



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board

Thursday 9th December 2021

4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

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

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in Attendance:

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

Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson

Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Dr Andy Williams	Business Representative (Substitute Member)

Officers:

Jasmine Berrill	Assistant Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Assistant Director: Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

2. Declarations of Interest

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

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 30th September 2021, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the correction of Councillor Meschini being a Member of Cambridgeshire County Council in the list of Members present on the first page, and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that ten public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in Appendix A of the minutes. It was clarified that those submitting questions had been offered the option of attending the meeting in person or having their question read out by an officer.

It was noted that one question related to Agenda Item 6 (Residents Parking Scheme Delivery), five questions related to Agenda Item 7 (Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network: Cycling Plus Consultation), and four questions related to agenda item 8 (Foxton Travel Hub).

5. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 18th November 2021.

6. Residents Parking Scheme Delivery

One public question was received from Councillor Jocelyne Scutt, City Councillor for West Chesterton. The question and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Assistant Director of Sustainable and Inclusive Growth presented a report to the Joint Assembly which outlined proposals for the resumption of delivery of Resident Parking Schemes (RPSs), following a request from the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee for the GCP to initiate the delivery of new schemes. It was proposed that the first stage would involve informal consultations, through local Members, on all the unimplemented indicative schemes, which would allow for the prioritising of schemes for delivery to support the wider aims of the City Access Strategy. In Romsey West, where informal consultations had already indicated support for a RPS, it was proposed to directly proceed to work with Members and residents to develop the proposals.

The development of an Integrated Parking Strategy with the County Council and City Council, which would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in 2022, would provide an opportunity to reflect on the future role of RPSs as part of a wider plan to manage parking in the city. Emphasising that the proposals at this stage did not include details about the order of delivery for schemes or factors such as boundaries or designs, the Assistant Director confirmed that the proposed consultations would lead to such developments, which would then be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly highlighted that members had shown a consensus in welcoming and supporting the recommendations, observing that the proposals represented a natural progression following the GCP's commitment to an Integrated Parking Strategy.

The Executive Board also welcomed the proposals for the resumption of RPSs and it was resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the indicative map of potential residents' parking schemes, and progress to date in delivering these;
- (b) Agree to proceed to informal consultation, through local members, on all the unimplemented indicative residents' parking schemes, as a first step towards prioritising schemes for delivery;
- (c) In Romsey West, where informal consultation has already indicated support for residents' parking, agree to work with members and residents to develop proposals; and
- (d) Note plans for the development of the Integrated Parking Strategy to consider delivery of residents' parking schemes in the medium term as well as the future evolution of existing schemes.

7. Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network: Cycling Plus Consultation

Five public questions were received from Councillor Linda King (on behalf of Willingham Parish Council), Mary Wheeler (on behalf of Windsor Road Residents'

Association), Vincent Poole, George Vardoulakis, and Marie Louise Holland. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth presented the report, which outlined the results of the Cycling Plus consultation, including thirteen routes that had been identified as missing links in the active travel network. Attention was drawn to the findings that were detailed in section 3 and Appendix 1 of the report, with safety, lower traffic levels, more direct routes and segregation identified as the key factors for people deciding to use active travel modes. Responses suggested there were high levels of support for further investment in the network, and members were informed that the indicative funding envelope of £20m would need to be increased significantly if all the schemes that had been identified were to be delivered. It was therefore proposed to move forward with the development of two schemes, as outlined in section 6.4 of the report, while simultaneously continuing to develop the active travel network in the context of consultation feedback and wider developments, including the City Access Strategy.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly noted that members had welcomed all the recommendations, with support also given to the remaining proposed schemes and the potential inclusion of further additional schemes. While consideration had been given to how the schemes had been prioritised, the Joint Assembly acknowledged the analysis that led to two of the schemes being progressed initially. The Chairperson also drew attention to the important relationship provided by the Making Connections consultations that had been identified by the Joint Assembly between providing capacity for funding for schemes further down the list and providing more capacity and road space within the highway network for this sort of schemes to proceed.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Supported the progression of active travel improvements on Hills Road and the A1134, noting that the consultations had produced extensive feedback and widespread support. Members welcomed the feedback from residents, and emphasised the value of local knowledge and the ideas that had been suggested, noting that sometimes just minor changes to the details of schemes could make them more attractive and safer. It was also suggested that further improvements could be considered, based on the contributions that had been made during the consultations.
- Observed that the active travel improvements were based on missing links that had been identified with the Greenways schemes that were already underway, and noted widespread support for those main schemes to be progressed as quickly as possible.
- Highlighted that every part of the Greater Cambridge area would be taken into consideration during the development of the City Access Strategy.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the results of the Cycling Plus consultation (Appendix 1 of the report);
- (b) Agree to prepare preliminary designs and strategic outline business cases for:
 - i. Active travel improvements for the A1134 North-South (Perne Road, Mowbray Road and Fendon Road), including considering how a scheme could improve provision for cyclists at the Addenbrooke's roundabout; and
 - ii. Active travel improvements for Hills Road from Hills Road Sixth Form College to the junction with Regent Street/Gonville Place/Lensfield Road; and
- (c) Agree to continue to develop the active travel network for Greater Cambridge in the context of the Cycling Plus consultation feedback, the emerging city access proposals discussed by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in September 2021 and the potential identification of a revenue source for additional investment in the network.

