

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 10th September 2020
2:00 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly

Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Davey (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Sargeant	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers

Jo Baker	Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Debbie Bondi	Project Manager Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Paul Van de Bulk	Project Manager (GCP)
Grant Weller	Project Manager (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Noel Kavanagh and Andy Williams.

2. MEMBERSHIP

The Chairperson noted that there were currently two vacancies for University representatives following the resignations of Jo Sainsbury and Dr John Wells. Expressing thanks for their contributions as members of the Joint Assembly, he informed members that the University was in the process of selecting replacement representatives to nominate to the Executive Board at its meeting on 1st October 2020.

It was observed that the membership listed on page 2 of the agenda incorrectly listed Councillor Nicky Massey as a member and it was confirmed that she had been replaced by Councillor Mike Sargeant.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to 'Greenways – Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and The Swaffhams' (agenda item 7) due to being a Swaffham Resident.

Councillor Heather Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to 'Better Public Transport - Waterbeach to North East Cambridge' (agenda item 8) due to being a member of the South Cambridge District Council's Planning Committee.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to 'Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project' (agenda item 9) due to his employment at Marshall of Cambridge.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 4th June 2020, were agreed as a correct record, subject to clarifying that the Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor 'John' Williams in paragraph 3 of minute 1 (Election of Chairperson) and were signed by the Chairperson.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that nine public questions had been submitted, of which four had been accepted under the Public Questions Protocol as they related to an item on the agenda. The remaining five questions were of a general nature and as they did not specifically relate to an item on the agenda and would receive a written response from officers. The four questions that had been accepted all related to agenda item 7 (Greenways – Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and The Swaffhams) and would be taken at the start of that item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in **Appendix A** of the minutes. The Chairperson confirmed that the

public questions had been published online and informed members that public speakers had been offered the choice of either presenting their question themselves or having it read out by an officer.

One member queried whether the five questions that had been submitted and not accepted for the meeting would also be published, along with the GCP's responses to them. The Chief Executive agreed to make the questions and responses available to the Joint Assembly.

6. PETITIONS

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

7. GREENWAYS – BARTON, BOTTISHAM, HORNGINGSEA, SAWSTON AND THE SWAFFHAMS

Four public questions were received from Jim Chisholm, Sue Rogers (on behalf of Swavesey and District Bridleways Association) and Lynda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which included an update on progress with developing the Greenways, outcomes from recent public consultations, and an outline of scheme details and budget proposals for the Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and Swaffhams Greenways. It was noted that final proposals would be presented in 2021 following the completion of the detailed design process, while delivery times of the various schemes would be reduced whenever it was possible and reasonable to do so.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Highlighted the importance of maintaining cycle paths to deter cyclists from reverting to on-road routes. The Transport Director acknowledged that the issue had also been raised on other projects and explained that it was factored in to the design process when selecting the quality of materials. He also informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP was working with the County Council to establish agreed maintenance regimes to ensure adherence to a high standard.
- Queried whether the Greenways 'Quick Wins' would be compatible with other interventions announced by the County Council in response to Covid-19. Noting that the GCP had been asked to deliver some of the Council's response measures, the Transport Director emphasised that they were working together closely to ensure that all the various interventions complemented each other.
- Expressed concerns about negatively affecting people who already used existing facilities along the routes, particularly horse-riders, given the scarcity of bridleways. It was queried whether people would be able to participate further through consultations, with one member noting that section 2.4 of the report suggested that public consultation had been completed. The Transport Director noted that there had been consensus in support of the measures in general, although he recognised that specific concerns would inevitably be raised during the detailed design stage. That design process would involve land-owners, road safety experts and other affected people, and while it could not be

guaranteed that every element of the enhancements would benefit every potential user, there would not be any degradation for current users. The schemes would be presented again to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board following the design stage to reassure members that all had been done to incorporate the views expressed by such stakeholders.

