooters.

## 10. Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy

Eight public questions were received from Martin Lucas-Smith, William Bannell, David Stoughton (on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge), Sarah Hughes (on behalf of Cambs Sustainable Travel Alliance), Neil Mackay (on behalf of Mackays of Cambridge Ltd.), Richard Wood (on behalf of Cambridge Area Bus Users), Sarah Lightowlers (on behalf of Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone), and Josh Grantham (on behalf of Camcycle). A further question had been submitted by Jethro Gauld (on behalf of East Cambs Climate Action Network). As he was unable to attend the meeting to present his question, he would receive a written response to his question. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Elliot Tong, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Noting that the economic impact assessment (EIA) that had been conducted by the GCP in September 2022 was focused on the financial logistics of City Access as a transport scheme, Councillor Tong queried whether a further EIA would be carried out to assess the wider economic impacts before a final decision was made on the project. He noted that the proposals would likely lead to a reduction in the annual revenue that the City Council received from parking charges, while both small and large businesses had expressed concern about the financial impacts that they would potentially suffer. He also sought clarification on the reasoning behind the assumption that people who stopped using private cars because of the proposals would use buses instead, as opposed to other alternative forms of transport. It was confirmed that further assessments would be performed, if the scheme progressed, which would consider the wider economic impacts of the proposals before any final decisions were made. It was also noted that assumptions were based on the results of a standard modelling process that was used consistently by the GCP to predict modals shifts, and any changes to the proposals would be subjected to the same modelling process.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Melbourn and Bassingbourn division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting the limited or non-existent bus services and active travel routes available to residents in smaller villages across the County, Councillor Van de Ven argued that they had little option other than travelling by car to reach the nearest train station. She argued that any redesign or augmentation of the existing bus network should exploit any opportunities for bus and rail links, to expand the public transport network and its accessibility. In acknowledgement of Councillor Van de Ven's concerns it was suggested that a franchised bus network would allow for these kinds of wider, social perspectives to be considered throughout the decision-making process of service provision.

The Director of City Access presented the report, which detailed the methodology and process of the second Making Connections consultation, which ran from 17 October 2022 to 23 December 2022, and its headline findings, which were drawn from over 24,000 responses to a public survey, demographically representative opinion polling, written submissions from organisations in the Cambridge travel-to-work-area, targeted meetings with representative and seldom-heard groups, and a series of in-person and virtual engagement events. These findings, summarised in Section 3 of the report and set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report, had led to the identification of a range of themes and concerns to be addressed, including whether to change any of the core parameters of the scheme, whether to change any of the rules about who was required to pay and under what circumstances, and whether to change any of the benefits that the scheme would deliver. The Joint Assembly was invited to consider these potential changes to the Making Connections proposals, as set out in Section 5 of the report, and to give a view as to whether and how the Executive Board should proceed with the proposals. The Joint Assembly received a presentation on the consultation and potential changes to the proposals, which was published on the [meeting website](#) and will be attached at Appendix B of the signed minutes.

While discussing the development of the City Access project that led to the second Making Connections consultation, how the consultation had been carried out, and the headline findings that had been identified, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that several significant events had occurred since the City Access project had commenced, including the Covid-19 pandemic, the withdrawal from the European Union, the war in Ukraine, the ongoing cost-of-living crisis and a deteriorating public bus network, and expressed concern that the potential impacts on businesses and residents could exacerbate problems they were already facing. Notwithstanding these concerns, it was also suggested that some of these events, alongside others, had served to underline the importance of finding a solution to the problems in the Greater Cambridge area, which were only likely to worsen according to the projected levels of growth in the region.
- Highlighted the ongoing need to improve public transport while reducing congestion and pollution in the Greater Cambridge area. It was emphasised that the City Access proposals were designed to improve the situation for those already living in or visiting the Greater Cambridge area, rather than to promote or create further growth in the region.
- Acknowledged the value of the Government agreeing to non-voting members being appointed by the Business Board and University of Cambridge to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, as they had been able to provide greater longevity and continuity throughout the development of the City Deal compared to the voting members, who were subject to regular elections.
- Noted that various changes had taken place since the consultation concluded in December 2022, including the ongoing development by the Combined Authority of Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, confirmation of the preferred alignment of East West Rail, and ongoing discussions about potential franchising of the local bus network, and queried whether such developments would affect the proposals or their cost. Members were assured that the updated Local Transport and Connectivity Plan would not affect the policy basis for the proposals. While franchising would increase public involvement and accountability in the decision-making process of bus service provision, it was acknowledged that the current limited, expensive, and unreliable network was not suitable for franchising, and would require significant improvements before it could be considered.
- Welcomed the high level of responses received during the consultation, highlighting the significant increase in public participation compared to previous consultations, and it was suggested that this was due to the inclusion of specific, tangible proposals for people to consider and comment on. It was agreed that the consultation process had been fair, accessible and effective, and the Joint Assembly paid tribute to all those who participated. Members also observed that it was the first consultation that had sought to influence the outcome, although it was noted that it was normal to campaign towards certain objectives during consultations.
- Queried whether the anticipated number of responses submitted from people living outside the Greater Cambridge area had been received, and it was clarified that



approximately 3,000 respondents had indicated they were from outside the Greater Cambridge area, compared to 16,000 respondents indicating they were from within the Greater Cambridge area, with an additional 6,000 respondents providing no indication either way.

