



**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 18th November 2021

2:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Rosy Moore (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Alex Beckett	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers:

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

Apologies for absence were received from Heather Richards and Councillor Heather Williams. It was noted that Councillor Williams had submitted written comments that would be read out during the relevant agenda items.

2. Declarations of Interest

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest due to his employment with Marshall of Cambridge.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 9th September 2021, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the correction of the date of the previous meeting from “24th February” to “10th June” in Agenda Item 3 (Minutes), and signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that seven 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 three questions related to Agenda Item 7 (Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network: Cycling Plus Consultation), two questions related to Agenda Item 8 (Foxton Travel Hub), one question related to Agenda Item 9 (Electricity Grid Reinforcements: Update and Next Steps), and one question related to agenda item 10 (Quarterly Progress Report).

5. Petitions

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

6. Residents Parking Scheme Delivery

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 an 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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed that the County Council had agreed to restart the implementation and development of further RPSs.
- Confirmed that the indicative map of potential RPSs, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, had not been fully defined or finalised, observing that areas including Abbey and East Barnwell had not been included at this stage.
- Observed that the development of the City Access Strategy could lead to the removal of street parking on certain roads to increase space for public transport and active travel, and sought clarification on whether the schemes would be amendable in such circumstances. Noting that the ongoing road network hierarchy review, due to be completed in early 2022, would inform such issues, the Assistant Director confirmed that the removal of parking would be taken into consideration discussed with local communities if it was considered to be of benefit.
- Clarified that the GCP would consider how to disincentivise the ownership of multiple cars as part of the development of the Integrated Parking Strategy.
- Suggested that it would be beneficial to develop a form of park and ride facility that would allow people who needed a car to access their vehicle by walking or bicycle, rather than keeping it outside their house, particularly if a road charge was implemented within the city of Cambridge.
- Highlighted the importance, when designing the schemes, of considering the needs of people who could not cycle, walk or use public transport, as well as how they would affect the ability of people on lower income levels to access places of education or work.
- Sought clarification on why it was proposed to progress with the Romsey West RPS while requiring other schemes that had also already held consultations to undertake further consultations prior to their development and implementation. Noting the higher level of local support for the Romsey West RPS than other

schemes, the Assistant Director observed that the consultations for that scheme had been held more recently than those of other schemes.

- Observed that the proposal to work through local Members would be more complicated for the GCP than the County Council, given the involvement of Members from two councils, and argued that it would be important to clarify the level of such involvement. The Assistant Director emphasised that the County Council would maintain responsibility for parking matters, although she confirmed that the GCP would also engage with City Council Members.
- Requested further information on the mechanisms and timescale for the development of an Integrated Parking Strategy and its various aspects listed in section 3.4 of the report. Noting that such a timescale was currently being established with colleagues at the County Council and City Council, the Assistant Director emphasised that it needed to be carried out in parallel to the ongoing Making Connections consultations for the City Access Strategy, which would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in June 2022.
- Expressed concern about the level of work involved in developing and implementing RPSs, but confirmed that the GCP had sufficient levels of staffing and expertise for its undertaking.
- Observed that areas providing a large amount of free parking, such as the Beehive Shopping Centre and other retail parks, generated significant levels of traffic and should therefore benefit from better public transport links, although it was acknowledged that the Making Connection consultations were looking to improve public and active transport to such locations.
- Sought clarification on whether schemes that had received lower levels of support during previous consultations would receive lower priority, particularly in the case of the Coleridge East RPS, which had subsequently experienced an impact from the implementation of the Coleridge West RPS. It was also argued that changes to traffic behaviour during the pandemic could have affected residents' opinions. Noting that a significant period of time had passed since the previous consultations, as well as elections resulting in some new local Members, the Assistant Director confirmed that a fresh look would be taken with all the schemes.
- Expressed concern about enforcement of RPSs, as well as ticketing systems for business users, suggesting that a phone app would be useful. The Assistant Director undertook to discuss the matters with officers at the County Council.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there was support for the proposals and no objections had been expressed, although specific issues had been raised that would be further considered by the GCP.