- Raised concerns over the onward connections for cyclists travelling in to Cambridge on the Greenways, noting that some of the routes ended abruptly on roads that were dangerous for cyclists, such as the A603. Although it was acknowledged that inner-city cycling was not part of the Greenways project, members argued that cyclists would be discouraged from using the routes if they did not consider their onward travel to be safe. The Transport Director agreed with the concerns and the need to ensure safety beyond the end of the Greenways routes, although he emphasised that the projects had a specific scope by which they were constrained.
- Suggested that there should be coordination between the road safety objectives of the Greenways and Local Highways Improvement (LHI) initiatives put forward by parish and village councils. Working together in such a way, as was the case with the Comberton Greenway, could help resolve local issues that would perhaps not otherwise be picked up in the design of the Greenways.
- Suggested that there should be clear communication on why timelines reached four years for projects that received such widespread support. The Transport Director acknowledged that the timescales seemed lengthy but informed members that the timelines included the provision for land acquisition through compulsory purchase orders (CPOs). The GCP had already commenced discussions with landowners to seek land access through agreement in a non-judicial or adversarial manner, and when that was successful it could reduce the timeline by up to 18 months, although he clarified that they were willing to use CPOs on any of the Greenways if required.
- Commented that an initial breakdown of costs for the schemes would have been helpful to assess delivery, given that there were significant constructions involved, including two potential underpasses on the Barton Greenway. The Transport Director noted that although the schemes had gone through a high level of assessment, further technical assessment would be carried out in the next stage on features such as the underpasses. Clarifying that the report was not seeking approval of budgets for the routes, he informed members that the budgets would be calculated as part of the design process and included in the subsequent reports to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- Observed that sections of the Sawston Greenway passed through areas that were dark and unlit at night, and that officers would need to consider how to give people confidence to use the route.
- Requested that consultation documents be made more accessible by including clear keys and explanations of why different colours were used.
- Welcomed the Greenways as a form of supporting people using alternative modes of transport, as well as the fact that it developed a network of routes.

In summary, the Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly endorsed the schemes, notwithstanding the comments and concerns that had been raised, which would be reflected in the report to the Executive Board.

8. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT – WATERBEACH TO NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE

The Transport Director presented a report which provided an update on progress with the Waterbeach to North East Cambridge project, including feedback from pre-engagement with stakeholders and outline proposals for a series of integrated packages which would be the subject of consultation and further analysis, if supported by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Referring to the Public Engagement Report attached as Appendix 3 to the report, he informed the Joint Assembly that responses had been broadly positive and in support of improvements. Smarter Cambridge Transport had suggested that the project should focus on the rail corridor and cycling links at both ends, although the next stage of technical work would establish whether such an approach was appropriate or whether further cycling interventions would be necessary. Attention was drawn to the list of potential quick wins on page 106 of the agenda, which required further exploration and consideration before it could be decided whether they were achievable.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed support for moving on to the consultation phase of the scheme and recognised the need to improve transport options for Waterbeach and Milton.
- Observed that the figures relating to potential new homes and new jobs in the North East Cambridge area were incorrect in section 3.2 of the report, although they were correct in section 3.2.2 of Appendix 1. It was also noted that the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan was predicated on the principle of no increase to levels of traffic using Milton Road and the surrounding roads and local planning authorities had indicated that they would not allow new developments that failed to address this issue.
- Commented that the report did not provide clear information on the anticipated onward trips in to Cambridge, as users of the route would need to reach other parts of the city beyond areas in the North East. It needed to demonstrate how the project interacted with other projects, such as the guided busway, for such onward journeys. The Transport Director acknowledged the importance of establishing onward connections and assured the Joint Assembly that would be assessed during the design stage.
- Expressed concern that the Eastern route didn't serve the Science Park and suggested that this would be of great detriment to that option.
- Suggested that it would be complicated for the route to cross the A10, especially if the road was converted into a dual carriageway, with one member expressing concerns that traffic lights or even a level crossing might be required in order to further accommodate the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM).
- Observed that Table 5 on page 105 of the agenda rated the A10 route as negative with regard to journey speed and reliability, whereas a later section of the report scored the same route with the highest indicative score.