- Considered whether the consultation had been clear on the issue of a charge as part of the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone, with one member expressing concern that it had not been sufficiently explicit when seeking opinions on the proposals.
- Observed that the consultation had been carried out during a period of significant disruption to the local bus network and expressed concern that people may have consequently found it harder to have confidence in the proposals to improve bus services. It was noted that people who responded to the consultation were likely to be those who held stronger views, either for or against the proposals.
- Expressed concern that an insufficient level of assessment had been carried out on the impacts of the proposals on businesses, commuters and residents, although it was acknowledged that assessments and engagement was ongoing and would continue throughout the development of the proposals. It was also noted that if the scheme progressed, a deeper analysis of the consultation responses would be conducted to provide a more detailed assessment of the issues that were raised.
- Emphasised the importance of ensuring there was public trust and confidence in the consultation, including relating to how it had been carried out and how the GCP would respond to the issues and concerns that had been raised before making a final decision on the proposals. Attention was drawn to the consultation's alignment with the Gunning Principles, including that there was sufficient information to give 'intelligent consideration', that there was adequate time for consideration and response, and that 'conscientious consideration' was being given to the consultation responses before a decision was made.
- Established that the Consultation Institute had provided feedback following its independent audit of the GCP's consultation approach, and it was agreed to include this feedback in the report to the Executive Board.
- Highlighted the importance of fairness and equalities when developing the proposals to ensure that the impacts did not disproportionately affect people on low income, key workers, young people, or those without any viable alternative to travelling by car. Attention was drawn to a specific question in the consultation survey which sought to seek opinions on how the proposals dealt with this issue, and members were assured that, if the scheme developed further, a detailed analysis of the responses to this question would inform any adaptations to the proposals, to balance the benefits and impacts as fairly as possible. Members also acknowledged that the current situation could be equally perceived as unfair, with minimal or non-existent bus services in rural areas leaving residents with no choice but to buy a car when they could not afford it.
- Acknowledged the headline findings of the consultation, which indicated almost universal support for the proposed improvements to the bus services and active

travel network, but also significant opposition to the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone. However, it was argued that the two were intrinsically linked to each other and that there were no realistic alternative funding mechanisms to support the proposed improvements.

- Suggested that the consultation and results should have been more explicit in the distinction between cycling and walking, given their differing requirements.
- Expressed concern about the level of opposition to the proposed charging mechanism, with one member arguing that the scheme should not go ahead when it had received support from only 34% of respondents. Other members, however, argued that only 20% of respondents had said they could not be persuaded by potential changes to the proposals, which suggested that the level of support could significantly increase if appropriate changes were identified.
- Highlighted the fact that younger people were generally more supportive of the Sustainable Travel Zone proposals, while residents of the city of Cambridge were also more supportive than those living outside the city. It was also noted that there was a higher level of opposition in the areas north-east of Cambridge, where it was argued the public transport provision was particularly limited.
- Highlighted the need to proactively support people who shifted to move sustainable modes of transport, including cycling and walking, and to respond to their concerns and suggestions. It was suggested that the GCP could consider providing grants to people to enable them to use active travel networks, including the Greenways.

While discussing the issues raised during the consultation and the potential changes that could be made to the proposals, the Joint Assembly:

- Considered and generally opposed a general exemption or discount for residents of the STZ, based on the following observations:
  - The financial impact on the revenue to support improvements to the bus and active travel networks would be too significant, given that many journeys within the proposed STZ area were undertaken by residents of the city;
  - It would unfairly benefit people who lived within Cambridge, who it was argued were generally financially more able to pay a charge, and who already benefitted from a better bus and active travel network that offered more alternative choices to a car journey. People who lived within the STZ would also be those who most benefitted from the reduced pollution and cleaner air that would result from the proposals;
  - The level of support in the consultation for such an exemption or discount in the consultation was significant, however, and a limited exemption or discount for a certain number of days could therefore be considered as an alternative.

- Requested further investigation on the potential impacts of the proposals on the different types of businesses and whether any discounts or exemptions could be appropriate, based on the following observations:
  - Many businesses that local communities relied on were already suffering because of the current economic situation, particularly small businesses, and the proposed charge could have a harmful impact on businesses both inside and outside the proposed STZ area. It was not clear what benefits the proposals offered for businesses, unlike residents and commuters, who would benefit from an improved bus service and active travel network.
  - Businesses contributed to the congestion problems, both directly and indirectly, while higher levels of domestic tourism had led to increased level of visiting coaches and cars. However, coaches, including school coaches, reduced the number of vehicles on the road and therefore helped reduce congestion. It would be necessary to differentiate between business and private vehicles or journeys when applying any discounts or exemptions.
  - Shuttle buses between shopping centres, integrated deliveries and better organised last mile deliveries could benefit businesses and such initiatives could be supported as part of the proposals, although it was acknowledged that some businesses, such as concrete delivery vehicles, had no alternative means of transport or method of operation. The impacts would vary according to the nature and size of the businesses, and it was noted that freight consolidation pilots were included as part of the proposals.
  - Although improvements to the public transport network would be implemented well in advance of a charge being implemented, it was not clear how businesses would be supported in their preparation during this time, or how they had generally responded to the proposals in the consultation.
  
- Considered and generally opposed an exemption or discount for electric vehicles, based on the following observations:
  - Electric vehicles still contributed to congestion as much as non-electric vehicles, and as their proportion of vehicles was expected to increase in the future, such an exemption or discount could significantly reduce the revenue needed for supporting the bus service and active travel improvements.
  - Electric vehicles tended to be owned by wealthier people who would simultaneously be more able to pay a charge, so any such discount or exemption would have a disproportionate impact on people with lower incomes.
  - Electric mopeds, electric motorbikes and electric three-wheeled vehicles contributed less to congestion and pollution, so perhaps a more targeted discount or exemption could be considered.