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

Three public questions were received from Stephen Pratt (on behalf of the Fendon Road Residents' Association), Lynda Warth (on behalf of the British Horse Society), and Matthew Danish (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Daniel Lee, City Councillor for the Queen Edith's ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Welcoming the report's proposal for the development of active travel improvements for the A1134 North-South, Councillor Lee highlighted that the road was one of the main roads leading to Addenbrooke's and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and noted that it was heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists throughout the day. Arguing that recent accidents had demonstrated the necessity to improve the safety of infrastructure in the area, he suggested that a segregated cycleway would achieve this and would support the GCP's objective to encourage active travel and reduce traffic levels.

Councillor Jamie Dalzell, City Councillor for the West Chesterton ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Indicating support for two of the potential schemes mentioned in the report that passed through his ward, Councillor Dalzell welcomed the County Council's decision to delegate further decision-making powers to the GCP and paid tribute to the GCP's model of consultation with local residents, which he hoped to see adopted more widely. While emphasising the benefits that potential schemes would bring to West Chesterton, he questioned whether such future schemes could be developed in phases and sought clarification on how they would be funded. Observing that the ongoing Making Connections consultations were considering the wider issue of developing a future revenue stream for long-term investment in the active travel network, the Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth noted that there were also alternative sources of funding, such as through the Government, which would be investigated as part of the development of projects.

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 4.4 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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the proposals and emphasised the importance of creating a joined-up network of cycle routes as a priority, while also expressing concern about the quality of road surfaces for cyclists.
- Observed that cycling was often a significantly quicker option than travelling the same journey by public transport, and suggested that e-bikes should also be considered while developing the active travel network.
- Drew attention to the Citizens' Assembly's call to be bold, and encouraged officers to consider bold actions, for example pairing roads, such as Trumpington Road and Hills Road, to develop a circular one-way system. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth acknowledged the call for bold action and noted that the ongoing road network hierarchy would establish how different roads could be treated.
- Highlighted the importance of basing decisions on evidence, rather than just levels of support or objection, and argued that it would be useful for models of estimated increase in usage to contain numbers, rather than percentages.
- Acknowledged that while it was necessary to implement additional cycling infrastructure, accidents would continue to occur regardless, with one member suggesting that cyclists were sometimes the cause of accidents.
- Highlighted the need to engage with all non-motorised users, including horse riders, to ensure that the surface materials and layout of schemes do not impede access. Noting that the GCP took such matters into consideration when developing more rural schemes, the Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth confirmed that such provisions would be made where appropriate and feasible.
- Expressed support for developing the two schemes that had been identified in the report, noting their priority for immediate attention.
- Considered whether it would be appropriate to formally request additional funding be allocated beyond the indicative £20m envelope, given the widespread support for the schemes. Acknowledging that there were more schemes being considered than the level of funding would provide for, the Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth informed members that the Future Investment Strategy was restricted in being able to allocate further funding, although she argued that this should not restrict such schemes being considered, given the potential for alternative future funding and revenue streams.
- Suggested that in order to encourage people in more rural areas to use active travel modes of transport, further investigation was required to establish missing links beyond the city and its immediate surrounding area.
- Suggested that a schedule for the development and delivery of all the proposed schemes would be useful, while seeing how they fitted into the wider strategies

and projects under development, as well as already implemented cycle routes, would further demonstrate their role in creating a joined-up network. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth observed that it would be possible to develop a timescale for the network once the Making Connections consultations had concluded and been analysed.