8. Foxton Travel Hub

Four public questions were received from Antony Carpen, Mal Schofield, Andy Brown (on behalf of Foxton Parish Council), and Amanda Hopewell (on behalf of Barrington Parish Council). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

A written statement from Councillor Peter McDonald, County Councillor for Duxford electoral division, was read out, in which he endorsed the concerns raised by the local community and asked the GCP to address them in further detail before the Travel Hub progressed. He requested more tangible evidence of it being a multi-modal hub with regular bus services to surrounding villages, and noted that he would seek assurances from County Council officers regarding the safety of the A10 crossing. Suggesting that a portion of any car parking revenue could be shared with the local community for active travel development to improve the multi-modal nature of the Travel Hub, he requested that these matters be included in the GCP's submission to the County Council's Planning Committee so that they could be taken into consideration during the determination of the matter.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress made on the Foxton Travel Hub. It also proposed progressing to the programme's next stage, which included preparing the Full Business Case and revising design features of the Travel Hub following the recent public engagement exercise and the proposed submission of a planning application. Attention was drawn to the proposed changes to the scheme that had been identified following engagement with the local community, which were set out in section 6.3 of the report, including a reduction to the number of car parking places, an increase to the number of bicycle parking spaces,

and the introduction of a bus service connecting residents of local villages to the facility.

Noting that concern had been expressed by members about the significant reduction in car parking spaces without any change to the original forecasted requirement, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly observed that officers had clarified that some users would arrive at the Travel Hub through the use of additional bus services and would therefore not require car parking spaces. Given that the Full Business Case would provide further clarity and evidence on such issues, as well as the fact that the number of car parking spaces could be increased at a later date if it became necessary, the Joint Assembly had supported the recommendations on the basis that it would have a further opportunity for consideration when presented for final approval. Members had also expressed concern about the A10 crossing, and the Chairperson noted that assurances had been given that safety standards would be met, and similarly the Joint Assembly and Executive Board would have another opportunity to consider the proposals when the Full Business Case was presented.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Sought clarification on whether the proposed 200 car parking spaces included disabled parking bays. The Transport Director confirmed that disabled parking bays would be provided in addition to the 200 car parking spaces, and that the provision would be above the required level.
- Welcomed the increased focus on the Travel Hub being multi-modal in nature, but emphasised the need to ensure that the bus service provided sufficient coverage to ensure this multi-modal nature.
- Observed that increasing bus connections to local communities would reduce traffic in surrounding villages if residents used the bus to access the Travel Hub.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring the A10 crossing was not just safe, but also convenient, including for people with disabilities. Observed that the A10 crossing at Foxton had been the GCP's highest priority project at its first meeting and expressed frustration that neither the County Council, Network Rail or the GCP had been able to resolve the issue since.
- Expressed concern that people could be less likely to use the Travel Hub if they did not have the reassurance that there would be any car parking spaces available. Noting that the main driver for an increase to the demand for the Travel Hub would be the opening of Cambridge South train station in 2025, it was suggested that the GCP should monitor usage before that, to ensure that it was prepared to increase capacity if such a need was identified.
- Drew attention to the danger for cyclists crossing the A10, and highlighted the need to ensure cycle routes were safe and well-lit.
- Welcomed the Combined Authority's commitment to buses and its improved working relationship with the GCP. Members also noted the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's suggestion that the dynamic Demand

Responsive Transport trial currently underway in Huntingdonshire could be replicated with the bus service to the Travel Hub.