- Considered and acknowledged a need to further consider the issue of trip chaining, based on the following observations:
  - Visiting various destinations within single journeys could be significantly more difficult and time-consuming if done on public transport, particularly for parents taking children to childcare or school. It was suggested that such an issue particularly affected women with parenting responsibilities. However, improvements to the public transport network would provide more options.
  - The proposed daily charge, rather than a per mile charge, would allow some people to make various trips on one day and pay just once, rather than spreading them out over various days, with most trip-chains consisting of a long journey that would be expected to be paid for if it was within the STZ.
  
- Considered and generally opposed changing the hours of operation, but acknowledged a need to further consider the issue, based on the following observations:
  - It would permit journeys that were not time-constrained to be made during non-peak hours, thus reducing congestion during peak hours. If reducing congestion was the main objective, it could be difficult to justify charging people for travelling when there was no congestion. However, such a shift in behaviour could simply displace congestion to outside peak hours and could have a significant impact on revenue for improving bus services and the active travel network.
  - Most people would be unable to change their hours of travel to outside peak hours, meaning that key workers and people in lower income employment were likely to be disproportionately affected. Conversely, people who were able to adapt their hours of travel were also likely to be more able to pay a charge. Notwithstanding, it was acknowledged that the Joint Assembly did not have evidence to support this and that more information on the potential impacts of such changes was required before a decision could be made.
  
- Considered and generally opposed reducing the charge, but acknowledged a need to further consider the issue, based on the following observations:
  - Current levels of inflation would effectively reduce the charge over time, and a reduction of the initial charge would therefore impact the revenue income for the bus and active travel network improvements. The alternative would be to progressively increase the charge if inflation persisted in the future.
  - Lowering the charge would reduce the incentive to use alternative forms of transport to cars, which was one of the underlying objectives of the proposals. A £2 bus fare was intended to be more attractive than a £5 vehicle charge, and a reduced vehicle charge would therefore reduce the appeal of buses.

- According to the consultation findings, businesses were generally more concerned about the level of the charge than individual people, who were generally more concerned about any charge at all.
  - A reduced charge for certain people, vehicles, days or times could however be considered as an alternative to a complete reduction in the charge, as could an incrementally phased introduction of the charge.
- Considered and generally opposed reducing the boundary of the STZ, based on the following observations:
- While concerns raised by people living close to the proposed boundary were understandable, particularly when the boundary passed through the middle of communities, similar issues would be raised by people living close to wherever a reduced boundary was proposed.
  - Removing Addenbrookes and the wider Cambridge Biomedical Campus from the STZ would result in residents of the zone paying the proposed charge to access the site while non-residents of the zone would not have to pay.
  - Maintaining Cambridge North train station in the STZ would require significant improvements to the bus services connecting rural areas to the station. It was suggested that a free shuttle service from the Milton Park & Ride to the station could also alleviate concerns about its inclusion in the zone.
- Considered and generally supported further consideration of free days or free time for account holders, based on the following observations:
- A system of free days or time could potentially resolve a wide range of difficult issues that had been raised with one simple approach, although the logistics and monitoring could be complicated.
  - More detailed information was needed on how such a system would function, including whether it would be applied per person, per vehicle or per household.
  - The vouchers for free days or time could potentially be exchanged for funds to help purchase a new bike or to use buses.
- Considered and acknowledged a need to further consider exemptions for all hospital patients and their visitors, based on the following observations:
- Access to hospitals had been a key issue identified in the consultation, with high parking charges at Addenbrookes already a cause of difficulty for many people visiting the site. However, it was suggested that a distinction should be made between people visiting the hospitals on the Cambridge

Biomedical Campus for medical reasons, and the significant proportion that travelled there for work.

- Improving public transport and active travel links at all hours in Addenbrookes and the wider Cambridge Biomedical Campus was important for staff and patients, particularly with the forthcoming construction of Cambridge South train station. It was suggested that a free shuttle service from the Trumpington Park & Ride to Addenbrookes and the CBC could also alleviate concerns about its inclusion in the zone.
  - The proposals already included various exemptions for regular visitors to Addenbrookes, and with improvements to the public transport and active travel links to the site included as a key feature of the proposals, additional exemptions could significantly affect the revenue that would fund such improvements.
  - Formal opinions should be sought from the various stakeholders on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, to best inform any decision on whether to expand the exemptions and to what extent to do so.
- Considered and generally supported further consideration of discounts for people on low income, based on the following observations:
- Argued that throughout the process of finalising the proposals the impact on people with lower income should be at the forefront of considerations, to ensure that the scheme was progressive. While it was acknowledged that they were likely most benefit from improvements to public transport, this was not universally the case.
  - Such a discount or exemption would also need to be considered for people with mobility or health issues that made it impossible to use public transport.
  - A discount for people on low income would potentially require a means testing process that it was suggested could be degrading for those who undertook it, while a reimbursement scheme would still require people to initially pay the charge. It was also argued that the need to consider such discounts indicated wider flaws in the proposals.
  - Further information was required on other processes, such as the NHS Healthcare Travel Costs Scheme, to establish how any changes to the proposals would be aligned.
- Considered and generally supported further consideration of exemptions for unpaid carers and charity volunteers, based on the following observations:
- Women were disproportionately affected by the lack of such exemptions, and it was argued that the value of their unpaid work should be reflected appropriately.

- The logistics for managing and monitoring such exemptions would be difficult, especially without a national definition for who would qualify for such categories.
- Considered and generally supported further consideration of exemptions for out-commuters near the boundary of the proposed STZ, based on the following observations:
- Most of the proposals were focused on commuting into the STZ, rather than commuting out of it, with such journeys not having a significant contribution to the overall congestion problems.
  - It was difficult to imagine a workable solution, although it was suggested that such people could keep their cars in Park and Ride sites, reaching them via active travel or public transport.