- Clarified that the selection was not restricted to one route and that a variety of alignments could therefore be implemented if appropriate. However, the Transport Director noted that they might not necessarily all be included in this particular scheme, citing the cycling improvements on Madingley Road that had arisen during the consultation phase of a separate project.
- Argued that rail improvements were a slow process and to focus solely on the rail corridor would therefore ignore the more immediate requirement for additional capacity.
- Queried whether the consultations would align with other similar consultations due to be held in the area on issues including other A10-related projects, but particularly one regarding the relocation of the sewage works given that two of the proposed routes could affect potential sites for the sewage works. The Transport Director informed members that the GCP was working closely with local planning authorities to align consultations, and he undertook to provide members with a more detailed response.
- Expressed concern that the proposed routes failed to serve many villages along the corridor, with one member noting that the map on page 67 of the agenda demonstrated a tendency for major projects to follow linear routes along corridors, with little connectivity branching outwards. The Transport Director noted that the GCP's strategy and overall package of interventions included large scale infrastructure projects but also smaller access projects that sought to connect villages and communities otherwise not served by public transport facilities, and emphasised the need to consider the project alongside other schemes.
- Commented that the map on page 67 of the agenda suggested that East – West Rail would not pass through Cambourne, although it had been confirmed that the route would pass through the town.
- Observed that without access to a structured transport system that included a reliable train station, people would continue to be limited to using the Park and Ride service, which required both car ownership and usage, and the modal shift sought by the GCP would remain unattainable.
- Noted that there had been an issue of ransom between developers in Waterbeach in a recent planning application, and queried whether any of the proposed quick wins would be affected by the issue. The Transport Director confirmed that the quick wins were not reliant on either of the developers involved in the dispute.
- Acknowledged that in line with an earlier decision, there would not be a Local Liaison Forum (LLF) set up for this project. LLFs had previously served as a constructive and unified way for various stakeholders to have the views expressed to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board through feedback from the respective LLF chairperson, rather than being required to submit individual responses. Acknowledging the importance of such engagement the Transport Director undertook to provide members with further information on how place based engagement would work in practice.
- Remarked that all of the routes appeared to be predicated on the destination being Cambridge North rail station, and sought clarification on the reasoning behind this approach. The Transport Director suggested that the final destination would be

established following public consultation and deliberation of the options, of which there were a number.

- Observed that the potential expansion of the A10 would improve road travel along the corridor to the detriment of the project, thus reducing the level of modal shift that it could achieve. The Transport Director acknowledged the concern and informed members that the GCP was liaising with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), who were responsible for the A10 improvements. He also noted that further research was required to establish how much of the traffic along the A10 was heading to alternative destinations to Cambridge.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly endorsed the direction as laid out in the report, and undertook to convey a summary of the comments and queries to the Executive Board.

9. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT – CAMBRIDGE EASTERN ACCESS PROJECT

The Joint Assembly received a report that provided an update on progress with the Cambridge Eastern Access (CEA) project, including feedback from pre-engagement with stakeholders, and outline proposals for a series of integrated packages which would be the subject of consultation and further analysis, if supported by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Referring to the Engagement Summary Report attached as Appendix 1 to the report, he informed the Joint Assembly that there had been general consensus supporting interventions in the area to promote alternatives to private car travel, although attention was drawn to some of the main issues that had been raised, as laid out in section 3.9 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Noted the observation on page 283 of the agenda that during peak hours Coldham's Lane carried a similar number of vehicles to Newmarket Road, and suggested that it should therefore receive a greater level of attention. The Project Manager acknowledged the observation but argued that a greater proportion of traffic on Coldham's Lane came from the surrounding residential area and was therefore more of a local issue, while Newmarket Road was the main strategic route coming from outside the city. He noted that a meeting was due to be held with the Local Residents Association to discuss the matter.
- Queried whether CPOs were being considered as part of the project, with one member recalling that a potential widening of Newmarket Road had been previously discarded because it would have required land acquisition from adjoining properties. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that CPOs were not considered by the GCP as a starting point on projects due to the fact that there were other alternatives available, although he acknowledged that they could not be ruled out completely.
- Identified the Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Way roundabout as a particularly difficult feature for cyclists to navigate and argued that cyclists would be deterred from using any new route if it were to end at the roundabout. The Project Manager acknowledged the concerns that had been raised about the roundabout during the public engagements and confirmed that options were being considered to resolve the safety issues.