The following amendments to recommendations (c) and (e) were proposed by Councillor Gough, seconded by Councillor Baigent, and agreed unanimously (additions in bold):

- (c) Agree that a planning application is made for the scheme, **emphasising its multi-modal nature and providing assurances on associated road safety issues**;
- (e) Approve the development of a bus service agreement with the Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority on GCP's behalf **that would provide regular bus services to the Travel Hub between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to and from the surrounding villages.**

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Note the findings of the public engagement exercise;
- (b) Approve the amendments to the design and associated infrastructure;
- (c) Agree that a planning application is made for the scheme, emphasising its multi-modal nature and providing assurances on associated road safety issues;
- (d) Approve the negotiation of land and rights required for the early delivery of the scheme including Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders as appropriate; and
- (e) Approve the development of a bus service agreement with the Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority on GCP's behalf that would provide regular bus services to the Travel Hub between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to and from the surrounding villages.

9. Electricity Grid Reinforcements: Update and Next Steps

The Chief Executive presented the report, which provided an update on the project to resolve electricity grid capacity constraints in the Greater Cambridge area. Noting that additional capacity was needed to support future growth of jobs and homes in the region, as well as to underpin ambitions around the electrification of transport, she emphasised that the standard process of increasing capacity in the system was reactive and therefore represented a risk to the delivery of future jobs and homes, due to the area's rapid growth. City Deal funding could therefore be used to invest in two proposed new grid substations, with the majority of the cost claimed back once new applicants were connected to the grid, and it was noted that the additional substations would increase grid capacity in the area by 29%. Members were informed that the preparatory work already carried out by the GCP had led to UK Power Networks (UKPN) recognising the need for additional capacity in its latest bid to the Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (Ofgem), although the Chief Executive highlighted that the

timeline of that process would be unable to address the urgent need for immediate action.

Noting that members of the Joint Assembly had expressed a variety of opinions and concerns about the recommendations, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly emphasised that there had been agreement about the need to progress the work as proposed. Concerns had been raised about the GCP's competence and capacity to carry out the work, and members had also observed that there was a proper body that would normally be expected to deliver such infrastructure. He also highlighted the Joint Assembly's request to ensure recovery of any funds that were provided.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Acknowledged the need to progress the work in order to remove restraints to growth in the Greater Cambridge area, although expressed concern that it was necessary for the GCP to undertake such work as a result of a failure in the regulatory system. It was argued that this would represent investment in an area that the GCP did not have experience, and would result in a significant dependence on work being carried out by consultants.
- Requested that officers continue to lobby Ofgem to develop regulatory incentives for UKPN to anticipate growth in the area and increase grid capacity accordingly. The Chief Executive confirmed that such efforts would continue and emphasised that the issue was an inhibitor to growth in areas of the country where the Government specifically wanted to see growth.

The Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

- (a) Approve the current preferred option, presented in Sections 6 and 7 of this report, including taking the project forward to Full Business Case, and the continuation of work to mitigate the risks outlined in Section 6.3 of this report; and
- (b) Approve the spend of £275,000 per substation from the already allocated budget in order to progress engineering feasibility work, detailed design, and planning, by securing the current UKPN 'Grid Connection Offers' within the required timeframe.

10. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Paying tribute to the work carried out by Form the Future and Cambridge Regional College in the twelve weeks of in-school teaching since the skills contract had been signed, she emphasised that they were doing all they could to adopt their practices and make sure they could engage as many young people as possible. Members were also informed that the latest research had been presented by the Centre for Business Research (CBR) on 8th December 2021, with a report based on the findings to be published on the GCP's website. It was highlighted that there had been a marginal drop in overall growth in the

Greater Cambridge area, from 4.8% in 2019/2020 to 3.7% in 2021, although the knowledge intensive sectors had maintained the previous level of around 8% growth.

Welcoming the research provided by the CBR, the Executive Board resolved unanimously to:

Note progress across the GCP programme.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on Thursday 17th March 2022.