In addition to these discussions, the Joint Assembly:

- Acknowledged the need to refine the proposals, but expressed concern that making significant changes or changing the core parameters of the scheme could have too much of a negative impact on the objectives to reduce congestion and raise revenue for improving the bus and active travel network, suggesting that providing further discounts or exemptions could be a better option.
- Emphasised the need to ensure the proposals included enough flexibility to make amendments in the future once any scheme was in place and monitoring of its impacts and effectiveness had been carried out. It was not possible to envisage and consider every possible scenario that people may find themselves in beforehand.
- Emphasised the importance of informing people that the proposed charge would not be implemented until improvements to the public transport network had already been implemented. It was suggested that initial priority for bus improvements should be focused in rural areas, where the wider benefits of reduced congestion would not be experienced. Members highlighted the importance of informing people of the available options and any relevant considerations for their journeys, including those who travel for work, school and social reasons.
- Suggested that the promotion of car sharing could also be an effective way to reduce congestion and reduce dependency on bus services. Providing schools with bus passes to distribute could also help alleviate concerns related to school runs.
- Requested further information on journeys within the Greater Cambridge region, including where they originated and ended, and differentiating between peak hours and non-peak hours. Members also requested further information on the potential of setting up user accounts so that potential savings could be identified and passed on to drivers.

- Queried whether the findings from the consultation could also lead to separate work, including nudging travel behaviour in the short-term to improve usage of public transport and the active travel network. Members were informed that there was ongoing work around behaviour change that was being undertaken at the same time, including the improvement of collecting data on travel choices and behaviour.
- Emphasised that the Joint Assembly would like to scrutinise options for changes to the proposals, along with additional information on the impacts that such changes would have on the underlying objectives of the scheme, as well additional information on the economic impact to Cambridge and the wider region, before they were presented to the Executive Board. It was agreed to convene an extraordinary meeting on 26 June 2023, in advance of the Executive Board meeting scheduled for 29 June 2023.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson welcomed the findings of the second Making Connections consultation, noting the support for the proposals and acknowledging the concerns that had been raised. While a number of proposed changes had been considered by the Joint Assembly, with some receiving greater support than others, it had been agreed that a range of further information was required on the impacts that such changes would have on the overall scheme if they were implemented. He drew attention to underlying concerns that large scale changes could lead to a reduction in the revenue from the proposed STZ, potentially impacting the objective to improve public transport and active travel networks while reducing congestion, and emphasised the importance of improving trust and confidence of the public in the proposals. He concluded that members supported the Executive Board proceeding with the development of the proposals consider potential options for proposed changes and test them against the scheme's policies and objectives, although it was emphasised that the Joint Assembly would like to scrutinise the options before the Executive Board made a decision.

## 11. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that, further to the extraordinary joint meeting with the Executive Board that would be held on Monday 26 June 2023, the next scheduled meeting was due be held on Thursday 7 September 2023, and noted the programme of meeting dates up to the end of 2024.

Chairperson  
7 September 2023



Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 8 June 2023  
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Answer
<p style="text-align: center;">Al Hanagan Resident and member of Riverside Area Residents' Association</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</b></p> <p><b><i>Shared Use</i></b></p> <p>Riverside is a busy, often narrow and often contested space. Most conflict is between cyclists/ e-scooters and pedestrians as very few vehicles use Riverside. Pedestrians mainly walk along the riverfront and in the road as footpaths are narrow or non-existent. Three Greenways (Horningsea, Bottisham and Swaffhams) are projected to converge on Riverside. P5 of the report states that the DoT seeks a minimum 20% uplift in user numbers and the GCP may set itself a higher target. However, the proposed traffic count will only identify <u>existing</u> levels of conflict.</p> <p>Can the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State the GCP target figure for future volumes of (i) cyclists (ii) pedestrians (iii) other users such as e-scooters, powered bikes and mopeds, per Greenway?</li> <li>• Guarantee that the Feasibility stage will comprehensively model the impact of <u>all three</u> Greenways on cyclist, pedestrian and other user volumes along Riverside and at the Stourbridge Common entrance, based on the DoT minimum increase of 20% or the GCP target figure, whichever is higher?</li> <li>• Confirm that the Greenway website promise that "<i>In all places there will be improved safety measures, and the path will be separate from road traffic</i>" will apply to Riverside, and that if new and/or expanded footpaths are needed to protect pedestrians, these will be provided?</li> </ul>	<p>The target of 20% within the Outline Business Case is based on DfT guidance. The next stage of the Business Case (the Full Business Case) will look at specific targets in more detail. As the Joint Assembly and Executive Board have previously stated, the aim is to achieve as much mode shift as possible.</p> <p>The Full Business Case for these schemes will look at the cumulative effect of all 3 schemes in the area.</p> <p>The points with regard to design will be addressed in the next stage of design following comments received during this engagement. However, I would reiterate that RSA's are undertaken for all the Greenways schemes.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm that where Riverside is too narrow to accommodate both a cycle path and a footpath, pedestrian safety will be given <u>absolute priority</u> in layout design decisions?</li> </ul>	
<p>Professor Sir David Spiegelhalter Resident and member of Riverside Area Residents' Association</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</b></p> <p><b><i>Red Asphalt Surfacing</i></b></p> <p>Because of the shared use and space constraints in many sections of Riverside, we are concerned that a dedicated red asphalt cycle path will increase conflict and danger by creating a sense of entitlement among cyclists and powered scooters that they can travel at speed with impunity. It will be like putting a motorway down a high street. The core issue is Greenway user behaviour.</p> <p>Can the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guarantee that the Preliminary design stage review will seek out and consider all available research on the respective effects of (i) dedicated cycle paths, and (ii) shared space approaches, on cyclist and e-scooter user behaviour?</li> <li>• Guarantee that all such research will be made publicly available?</li> <li>• Guarantee that appropriate speed-reducing measures will be incorporated??</li> <li>• Guarantee design decisions on surfacing along Riverside will be informed by such research, and the issue of managing Greenway user behaviour to maximise pedestrian safety given <u>absolute priority</u> in design decisions?</li> </ul>	<p>A meeting was held with the Riverside Area Residents' Association and Local Members on 17th April 2023. GCP agreed it will undertake a review of the proposed red asphalt, the lining design and the entrance and egress to Stourbridge common during the next design stage.</p> <p>The design of these schemes are developed in accordance with local and national design standards. They are also subject to Road Safety Audit.</p>