- Observed that although the report discussed the issue of double tracking the Cambridge to Newmarket line, it failed to mention the Cambridge Corridor Study's estimated cost of £140m, which significantly exceeded the GCP's budget for the project. One member queried why it would be included in consultations if it was not a feasible option on which the GCP held influence. The Transport Director recognised that the double tracking was not within the remit of the GCP, but given that East West Rail was investigating possibilities to the east of Cambridge, he argued that it would be remiss to omit such considerations.
- Suggested that slip roads could be used to improve traffic flow on the A1303 between the A14 and the Airport Way roundabout, instead of the traffic lights that were proposed in the report, as they would allow traffic to flow more freely. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion but noted the importance of balancing the various traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements in the urban realm.
- Expressed support for considering improvements to Mill Road as part of the project. One member suggested that the purpose of recent and current interventions on Mill Road had been misunderstood by local residents and that the GCP should learn from such issues to avoid conflict in the future. The Transport Director noted that the project could not expand indefinitely, although he confirmed that any such issues or proposals raised during the consultation stage would be considered and explored appropriately.
- Observed that a high proportion of the issues raised during the public engagement were related to cycling and it was suggested that this could be due to the fact that the area was close to the city centre and therefore a popular route for cyclists. It was also noted that the boundary for improvements had been drawn close to the edge of Cambridge, whereas congestion issues started from further out, so the consultation should therefore also reach a wider area to better represent the actual usage. Noting that interventions could not extend further down the A14 as they would then correspond to national agencies, the Transport Director acknowledged the concerns over limited involvement in consultations and reassured the Joint Assembly that it would be considered as part of the development of the consultation process.
- Suggested that the interdependencies of the GCP's various schemes should be better promoted and emphasised during the consultation stage.
- Queried how public consultations would be carried out given current restrictions to public gatherings, and whether the level of engagement and effectiveness of consultations would be monitored. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that online consultation events had led to higher levels of attendance and participation. The Chief Executive recalled a previous report that had been presented to the Executive Board which recognised that the engagement approach would need to evolve as the GCP programme developed. While it was possible to have Local Liaison Forums when there were a small number of schemes, as the network of schemes expanded it was increasingly important to recognise how they interacted and complemented each other, which required a more place-based approach to engagement with communities. Noting that consultation responses would continue to be captured, logged and reported, she informed members that the Head of Communications would provide them with a briefing note on current and future consultation plans.

- Suggested that it would be beneficial to include an explicit commitment to maintaining the green spaces on Ditton Meadows and Coldham's Common in the proposals, to allay fears that they would be affected.
- Observed that the project would have knock-on effects in different areas of city, such as Cherry Hinton Road, and it was argued that such interdependencies should be built in to the project early on so that it could be considered during consultations.
- Emphasised the importance of improving the environment of Newmarket Road, as well as the traffic efficiency.
- Acknowledged the potential developments of Cambridge City Airport, noting that although it had not yet been included in the Local Plan, future decisions on the airport would potentially be influenced by the Eastern Access project and vice versa. The Transport Director assured members that the GCP worked closely with local planning authorities on such matters, given the fact that they were responsible for the local planning framework.

The Chairperson acknowledged broad consensus for the report's proposals and assured members that a summary their comments and questions would be shared with the Executive Board.

10. COVID-19 – SKILLS AND EMPLOYMENT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which included proposals for a package of measures to address the medium to long term impacts that Covid-19 was likely to have on the local skills base and labour market. Engagement with private sector partners and providers had identified four broad themes as key areas for intervention: supporting young people into employment, support for adults who need to retrain, preventing NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training), and ensuring employers could find the skills and talent they needed locally. A core set of activities had been established to support these themes, as set out in section 4.2 of the report.