- Confirmed that the proposed A1134 North-South scheme included Brooks Road.
- Emphasised the importance of engaging with local residents when designing schemes.
- Expressed concerns about the priority of schemes in section 4.3 of the report, particularly regarding the Cherry Hinton Road scheme, which had already received high levels of support in previous consultations, and had also received the second highest number of votes in the table set out in section 3.7 of the report. It was also observed that planning applications had recently been approved for sections of East Road that would include improvements to the current cycling provision in the relevant stretch of the A1134 North-South scheme, and queried how such a factor could be taken into consideration when prioritising schemes, with a section of that scheme already designed and externally funded. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth confirmed that schemes could be brought forward earlier than their placing on the list of priorities if factors such as alternative funding or other developments allowed it.
- Argued that it was misleading for section 3.3 of the report to state that 98% of respondents never rode horses, given that most of the respondents were city-dwellers. It was noted that there were 25,000 horses in Cambridgeshire, and one member argued that joining up routes for horse riders would improve trekking and tourism in the area.
- Observed that improvements to safety were the main reason for people taking up cycling, including taking children to school by bicycle.
- Sought clarification on what alternative funding sources might be available beyond the establishment of a future revenue stream, funding from the Combined Authority, or Section 106 funding. One member also expressed concern about reallocating any further money from improving bus services, as had been the case with the indicative £20m, and it was observed that alongside obtaining funding for such schemes, it would also be necessary to reduce car volumes to enable their delivery. The Assistant Director for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth assured the Joint Assembly that the GCP was considering all potential sources of funding, particularly when taking into consideration members' calls for speedy delivery of the schemes.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there had been no objections to the two proposed projects being progressed as indicated in the report, although concerns had been raised about other schemes being lower down the list. He also highlighted members' concern about obtaining additional funding for the rest of the schemes.

8. Foxton Travel Hub

Two public questions were received from Mal Schofield and Annabelle Wright (on behalf of Foxton Parish Council). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

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 4.3 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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Expressed concern about the feasibility of reducing the number of car parking spaces by 60% in achieving the project's objectives, which included reducing traffic levels through Harston, reducing traffic queues in Foxton, and providing alternative travel options for reaching Addenbrooke's, and queried how the GCP's initial analysis had changed so significantly to justify the proposed reduction. Noting that the initial assessment of the impact of Cambridge South train station on Foxton had identified approximately 900 additional passengers per day, the Transport Director informed Members that the GCP's feasibility work had suggested approximately 500 car parking spaces would be sufficient for delivery. While this level of car parking space was agreed by the Executive Board previously, further engagement with the local community had identified concerns about its sustainability, the capability and capacity for bicycles, and how it would be linked to local bus services, and members were informed that reducing the number of car parking spaces would deliver on these objectives in a different way.
- Sought clarification on whether the number of car parking spaces could be increased in the future if required by the level of demand, without negatively affecting the number of bicycle parking spaces. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that there were no plans for future development, although he acknowledged that this could be reconsidered if the facility was successful and further expansion became necessary.
- Expressed concern about the lack of a safe and easy crossing over the A10, particularly when it was dark, and suggested that the lack of such a provision could reduce the effectiveness and attractiveness of the Travel Hub's modal interchange facilities. The Transport Director assured members that the A10 crossing would be designed to safe standards, and clarified that if the continuous safety checks established that it was either not safe nor an improvement on the current situation, the project would not progress, or an alternative intervention would be considered. Acknowledging that the ideal crossing would be either over or under the A10, he

emphasised that such an intervention would have significant cost implications and would also affect the amenity and environment of the village location.

- Acknowledged that the proposed changes demonstrated the GCP's willingness to respond to concerns raised during engagement with the local community, although it was also argued that further consideration should be given to making the Travel Hub of benefit to local residents and existing users of the train station.
- Suggested that the broader congestion issues on the A10 were a matter that could be considered by the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee. Acknowledging the significant level of traffic on the A10, the Transport Director informed members that there was no single solution to the issue and that a variety of interventions were required, including the proposed expansion of the Park and Ride in Trumpington. While most of the traffic entering Cambridge from the South-West side originated on the M11, the Foxton Travel Hub would intercept some vehicles further away and thus reduce congestion.
- Confirmed that the possibility of relocating the station to the other side of the A10 had previously been considered.
- Highlighted the importance of the Travel Hub acting as an interchange between different modes of transport and expressed concern that the plans did not appear to provide for greater levels of bus connections in the future. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns and undertook to further investigate the issue.
- Emphasised the need for secure bicycle parking, given the extended periods of time that people would be leaving the bicycles at the Travel Hub. The Transport Director informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP was looking to install secure bicycle parking at all Park and Ride sites and other key locations across the area.
- Expressed concern that car users could prefer to drive beyond Foxton and use alternative current and planned park and ride facilities closer to Cambridge.
- Sought clarification on whether the location of the Travel Hub would impede any future attempt to remove the level crossing in Foxton. The Transport Director confirmed that the GCP had consulted Network Rail to ensure that they would consider the interaction with the Travel Hub in any future proposals that were developed.
- Observed that the proposed changes to some of the key design elements would first go through the appropriate planning process before the Final Business Case was presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there had been no specific objections to the proposed changes, although significant concerns had been raised that would need to be considered before the Full Business Case was presented.