<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</b></p> <p>It has been clear throughout this stage of the Greenways consultation, that the previous work done has not been fully understood, considered and acted upon. For example, where challenges were previously highlighted, little has been done to resolve the concerns. Furthermore many of the major infrastructure elements have been removed any decision making process behind their removal apparently arbitrary.</p> <p>For example: members of Camcycle recently submitted a FOI request to understand the reasoning behind the proposal for an unsatisfactory and dangerous section of route along Green Bank Road in Swaffham Bulbeck. The GCP stated that the "issues log" which they released earlier is the only documentation they have. The issues log mentions some potential downsides to that route, things like "the Ramblers might object" but they are both speculative and hardly decisive. This strongly implies that no serious work was done on progressing the proposal since the 2019 consultation for a route along the existing footpath.</p> <p>We have also heard in the response that an underpass on Ditton Lane would 'represent poor value for money' with the feasibility work identifying issues such as utilities, flood risk and land acquisition and safety of underpasses. These are typical constraints for infrastructure like this and are very similar to those of the Chisholm Trail underpass on Newmarket Road, a piece of infrastructure that has transformed cycling in the local area. Where is the detailed review of alternatives (including those previously suggested) to the underpass.</p> <p>It is clear that the design teams employed by the GCP to do this work are not being held to a high enough standard. We therefore ask the GCP to create a scrutiny panel to review the design work at a much more regular interval. The current level of engagement with key stakeholders is simply not enough.</p>	<p>I disagree.</p> <p>CamCycle alongside other user groups took part in a NMU workshop to understand the design on 10th February 2023. Bottisham Greenway engagement concluded in March 2023 where stakeholders and members of the public were invited to engage on the proposals.</p> <p>Where changes are being recommended to the Board these are clearly set out in the papers. Officers work closely with teams of engineers at specialist consultancies in order to inform the designs that are put forward for sign off by the Executive Board.</p> <p>Judgement on issues day to day is taken based on significant experience in delivery of schemes, working with internal stakeholders and consultants.</p> <p>Following the engagement for Swaffham Greenways (March 2023). GCP met with Elected Members and stakeholders to discuss re-routing cyclists and equestrians from Green Bank Road. This work is currently in progress with the design team</p> <p>GCP need to manage the competing priorities of the Greenways network whilst ensuring cost control and deliverability.</p> <p>Installing an underpass on Ditton Lane would be cost prohibitive and would add a considerable length to the programme due to the engagement and coordination with the utility companies.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Martin Lucas-Smith Petersfield Resident</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>One of the interesting outcomes of the last nine months of public debate on how to reduce traffic and fund public transport has been the emergence of an option which both sides seem to agree on: a Workplace Parking Levy. Both those campaigning for sustainable transport as well as even the South Cambs Conservative MP seem in favour.</p> <p>A Workplace Parking Levy (a charge on employers who provide workplace parking) would answer a common complaint: Namely, that larger employers, who benefit most from growth and are most responsible for the congestion problems it creates, currently do not contribute to solving it. The current GCP proposals put all the onus on citizens, omitting companies.</p> <p>A WPL would quickly bring in £5-10m of annual bus subsidy, reducing pressure on city-wide congestion charging. It would be straightforward to implement. It taxes employers not employees. It has no regressive impacts. It would not see employers move away just because of parking taxation. It doesn't need camera infrastructure, nor a complex exemption system. It encourages workplaces to help employees by subsidising cycling and public transport. And it nudges employers to replace inefficiently-used land with things like much-needed housing instead.</p> <p>Page 84 says “a Workplace Parking Levy scheme would perform significantly less well than a sustainable travel zone in terms of overall traffic reduction.”</p> <p>Whilst this is obviously true, no proposal is ever a complete solution. It's not a reason not to include it, balancing other measures.</p>	<p>In this session today, the Joint Assembly is asked to consider the report GCP Officers have prepared, which sets out the public response to the proposals on which we consulted, and to discuss the options available for adapting the scheme in response to the views shared in the 2022 Consultation.</p> <p>It has been quite a long journey of five years or more to get to the point of this consultation, that involved assessing and consulting on a range of options, including through a Citizens Assembly. The Making Connections proposals did not include a WPL it was assessed and rejected at those previous stages both by the technical assessment and by public opinion.</p> <p>Previous rounds of consultation, including 2017's Our Big Conversation, 2019's Choices for Better Journeys, and the 2021 Making Connections consultation, found that respondents preferred road user charging options to new parking charges, including a WPL.</p> <p>The conclusions of the previous technical work and consultation findings broadly reflects the points that Mr Lucas-Smith sets out: WPLs can raise revenue and reduce traffic but on a smaller scale than the proposed STZ and is would therefore have a much more modest impact on addressing the issues of congestion and pollution far below the objective of 15% below 2011 levels needed to ensure reliable and efficient public transport. A WPL alone won't solve the problem.</p> <p>There is of course nothing to preclude consideration of a WPL or other 'balancing measures' as suggested by Mr Lucas Smith. A WPL specifically would require a further statutory</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Can the Assembly please commit to keep a WPL on the agenda and consider its introduction alongside other measures? Speaking as a sustainable transport advocate frustrated with various aspects of the STZ, I can tell you that taxing larger businesses would give the GCP much-needed credibility by people on all sides of the debate.</p>	<p>consultation and so could not be implemented as part of a package on the basis of the consultation just held.</p> <p>It is worth noting that it is not quite correct to say that a WPL is a cost to employers but not employees. Whilst the charge is levied on employers, they may choose to pass this on to the employees that use the spaces and there would be no means of stopping them from doing so. Nottingham's experience with its WPL saw around 40% of employers pass on the costs to their employees. If implemented alongside the Sustainable Travel Zone, this would be likely to result in some people paying two different charges for the same car journey to work.</p>
<p>William Bannell</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>My question relates to the GCP making connections report, and the issue of public trust which has been destroyed in recent months by the manner and behaviour of Councillors with regard to the GCP plans for the city. This report is widely regarded as not credible, and not a genuine representation of what the public really thinks and feels.</p> <p>I'll give you 6 examples why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GCP data and stats in the 2022 presentation were debunked at an early stage by residents, calling into question the overall validity of the presentation itself (debunked figures which are still on the website I would like to add).</li> <li>- In December the County Council voted against having the consultation independently verified.</li> <li>- In March the County Council voted against holding a proper referendum which would have provided us with an authentic</li> </ul>	<p>GCP has taken care to ensure the integrity of all materials and communications presented during our Making Connections consultation although where specific concerns are raised about errors we will investigate and where necessary correct them.</p> <p>As part of our standard governance and assurance process all of our business cases are independently audited, as was the Strategic Outline Case presented to the Executive Board last September. Any future business case development will likewise be independently audited.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, GCP also engaged the Consultation Institute to provide an independent review of our approach.</p> <p>GCP met with a wide range of stakeholders in a series of formal and informal engagement events during the consultation, in order to maximise the number and variety of</p>