Chairperson
17th March 2022

Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – 9th December 2021
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Answer
<p>Councillor Jocelyn Scutt</p>	<p>Agenda item 6 – Residents’ Parking Scheme Delivery</p> <p>Before the Residents Parking Scheme Programme was suspended by the County Council, the areas contiguous with Ascham, namely Elizabeth and Hurst Park, were a part of the Residents Parking Scheme Programme. Informal consultations had been conducted, but the possibility of advancing these areas was interrupted by the County Council suspension. The Milton Road Project, which will provide advantages to the area – good road grade (we are confidently trusting of subgrade, sub-base, membrane, paving slab and asphalt); well-constructed cycleways and footpaths, tree-lined and lush verges, with public art incorporated, whilst welcomed will impact on parking provision. The need for public consultation and progression on residents parking in the area is more than pressing already, and this major project makes it even more so.</p> <p>May residents have an assurance from the GPC that these areas will be at the front of the queue, with residents consulted and action taken accordingly, so that the parking needs can be fairly, competently, appropriately and promptly addressed.</p>	<p>The paper recommends beginning informal consultation on all areas of the city without a residents’ parking scheme, which would include the Elizabeth and Hurst Park areas. This will include understanding parking issues and pressures, as well as the linkages with other projects such as Milton Road. A prioritised delivery plan will be presented to the Executive Board for consideration next year.</p>
<p>Councillor Linda King, Willingham Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 - Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network</p> <p>Willingham is a large village in South Cambridgeshire with around 5000 inhabitants, but only one cycleway – an inadequate shared use one to the Busway at Longstanton, but not one to Cottenham village college. Numerous comments</p>	<p>The paper recommends continuing to develop the active travel network for Greater Cambridge in the context of the feedback from the Cycling Plus consultation, as well as the emerging city access strategy and wider local and national</p>

	<p>throughout the report highlight the need for better connections between rural locations and to education establishments and the inadequacy of shared use paths. For example, the executive summary mentions:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“concerns about the use of shared use paths which were felt to result in conflict between active travel modes; the need for more active travel routes around rural locations and to/from education/employment sites”</p> <p>When drawing up proposals for cycleways following the consultation, how will these many comments be taken into account in the provision of new cycleways?</p>	<p>policy developments. This would include continuing to work with partners to develop the rural cycling network, building on the greenways. The feedback from the consultation will inform the development and design of new cycleways and footpaths.</p>
<p>Mary Wheater, on behalf of the Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE)</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 - Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network</p> <p>The "Cycling plus" consultation, by its very title, emphasises the importance of cycling compared with other forms of active travel. In spite of this, more than half of respondents reported walking daily, whereas less than half said they cycled daily. Is there a danger of the GCP being influenced by vocal cycling campaign groups to the disadvantage of the quiet majority of pedestrians?</p> <p>The needs of pedestrians and those with disabilities seem rarely to be prioritised. It is unfortunate that while stakeholders responding to the consultation included three cycling pressure groups there was no-one representing the needs of those with physical disability, or of the older citizen. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many pavements in and around the City are in a poor state of repair and present trip hazards, particularly to walkers with imperfect vision. 	<p>The consultation sought feedback from people walking or using mobility aids, as well as people cycling, and this will be used to inform the design of the schemes which are recommended to be taken forward initially, as well as the continued development of the wider network.</p> <p>The GCP is also undertaking a study looking at accessibility for disabled and mobility impaired people across all modes of transport. This is expected to report next year and will inform transport proposals including the city access strategy, which aims to lower traffic levels to improve the environment for people walking or using mobility aids, cycling or using other active travel modes.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is common for illegally parked vehicles and other objects to obstruct pavements. • Shared cycle/pedestrian paths are hazardous to less-than-nimble pedestrians, and many pedestrian paths not designed to be shared are in fact used by cyclists. • The recent increase in the use of electric scooters and cycles (less-than-active transport and capable of silent speed) presents hazards to pedestrians <p>What improvements for pedestrians and the users of mobility aids are planned? Will they tackle the problems listed above?</p>	
<p>Vincent Poole</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 - Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network [specifically to pp 38-41 which looks at active travel and priority cycle routes]</p> <p>GCP papers for the joint assembly meeting on the 18th November 21 state (point 4.5 on page 41) '<i>The GCP and the County Council are undertaking a review of the Cambridge road network hierarchy, which will be consulted on in 2022. The review aims to better reflect current and future transport priorities and support the uptake of sustainable modes of transport</i>'.</p> <p>Motorised traffic should use appropriate roads: roads which are wider, roads that don't have multiple schools directly them on or just off them, roads that have protective grass verges, wider pavements, cycle lanes, and where homes are set back further from the road.</p> <p>Arbury Road at its eastern end has none of this protective infrastructure and has two schools directly on it and several more on adjacent roads. Arbury Road east is very narrow,</p>	<p>The city's current road network hierarchy dates from the 1980s. The GCP is working closely with the County Council and other partner authorities to review the hierarchy to better reflect current and future transport priorities. This will facilitate a more strategic approach to road space reallocation in the city to deliver a step change in active travel provision and to improve the reliability of public transport.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to pre-empt the outcome of the review, but have shared a copy of Mr Poole's comments concerning Arbury Road with officers undertaking the review.</p>