Building on the work currently being carried out by Form the Future and Cambridge Regional College, it was proposed to procure a new GCP skills contract that would be more targeted and significant in scale. Local providers and businesses had indicated a desire for greater sustainability and continuity, leading to a proposal for a four-year contract which would run until the end of the current Gateway period in 2025. This would entail doubling the GCP's work in the skills and training field, which would require the contract to double in annual cost, leading to an estimated value of £2m, although the Head of Strategy and Programme noted that this figure would be tested with the market and adjusted if appropriate. The Joint Assembly was informed that in order to avoid a gap in provision when the current contract expired at the end of March 2021, the procurement process would need to commence in October 2020.

While discussing the proposals laid out in the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Recognised that the activities being carried out under the current contract had developed capacity, and the Head of Strategy and Programme indicated a desire to incorporate them in to the new, wider scope.

- Welcomed the proposal to support adults, given that many workers had lost their job security as a result of the impacts of Covid-19.
- Supported the development of a 'Cambridge Curriculum' and suggested that if it was successful, it could lead to similar schemes in other areas of the country.
- Noted the difficulty in attracting people into industries such as farming and agriculture, although it was argued that it was important for the GCP to do so.
- Observed that the best way for the GCP to support people in the current climate was through education and skills. One member, while acknowledging that the work needed to be carried out, questioned whether the GCP was the right body to do so. Another member argued that if the GCP did not do the work, then nobody would, suggesting that no other body locally had acted with such speed and efficiency on the issues as the GCP, which benefited from extensive connections to colleges and employers that were not easily available to local authorities. The Head of Strategy and Programme recognised that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board would decide the level of involvement and steer the programme, although she noted that the City Deal included commitments on skills. The underlying purpose of the City Deal was to sustain the local economy, and she argued that this area was currently fundamental to achieve that.
- Proposed the development of a local task force to provide assistance in situations of mass unemployment, such as the closure of a business and subsequent loss of dozens or hundreds of jobs in one locality. One member suggested that when faced by largescale unemployment, employers were often willing to invest to assist their former workers in securing new employment, and argued that this disposition could be supported by the GCP through some form of project funding basis. The Head of Strategy and Programme welcomed the proposal and agreed to consider it.
- Argued that greater focus should be placed on deprived areas in and around Cambridge. The Head of Strategy and Programme agreed with the observation and undertook to place a greater emphasis on targeting deprived areas if the proposals were accepted.
- Welcomed a proposed focus on the relationship between employers and colleges to encourage a resumption of apprenticeships that had dropped significantly in number over recent months. It was noted that employers were largely currently unable to employ additional people due to the risks involved, which meant that young people were being excluded from employment and education.
- Argued that the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union would also lead to a skills shortage that would affect the Greater Cambridge area.
- Highlighted the importance of supporting employers in their role of managing the concurrent work element and learning element of apprenticeships.
- Observed that there were multiple colleges in the GCP area and that the programme should be expanded from working through only one college. One member also noted that employers within Greater Cambridge also hired people from outside the area and therefore consideration should be given to colleges in surrounding areas.