	<p>survey of opinion using the same strict rules as an election, which would have been credible and legitimate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were public meetings and engagements which took place over the consultation period which were not listed among the public engagements.</li> <li>- There was a meeting held with the GCP board at a local business which remained private and undisclosed to the public, not mentioned in the report. Maybe there were more secret undisclosed meetings.</li> <li>- And during the election, no candidate spoke in favour of the proposals, but did everything they could to avoid the issue and distance themselves from them.</li> </ul> <p>All this creates a very suspect picture, and Councillor's appear disingenuous. It is easy to understand why the people of Cambridge don't believe a word anyone here says.</p> <p>Can this Assembly carry on like everything is okay, or are they going to need to attempt to restore public confidence? How do Assembly members intend to address this issue of trust?</p>	<p>views received, which are being used to inform the next stages of our Making Connections programme. We have listed these in the consultation report but if you believe there have been specific omissions or oversights please let us know and we can if necessary correct them. The consultation period was a point in time for formal feedback on a specific question but as you would expect we continue to engage with stakeholders on an ongoing and as needed basis as a point of good practice.</p> <p>Decisions taken by the Cambridgeshire County Council, as well as electoral statements by candidates, are beyond GCP's responsibility and it would be inappropriate to comment on them.</p>
<p>David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Cambridge Living Streets welcomes the GCP report on the Making Connections consultation and calls on the Joint Assembly to endorse the call to action for active travel investment that it reveals. .</p> <p>70% of respondents support the bus improvement strategy. An even higher 75% of respondents call for measures to improve walking and cycling. This overwhelming mandate for a shift in priorities towards</p>	<p>Secure, long-term funding for active travel improvements, and creating the space for better pedestrian facilities and a safer and more pleasant environment is a core part of the Making Connections vision. You are right that there is clear support from the public for the walking, wheeling and public realm elements of the Making Connections proposals. Revenue raised from the Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ) would be intended to support continuing improvements and</p>

more active travel must be converted into actions or politicians and officers risk losing public confidence and trust.

As yet more evidence demonstrates that walking is the most used active travel mode, we question why it has been for so long the 'Cinderella' in transport investment? 65% of consultation respondents use it as their 'most common transport', reinforcing the point that walking - to work, to school and college, for shopping, leisure and access to amenities - is a key type of economic activity.

Why haven't the GCP and politicians changed their mindset on walking and moved beyond fine words and dribbles of investment to deliver a comprehensive strategy for the whole city and beyond? Why is so little attention paid to pavement quality and amenities when the evidence shows these are the greatest determinants of the choice to walk? And why haven't they 'joined the dots' and recognised that investment that transforms our streets into safer and pleasanter environments also supports our health and wellbeing, cuts costs for the NHS and helps to save the planet?

maintenance of cycling, walking and wheeling infrastructure. The precise balance and detail of investment remains to be defined, in part on the basis of the response to this consultation.

All of this evidence, including Living Streets Cambridge's response to the consultation, which was gratefully received, will form part of the evidence base that supports future decision making on how the sustainable travel fund should be best invested if some form of Making Connections proposals proceed.

The City Access programme is not only the Making Connections proposals, although that is the focus of this meeting. It also includes work on a Road Network Hierarchy Review for Cambridge, which takes a whole-city approach to understanding which routes and areas can be prioritised for place-making and active travel, including pedestrians. An update on RNHR is planned for later this year.

Elsewhere across the Transport Programme, GCP is committed to improving active travel in the Greater Cambridge area, and this includes walking and wheeling as well as cycling. In the proposed budget for the March 2023 Executive Board, around £125m was allocated to active travel projects. GCP are following the Active Travel Hierarchy that is adopted within the Active Travel Strategy for the County Council, this puts pedestrians at the top of the Hierarchy, and our schemes are designed taking this into account. We are providing for pedestrians across the Greenways network through reduction in speeds in urban areas to improve general safety, improvements to multiple crossings across the network and in some areas providing better segregation such as along Cowley Road, Milton Road and Histon Road.