	<p>dangerous and does not even have B road designation. The Arbury Road is not a 'completed GCP project' (as suggested on p170 of today's Agenda) but is instead left as a dangerous 'missing link'.</p> <p>Please can the board confirm that Arbury Road east:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will not be considered a 'key corridor' for motorised traffic after the network hierarchy review • will instead be considered a strategic road for active travel as it already carries high cycle volumes despite its perils. Arbury Road East is an obvious gap in the cycle network for the city and creating a 'joined up network of safe and attractive active travel routes has been identified as a key priority for the city access strategy' as noted in todays Agenda (point 6.7 p41). Also Cambridge County Council's own LCWIP highlights Arbury Road east as a Priority Cycle Route (in appendix 2 (matrix) and in appendix 3 (map)) <p>Also will the GCP will act on the LWCIP's recommendation for 'short term' implementation of improvements.</p>	
George Vardulakis	<p>Agenda item 7 - Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network</p> <p>The GCP left behind a dangerous missing link in the cycling network when it failed to provide protection for the large number of cyclists using Arbury Road, Cambridge, at its eastern end. This section is a popular route to the river, the station and the cycle bridge and town but congestion and speeding means it is extremely dangerous, polluted and unpleasant. Cyclists (including school children heading to the NCA) are usually forced off the road onto a narrow pavement creating a further</p>	<p>The GCP is working closely with the County Council and other partner authorities to review the city's road network hierarchy to better reflect current and future transport priorities. The review will guide the future implementation of measures such as that proposed for Arbury Road.</p>

	<p>hazard to pedestrians. The two schools on Arbury Road mean school children use this narrow pavement each day, often walking inches from speeding cars and HGVs as there is no verge protection.</p> <p>Will the Committee support the implementation of measures identified in the LCWIP for Arbury Road where it is listed as a <u>priority</u> cycle route and 'short-term' for implementation? Only then can GCP correctly say that the Arbury Road corridor is complete.</p>	
<p>Marie-Louise Holland and James Murray-White</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 – Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network</p> <p>I refer to the proposed scheme for a section of orbital cycleway as described in an article (pages 12-14) in the Cambridge Cycling Campaign newsletter 117 (Dec 2014/Jan 2015) newsletter [extract attached].</p> <p>Darwin Green (Castle ward and sections in S. Cambs)</p> <p>A section of the orbital cycleway route was integral at the masterplanning stage of the proposed Darwin Green development. The cyclepath which would route along the perimeter of the development would link West Cambridge/Eddington to King's Hedges Road alongside the guided busway to the Science Park.</p> <p>Currently the provision of this transport infrastructure is not a priority for the developer. However, I ask the committee to reflect on how times have changed since 2014. Government funds are now available for transport projects which would never have been envisaged a decade ago. The expectation is that the developer (Barratt Wilson Homes) are responsible for</p>	<p>We understand that the orbital cycling route referred to forms part of the planning permission for the developer, and that they therefore have the responsibility for funding and delivering this scheme. It would be inappropriate for GCP or any other public funding to be used for this.</p> <p>We have requested that CCC as the Highways Authority provide an update on the current situation.</p>