- Suggested that it would be difficult to monitor the impact of the proposed focus on career activities at a primary school level, given that the contract was only for a four-year period. The Head of Strategy and Programme acknowledged the concern and informed the Joint Assembly that the procurement process would require applicants to demonstrate how they would carry out monitoring and evaluation on all the key areas.
- Argued that the list of proposed activities was too broad for the money that was being made available and would therefore need to be either slimmed down or supported by a greater level of funding. One member suggested that the list should be more targeted and focused on a smaller number of specific sectors, issues and measures. The Head of Strategy and Programme emphasised that early testing of the market would establish whether further funding would be necessary, while further discussions would be held with businesses and providers to establish whether it would be appropriate to refine the list of activities.
- Observed that the CPCA should be closely consulted on the proposals, given that they would also provide funding, although it was suggested that such funding was unlikely to be focused specifically on the Greater Cambridge Area. It was confirmed that detailed discussions had been held with CPCA officers, and the Joint Assembly was informed that the CPCA would deliver in the skills area through its Growth Service, which was going through the final stages of procurement. She assured members that the intention was not only to avoid duplication of the CPCA's work, but to maximise the effect of efforts by both bodies.
- Emphasised that the emerging labour market and skills requirement would change significantly over the coming months and years, and it was therefore vital to continuously monitor and assess the evolving dynamics to ensure that correct and up-to-date careers advice was provided to people. The Head of Strategy and Programme recognised the concern and noted that it would be explicitly included as part of the work.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly supported the proposals, although it had raised a number of concerns which would be reflected to the Executive Board.

11. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme and which also sought endorsement for three separate proposals. Members were informed that the skills working group had requested short-term opportunities to accompany the more long-term approach in tackling the impacts of Covid-19, which had led to the first proposal, which was for two additional careers advisors in the Greater Cambridge area for an initial 12-month period. The constrained capacity of the local power network continued to represent a barrier to growth in the Greater Cambridge area and initial research over the past two years had developed various scenarios which now required to progress to a more detailed stage, as proposed and laid out in section 15 of the report.

Following on from the development of a Local Economic Recovery Strategy with the CPCA and other local authorities, along with other research carried out by organisations such as Hatch Generis, it had been identified that there was a lack of Greater Cambridge-specific

sectorial data available. A proposal had been discussed with the Centre for Business Research (CBR) to produce a quarterly analysis that would allow the GCP to deliver interventions in a more focused and targeted way. The Head of Strategy and Programme noted that the data would be shared with other partners and therefore the cost of the research could potentially be shared as well.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that the offer of a 12-month contract might not be particularly attractive for potential career advisors, although the Head of Strategy and Programme informed members that it was a buoyant market for recruitment and that Form the Future had expressed confidence in being able to attract suitable candidates. She also noted that the contract could be extended at the end of twelve months if that was considered appropriate and beneficial.
- Queried whether an evaluation had been carried out on the impact of the inbound-lane closure on Histon Road for student journeys in to Cambridge, and also whether the reduction in public transport had affected such journeys. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that discussions were being held with Stagecoach on the impact to their network and whether any extra provision was considered necessary. Schools and colleges had only recently reopened following the lockdown and the situation would continue to be monitored for as long as necessary.
- Expressed concern that the City Access project remained in the design stage, given the Citizens' Assembly's call for action, and sought clarification on whether there would be any practical developments over the coming months. The Transport Director acknowledged the concern, although he observed that modal filters and road closures had been progressively introduced on an experimental basis and were going through a process of consultation. He noted that the transport situation had changed significantly as a result of Covid-19 and data was still being captured for analysis. It was already evident, for example, that movements had changed and although levels were rising again, there was a wider spread of journeys throughout the day than previous peak concentrations. Public transport travel was returning at a slower rate to private car travel and such profound implications would inevitably affect the GCP's larger strategy and policy decisions.
- Queried whether it would be possible to implement short-term measures to alleviate problems on Madingley Hill following the pause to the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. The Transport Director confirmed that temporary measures were not being planned, although he indicated that dialogue with the CPCA continued to try and resolve the issues that had led to the pause of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.
- Established that grid reinforcement could include upgrading current infrastructure or enhancing its connectivity.
- Welcomed the proposal to advance the project for improving the local energy grid, noting that various renewable energy projects had been discarded due to the inability of the energy grid to absorb the level of energy that they would have created. It was argued that the project would therefore support growth and assist progress towards becoming zero carbon.