<p style="text-align: center;">Sarah Hughes Cambs Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The Making Connections report clearly shows that the public would like better sustainable transport options: 70% are in favour of the proposed bus improvements and 75% of measures to improve walking, cycling and public spaces.</p> <p>Overall, only 17% of those polled by the GCP were against road charging in any form; many who opposed or were unsure about the STZ reported there were changes that would encourage them to support it.</p> <p>People will never be able to get to where they want to be safely, easily and affordably by bus, walking, wheeling or cycling while central government funding lacks a sustainable, long-term plan, and while bus services aren't under local control.</p> <p>Last October's bus service withdrawals would have left many villages without any service whatsoever, had the Combined Authority not funded tendered replacements. In February, the Government's three month extension to the Bus Recovery Grant was announced so late that some services had already been registered for withdrawal (again).</p> <p>In March, the Secretary of State for Transport announced cuts to active travel schemes in England outside London, including a two-thirds cut to promised capital investment in infrastructure for walking, wheeling, and cycling.</p> <p>A decision not to progress Making Connections would be a decision to perpetuate the sporadic, precarious funding situation, and a decision to tolerate aggravated traffic congestion, unreliable bus services and unsatisfactory conditions for walking, wheeling and cycling. It would</p>	<p>It is clear from the feedback from the consultation that there is a clear recognition of the transport issues facing our area, and a strong desire to see improvements to public transport and active travel.</p> <p>One of the most important aspects of the Making Connections programme is the potential to establish a stable, long-term funding source for public and sustainable transport for Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>The focus of today will be the Joint Assembly considering directly whether it considers it worth looking at potential amendments to the proposals that could balance the need to address the concerns we heard during the consultation but also the support we heard for the vision it sets out. I am sure they will welcome your comments which supports them in doing so.</p>
---	--	---



	<p>also be a decision to ignore the clear public message of support for sustainable transport.</p> <p>Given the precarious and short-term nature of central government funding for sustainable transport, does the Joint Assembly agree that, alongside bringing buses under contract to the local transport authority, they have a duty to work together to find a reliable funding source that is under local control?</p>	
<p>Neil Mackay Managing director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>During public questions in Cambridge City Council on May 25th I addressed the City Council. In doing so I had assumed that they had conducted a detailed impact analysis on the true cost of the £50 per lorry per day tax proposed and devised a means to scrutinise that data. I asked "What is that total figure and how was it derived?" I also asked "What will the total additional cost burden be for all Cambridge businesses that will fall within the currently proposed Congestion Charge zone?" Why do I need to know? Because my business receives between 6 and 10 deliveries by lorry per day. Which I estimate is equivalent to £104,000 pounds per year out of pocket.</p> <p>Sadly I failed to receive an adequate reply to either question Councillor Davey the newly elected leader of the City council stated that "The work that has been done to date on small business is not as we would like it!!" I would therefore like to address the same questions to the GCP Assembly in the hope that the organisation that has put forward the proposals for consultation, will themselves, have done some really rigorous work on this crucially important area, which is of great interest to not just the business operators within the area, but also their employees and customers.</p>	<p>The Strategic Outline Business Case considered looked at a range of impacts, on which basis a preferred option was put out to consultation. It followed standard approach set out by central government of an iterative method of scheme development and appraisal. Preliminary assessment was undertaken in order to identify a preferred option for consultation at a formative stage, which is what we did last year.</p> <p>Part of the purpose of the consultation was to gather evidence of expected impacts that could support any future more detailed scheme development and assessment of impacts.</p> <p>We have now heard what both the public and various stakeholders, including business, said about the proposals – including similar opinions to those expressed in this question. Now is the time to digest all the data, all the views and reflect what to do next. Evidence of concerns around impacts on businesses, especially small businesses is flagged in the JA papers as an issue to consider if further work is undertaken and there may be a range of ways of responding to these concerns informed by the consultation.</p>

		<p>If the Board asks us to proceed with further scheme development, any future stage of technical work would involve a more detailed round of both scheme design and impact assessment, which would be presented to Executive Board members in advance of them being asked to make a recommendation.</p> <p>The final decision would be a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council as the charging authority.</p>
<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that bus users in the Greater Cambridge area will remain unable to make convenient, affordable bus journeys, unless services are under local control and funding is sustainable, long-term and also under local control?</p> <p>October 2022's bus service withdrawals left many rural residents fearful of being unable to get to work, school/college, medical appointments or recreational activities, until the Combined Authority funded tendered replacements. Fears returned early this year, as the Government's three month extension to the Bus Recovery Grant was announced so late that some services had already been registered for withdrawal.</p> <p>Bus service provision in the Greater Cambridge area is over-ripe for reform – and has clear public support. The Making Connections report recorded 70% in favour of proposed bus improvements. Even those opposed to the Sustainable Travel Zone recognised – and in large measure supported – the need for better bus services.</p> <p>Whilst the commitment of the Greater Cambridge Partnership to collaborate with the Combined Authority to stabilise the network by</p>	<p>One of the most important aspects of the Making Connections programme is the potential to establish a stable, long-term funding source for public and sustainable transport for Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>It is certainly the case that the deregulated bus network nationally has been struggling, with passengers still below pre-COVID levels. Car traffic has recovered relatively more quickly, and we have therefore seen a car-led recovery from COVID. Last year, the Mayor of Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough took the decision to step in and help support a number of services that otherwise would have been withdrawn as not commercially viable. The response to the consultation feedback has made it clear that people want the bus network to be able to support a level of social need that goes beyond what can be, and is currently being, provided on a commercial basis. The question now is how to deliver that. The technical work that has led us to this point shows us that we need both revenue and a reduction in overall traffic levels to deliver that reliability and service that will give people genuine alternatives.</p>