	<p>the delivery of this important section of cycle route. I have spoken to their representatives and the project is not a priority.</p> <p>Would the GCP raise the importance of this long-awaited cycle route by offering match-funding to the developer, if the GCP cannot fund in total? This would kickstart a project which is desperately needed in the North-West of Cambridge and so much time has lapsed in the delivery of this Active Transport infrastructure project?</p>	
<p>Antony Carpen</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 – Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>I note the GCP plans for Foxton do not involve building a bridge for the A10 over the railway line/level crossing. The level crossing was formally identified in the Cambridgeshire Regional Plan of 1934 as and I quote: "One of the most obstructive". The author Mr William Davidge, and the Chair of the Committee Cllr Dr Alex Wood stated that Cambridgeshire County Council had plans for a bridge to be built over the railway line. Please could officers explain whether any analysis was done on Davidge's report, and whether any search of the county's archives was done on why the bridge remains unbuilt, and whether the results of archival searches were included in any analysis of whether to build a bridge over the railway line?</p>	<p>The Foxton Travel Hub scheme does not include building a bridge or bypass for the A10 over the railway line/level crossing. The development of the scheme is based on the current and emerging transport policy in the Greater Cambridge area and in accordance with DfT requirements.</p> <p>As such, a review of Mr William Davidge's work has not been undertaken.</p>
<p>Mal Schofield</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 – Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>There are operational concerns as confirmed by the minutes copied below. The travel hub and rail station need to be adjacent to each other on the same side of the track.</p> <p>“4.2 Members also queried plans for the A10 crossing, highlighting concerns about lighting, safety and ease of use. While it was acknowledged that the design would</p>	<p>Q1. The Foxton Travel Hub will offer users a quicker and more reliable public transport alternative to the high levels of highway congestion and journey time delay experienced on the A10. This is particularly the case with the Cambridge South Station on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site that is now planned for delivery.</p>

<p>meet the required safety standards, it was suggested that a Travel Hub needed additional measures to make sure interchange was as easy as possible; otherwise, it was unlikely to be fit for purpose"</p> <p>The strategic significance of a "travel hub" south of has still not been addressed. (Question to the Assembly see below*) The attached reference (Appendix 2) from East West Rail illustrates the issue well.</p> <p>Foxton as a "travel hub", Whittlesford as a "parkway" are designed to add capacity and choice to motorists accessing the city and Bio Medical Centre. In addition, there is the existing P&R at Trumpington and a proposed higher capacity P&R at Hauxton. Neither offers the choice of transfer from road to rail.</p> <p>Question. Does the Board consider the proposal as is stands, of strategic value as part of this future triple rail corridor?</p> <p>[*The A10 corridor, Royston to Trumpington is subject to traffic delays at the Foxton level crossing. There are other tail backs as the route reaches the villages of Hauxton & Harston and the M11 interchange. The Trumpington Park and Ride provides double decker bus access to the city centre along the A10 and single decker by guided busway via the Addenbrookes/Bio Medical Centre (BMC).</p> <p>This corridor is to be provided with a travel hub at Foxton*, recently scaled down in size and a second higher capacity Park & Ride just west of the M11 interchange. There is also the planned intent to site the new East West rail route in part within this corridor; destination an additional city rail station - South Cambridge, at the BMC. Three major rail links accessing the city from the south & west.</p>	<p>Q2. The Foxton Travel Hub is programmed to be complete in 2024. The scheme has been closely developed with the CSWTH and Cambridge South station projects, e.g. modelling approach.</p> <p>The proposals for an East-West Rail route linking Cambridge and Oxford are still in development. We await an update from EWR on next steps following their recent consultation and we look forward to working closely with them.</p>
---	--

	<p>Question. To what extent is there planned integration of this new infrastructure and its timing for the four schemes?]</p>	
<p>Andy Brown, Foxton Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 – Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>1. The whole Travel Hub concept needs to be considered as part of a broader transport review which will include the closure of Foxton Level Rail Crossing, a bypass for Foxton and Harston and true bus, cycle and pedestrian connectivity. This should include changing work/travel patterns due to Covid and the impact this has on the need for the current design of the Travel Hub, the serious safety issues of crossing the A10 to access the car park and the lack of true bus/ cycle/pedestrian connectivity. Will the Executive Board request a whole new Outline Business Case to reflect the latest iteration of the Travel Hub?</p> <p>2. The biggest item of concern with the current Travel Hub proposals is safety. There are major concerns for pedestrian safety in accessing the car park and station when crossing the very busy A10 using the current designed unlit and uncontrolled road crossings. There are also concerns for cycle safety intersecting pedestrian routes, as well as using the proposed width reduced route crossing the railway tracks at the level crossing. It also seems that there is a potential for traffic chaos with vehicles becoming trapped within the zones of the level crossing itself.</p> <p>3. Please will the Executive Board seriously consider ‘mothballing’ the whole scheme for at least a year and go</p>	<p>Q1. The scheme has been developed to promote sustainable and active transport schemes to seek to reduce private car use – not move the problem as in the case of the bypass.</p> <p>Q2. The design for the Travel Hub and crossing of the A10 has been developed in accordance with national standards and the requirement to undertake a Road Safety Assessment (RSA).</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing has a central refuge and reduced speed limit, been designed to DMRB (design manual roads & bridges) and have been through the RSA 1 process. The design does include lighting.</p> <p>Q3. The proposed scheme seeks to intercept the existing commuting trips already on the A10 and projected increase in trips associated with Cambridge South Station.</p> <p>The technical modelling assessment does not show more car journeys to Foxton as a result of the scheme.</p>