- Recognised the need for improvements to the energy grid but expressed concerns that such improvements could be the statutory responsibility of another body and that therefore the GCP should aim to recover all of its costs related to the project. The problem was not simply caused by new connections in an expanding network, but also by an increase in usage by those already in the network. The Chief Executive acknowledged the concern and drew attention to section 15.6 of the report, which explained the reasoning behind the GCP's involvement. She also agreed that the business case would need to be explicit about recovering the project costs. The Project Manager Smart Cambridge also informed the Joint Assembly that discussions were being held with UK Power Networks as to whether they would provide funding.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly endorsed the three proposals contained with the report.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday 19th November 2020.

Appendix A - 10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions, Listed by Subject

Questioner		Response
<p style="text-align: center;">Sue Rogers Cycling Representative, Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum Secretary, Swavesey & District Bridleways Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: St Ives Greenway</p> <p>Why have local equestrians and local bridleway groups and British Horse Society County Access officers not being consulted with ahead of GCP Greenway proposals being drawn up for the St Ives Greenway? The documentation indicates that consultation has taken place.</p> <p>There has been no communication to date with the local equestrian sector in the St Ives Greenway area. As a result, the GCP proposals shown are less than ideal in some cases and may seriously disadvantage equestrians.</p> <p>For example, raising the section of busway embankment alongside the stretch of guided bus Public Bridleway which floods between Swavesey and Fen Drayton to provide a 2m path for walkers and cyclists. Equestrians are legal and frequent (daily) users of this section which can flood to a depth of 1-2m. Any flood mitigation to this route must include all legal users of this Public Bridleway and that includes equestrians. Equestrians should not be disadvantaged by design or designed out of existence.</p>	<p>The St Ives Greenway was considered at the Joint Assembly meeting on the 4th June 2020 and approved at the Executive Board meeting on the 25th June 2020.</p> <p>The officer report to the board was clear: <i>“The St Ives Greenway has been treated differently to the other Greenways ...rather than holding a full public consultation on the whole route a localised approach was taken, with engagement on each link leading to the development of proposals. This has included discussions with Parish Councils, landowners and other stakeholders.”</i></p> <p>As with all Greenway schemes there will be plenty of further opportunities for all stakeholders to engage and shape the schemes as we move into the detailed design stage. This dialogue will include local bridleway groups and the British Horse society.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: General</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge the importance of encouraging active travel commuting, Greenways must be planned with equal importance given to both leisure use by all non-motorised users (NMUs)(walkers, cyclists, equestrians, disabled people, and commuter-cycling use).</p> <p>The UK’s obesity crisis and Covid-19’s disproportionate effect on obese people needs good policy to improve the nation's health, wellbeing and fitness. Providing welcoming, encouraging, pleasant and safe to use ‘gold standard’ Greenways for all NMU groups is an important step towards this policy's delivery.</p>	<p>The GCP has made a commitment that the Greenways will enhance routes for all users and not disadvantage existing users.</p> <p>There will be opportunity for further engagement and discussion over design issues including surface and signage as the projects move forward.</p>

Appendix A - 10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions, Listed by Subject