	<p>bringing bus provision under local control is welcome, this is not enough.</p> <p>Bus service funding can neither rely solely on farebox revenue nor upon the vagaries of sporadic, precarious, central government grants.</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that, alongside bringing buses under contract to the local transport authority, they have a duty to work together to find reliable, sustainable funding sources which are under local control?</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members further agree that any decision to abandon (rather than modify) the Making Connections proposals would be a decision to ignore the clear public message of support for sustainable transport, a decision to tolerate aggravated traffic congestion, and a perpetuation of unreliable, declining, bus services?</p>	<p>It is now for the Joint Assembly and Executive Board to decide whether and how to adapt the proposals in order to respond to public feedback in the consultation, and build a scheme which addresses our area's transport needs.</p>
<p>Sara Lightowers on behalf of the group Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone'</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The Making Connections Report shows that there is significant concern amongst local residents and groups that the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone could disadvantage low-income groups. However, data suggests that these groups also disproportionately bear the serious harms of the status quo: air and noise pollution, and congested, unsafe roads. This is despite the fact that households in the lowest income areas contribute less to these problems due to lower rates of car ownership, fewer diesel vehicles, and fewer miles driven. In 2021, 38% of households in the lowest income quintile nationwide (compared with 16% in the highest quintile) did not own a car; infrequent and unreliable public transport provision is likely to be a major problem for this group, particularly for families who may be making multistep journeys.</p>	<p>GCP is committed to making sure that any proposal does not disadvantage those on low incomes, and that there is a more affordable alternative to the private car as a primary mode of travel. Alongside the consultation materials we published preliminary SDIA, HIA and EqIA documents. These are of course living documents and will be updated to reflect evidence gathered during the consultation, as well as to reflect any scheme changes, if the Board instructs us to proceed with further work.</p> <p>Our consultation materials emphasised that a scheme would have a range of Discounts, Exemptions, and Reimbursements (DERs) available, including a proposed low income discount, so that the Sustainable Travel Zone is not exclusionary based on wealth. The detailed public feedback on the way in which</p>

	<p>What assessment has the GCP made of the impacts, both economic and on health outcomes, on low income families, of the current proposals versus the status quo?</p>	<p>those DERs were set out that will help us with more detailed scheme design if the Board ask us to proceed.</p> <p>You are correct to point out that the package proposed was not only the zone but the approximate doubling in scale of the bus network through a range of service and route improvement and fare reductions – all of which would be expected to disproportionately benefit those on lower incomes who are more likely to be bus passengers and more likely to be underserved, isolated and let down by the status quo. You are also correct to point out the evidence shows that people on lower incomes suffer disproportionately from the environmental and health impacts caused by traffic congestion and pollution.</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The consultation shows strong support for active travel and public transport improvements and Camcycle believes that by making the scheme better and fairer we can achieve a high quality transport system for everyone.</p> <p><b>BETTER</b></p> <p>As noted in 3.12, many people have reminded the GCP that Making Connections must not be allowed to become solely about the bus network. 75% of consultation respondents cycled, with strong support for improved cycleways and secure cycle parking, including among those who opposed a road charge. The most popular sustainable travel measure was making the city more accessible for disabled people. The GCP should start delivering more active travel improvements that people want now on top of already scheduled projects.</p>	<p>In addition to the Making Connections proposals which are the focus of today, the GCP’s City Access programme includes work to develop an Integrated Parking Strategy which would consider the whole approach to parking across Greater Cambridge including how to tackle any unintended consequences of a potential STZ such as how to stop vehicles being left at the edges of the proposed Zone. An update is planned for later this year.</p> <p>With regards to bus fare pricing, I believe the proposal is that both Milton and Histon bus fare would be £1 - the rationale being that the £1 flat fare would apply to the current Stagecoach Megarider Zone and the £2 fare the Megarider plus zones.</p>

This must include links between towns and villages, not just into and within Cambridge. The GCP should also fast-track progress on the road network hierarchy and residents' parking schemes to free up road space for active travel.

**FAIRER**

Motor traffic reduction and a reliable source of funding are essential for better active travel, so it is vital that the GCP delivers a plan that will work. To address concerns, progress is needed on an appropriate scheme of exemptions. For example, a Workplace Parking Levy for the Biomedical Campus could ensure larger employers contribute while providing the necessary exclusions for those visiting the hospitals. Extending the zone to weekends but adding a system of free passes could provide more flexibility for people's different circumstances while still tackling traffic issues.

People in Cambridgeshire need better walking, cycling and wheeling infrastructure now and the guarantee of a scheme that will prioritise sustainable transport for the future. Will the GCP commit to strengthen its commitment to active travel by ring fencing funding and bringing forward new schemes and ensure the effectiveness of a revised STZ for funding and traffic reduction?

Of course with any such boundary it will create what feels like a slightly artificial distinction between places close to one another that are just inside and just outside the boundary.

These fare proposals, like everything in the consultation, were indicative and subject to change as more detailed work on bus service options progresses and depending on how the Board steers us to proceed in response to the consultation. The rationale for aligning with existing commercial fare zones was to allow rapid implementation of proposed bus improvements funded by the £50m the GCP board has set aside from the city deal to front-fund bus improvements before any charge comes into place. The consultation set out that these could start as early as next year depending on decision timing. Fare reductions could be one of the quickest things to implement if planned to align with the existing system.

There would be scope over time to review and amend the fare structure and deal with any anomalies that do arise, particularly if the Mayor takes forward a franchised network in which case the ongoing fare structure would be matter for the CPCA.