	<p>back to the drawing board to take proper and effective account of all the multitude of problems which have not been satisfactorily addressed? The current Travel Hub as presented is just not fit for purpose and could end up generating more car journeys to Foxtton with a free or low cost car park near Foxtton station –totally contrary to the sustainable transport aims of the GCP.</p>	
<p>Amanda Hopewell on behalf of Barrington Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 - Foxtton Travel Hub</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the GCP confident that the Safety Case for the proposed “Foxtton Hub” is robust and that the risk of fatality or serious injury – especially amongst the vulnerable when crossing the A10 is acceptable? 2. Is the GCP confident that the Business Case for the proposed “Foxtton Hub” passes the appropriate tests? Has any allowance made for substantial s106 payments to Foxtton, and to Barrington to support traffic calming through the village? 3. Is the GCP convinced that the proposed “Foxtton Hub” passes the Sustainable Development test? Is this a truly environmentally, socially, and economically sustainable multi-modal “travel hub”, or is it just another station car park? 4. Is the GCP aware that this proposal does not address, but will most likely worsen, the already significant traffic hold-ups at the Foxtton Level Crossing? 5. Is the GCP confident that the current proposed location for the Travel Hub and the timing of its implementation, is consistent with the CPCA’s Local Transport Plan (2020) which recognises the rail crossing as a “Pinch Point”? 6. What data has been used to properly consider the traffic impact on local villages? Our independent consultants found excessive speeds through Barrington from traffic 	<p>Q1. The design for the Travel Hub and crossing of the A10 has been developed in accordance with national standards and the requirement to undertake a Road Safety Assessment (RSA). This assessment is made for all users of the site and surrounding highway area.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing has a central refuge, been designed to DMRB (design manual roads & bridges) and have been through the RSA 1 process. The design does include lighting.</p> <p>Q2. The FBC will be presented to a future GCP Executive Board when a final decision can be made. Further work is needed to complete the FBC in line with the government guidance for developing transport schemes.</p> <p>Q3. The principle of intercepting car journeys and switching commuters onto sustainable transport modes complies with the GCP aims and objectives.</p> <p>The site is seeking to achieve;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Up to 20% Biodiversity Net Gain ○ Connect with the planned Greenways, ○ Provide new bus routes and to better connect commuters to the train network.

	<p>avoiding the Foxtan crossing.</p> <p>7. Why has the Choice of Site not been reconsidered, given so many objections on the grounds of safety, environmental impact, sustainability and the lack of a convincing business case – for this “wrong side” southern location? Can the GCP please defer this proposal and consider a more holistic approach to the complex problems arising from the A10 / Foxtan Level Crossing?</p> <p>Barrington Parish Council also supports the approach and questions being put to the GCP by Foxtan Parish Council.</p>	<p>Q4. The proposed scheme seeks to intercept 200 car-based journeys from the A10 on a daily basis. The work undertaken does not show that the traffic ‘hold-ups’ at the Foxtan Level Crossing will be made worse.</p> <p>Q5. The proposed location for the Travel Hub and the timing of its implementation, is consistent with the current and emerging CPCA Local Transport Plan (2020).</p> <p>Q6. The scheme has used Cambridge Sub regional Model (CSRM) as well as localised traffic counts on the A10.</p> <p>Q7. The choice of site made by the GCP Executive Board in 2019. The site selection followed government guidance for developing transport schemes.</p>
--	--	--