	<p>The appropriation of Public Rights of Way to function as high-speed commuter cycling corridors is only acceptable where mitigation is in place to ensure that leisure use of such routes by other non-motorised user groups is not disadvantaged in any way. For example, if a right of way is hard-surfaced to provide a velodrome-like environment for the commuting cyclist who will then attain high speeds, a regularly-topped, parallel grass verge of equal width must be available and maintained to provide comfortable conditions for walkers, runners, dogwalkers and horse riders. Appropriate signage to remind cyclists of the need always to slow down and give way to walkers, equestrians and slower-moving cyclists (eg families with young children on bikes) would reduce the opportunity for conflict.</p> <p>Will the GCP undertake as a matter of principle, not to diminish the amenity benefit of existing rights of way for other users in the rush to provide for commuting cyclists on all the Greenway schemes?</p>	
<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: Barton Greenway</p> <p>Traffic calming schemes in Barton Village must include provision for horse riders. The quick win path on the Comberton Road where Barton PC has recorded speed in excess of 90 mph, did not include horse riders. Horse riders are not being safe guarded in the same way as other users but are being put at increased risk by cyclists speeding past on their inside as well as traffic on their outside. Traffic accidents have been reported by equestrians on this road which links two PRowS.</p> <p>Approval of the New Road junction crossing linking to the bridleway must include horse riders. At Haggis Farm Stables alone there are 60 horses who need safe access to the bridleway.</p> <p>Approval of the Underpasses must include access for horse riders. The horses from Haggis Farm, Barton, Coton and Grantchester all need safe places to cross the M11N slip road and Grantchester Road. The recent NMU fatality on the slip road must not be</p>	<p>As the BHC is aware the Greenways project team proposed that the quick win scheme in Barton would cater for all users including equestrians as the scheme would provide a useful link between two bridleways. Every effort was made to achieve this within the available time and budget, but specific constraints were identified by road safety auditors and the quick win, whilst significantly widening the existing path, was not able to provide an off-road path for equestrians at that time.</p> <p>The GCP has already committed to the principle of inclusion for all users and embedding access for horse riders along the Greenway routes. Thus scheme proposals include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Road junction crossing linking to the bridleway proposed does include horse riders • The underpasses proposed include access for horse riders

Appendix A - 10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions, Listed by Subject

	<p>repeated.</p> <p>Approval of the Bridge route over M11 must include horse riders. Local horse riders already use this path and need a safer route across the M11 bridge.</p> <p>Approval of the Barton Road route must include horse riders.</p> <p>The principles of equestrian inclusion set out above for the Barton Greenway, should be replicated on all the other Greenway schemes. To date, no useable equestrian access has been delivered on any of the Greenways or Quick Wins although these schemes are proposing to utilise part of the existing, inadequate and fragmented bridleway network for the creation of commuter cycling routes to the detriment of existing legal users.</p> <p>Will the Assembly approve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Greenway scheme only if all these changes to include equestrian access are accepted? • Other Greenway routes only if the principles of equestrian inclusion are embedded in the schemes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bridge route over M11 proposed does include horse riders <p>These proposals all rely on overcoming challenges and satisfying requirements of third parties, including Highways England.</p>
<p>Jim Chisholm</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: General</p> <p>“Over my dead body...”</p> <p>Not mine I hope.</p> <p>I must start by saying that there is lots of good stuff proposed.</p> <p>In 1995 I first became involved with the development of possible cycleways in Cambridgeshire through Sustrans and the sterling work of Nigel Brigham. I’ve some of those papers here (wave papers). Nigel rolled up the basic planning, land negotiations, and initial design in one project. Other similar consultants are available.</p>	<p>On the 19th February 2020 the GCP Executive Board approved the use of compulsory purchase powers to secure land, if required, should this not prove possible and/or timely through negotiation.</p>

Appendix A - 10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions, Listed by Subject

	<p>Some sections of those proposed routes were never delivered.</p> <p>This was because unlike road improvements, there was no commitment to use Compulsory Purchase Orders. Negotiations with Trusts on the other side of the Pond, farmers, and for small parcels of land with development potential stalled. On the Appendices to these documents I see, to my limited knowledge, at least two such sections that were never delivered.</p> <p>One became known as ‘over the farmer’s dead body’, and later ‘over the farmer’s son’s dead body’.</p> <p>It is paramount that this Assembly, and then the Board, give at this stage, a commitment, where required, to use CPO for these so valuable projects.</p> <p>I see no such commitment.</p> <p>For the Sawston Greenway some linked to Cambridge South station must wait, and 2kms has been vastly improved under the “Quick Wins” program. But an extremely substandard section within Stapleford, with an effective width of under a metre, carried on Monday morning over 250 bikes in little over an hour, with 150 being to Sawston Village College! A Sustrans agreement still exists for part for the proposed 2km improved route, and under 500m remains where commitments now, to use CPO would accelerate progress. Under current plans, all those I counted would have left school, before this route would open!</p> <p>Let us commit to using CPO, and to delivering what is possible now, don’t say ‘Four more years’.</p>	
--	--	--