9. Electricity Grid Reinforcements: Update and Next Steps

One public question was received from Reverend Anthony Mitchell (on behalf of Bar Hill Parish Council). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

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.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Acknowledged the urgent requirement for increased grid capacity in order to prevent restraints on growth in the region, with one member paying tribute to the GCP for its boldness in accepting a significant level of financial risk. However, members also expressed concern about taking on the risk instead of private developers, and emphasised the importance of recovering costs once new applicants were connected to the grid. The Consultant informed members that the Electricity (Connection Charges) Regulations 2017 (ECCR) contained restrictions for recovering costs through electricity connection charging, although she noted that the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy were revising the ECCR within the next eighteen months. She suggested that the GCP could consider alternative revenue recovery options, such as Homes England funding or Section 106 funding. One member also suggested consulting with local authorities to discuss options for raising additional funds in anticipation of returning it with full cost recovery. Attention was drawn to the case for public funding set out in section 2.5 of the Outline Business Case, which included a diagram demonstrating the twin-track approach to seeking funding for the two substations.
- Argued that, despite other regions experiencing similar problems, the GCP's work to date demonstrated that it continued to be at the forefront of finding solutions.
- Highlighted the need to continue lobbying, along with other high-growth areas, for changes to the regulatory framework that required such work in the first place. The Chief Executive informed members that the GCP had written to Government ministers and held a meeting with Ofgem to express its concerns, and would continue to expand its lobbying efforts.

- Expressed concern that data used by the Government for predicting levels of growth had been consistently lower than actual levels for the Greater Cambridge region over the past decade. The Consultant informed members that the data used by the GCP in the development of the Business Case had been shared with UKPN, which they subsequently used in their latest Ofgem bid that included the two additional substations.
- Sought clarification on the Combined Authority’s position on the matter. The Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that a project board had been established, with GCP officers consulting and updating the Combined Authority on the project. She also noted that the work had been undertaken prior to the Combined Authority establishing the Independent Commission on Climate, and observed that it was an issue specific to the Greater Cambridge area, rather than the wider Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region.
- Suggested that it would be helpful to be provided with further forward analysis of grid reinforcement requirements to ensure that there was sufficient capacity to deliver on planned development and a zero-carbon future.
- Observed that there were further potential obstacles to growth that the GCP might have a role in mitigating, despite not being directly involved in the sector, such as issues surrounding water, and sought clarification on whether the GCP was looking at such matters. The Chief Executive confirmed that the GCP had not carried out any work on water-related issues, as it was the responsibility of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, and was being considered as part of the ongoing development of the Local Plan.
- Expressed concern that the GCP’s work on increasing grid capacity had effectively been self-fulfilling, as alternative bodies who may have been required to deliver the infrastructure could have seen the progress and therefore become less likely to undertake the work themselves.
- Observed that Table 2.1 in the Outline Business Case contained a significant variance between demand assumptions of up to 10.5kVA per dwelling in 2018 and only 1.4kVA per dwelling in 2021, and sought clarification on the difference. Noting that there was uncertainty on future demand levels, the Consultant informed the Joint Assembly that the numbers reflected various heating and charging scenarios, which differed significantly between urban and rural dwellings, with a mid-point having been established around 4kVA per dwelling.

In summarising the Joint Assembly’s discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there had been a reluctant acceptance of the need to progress to the next steps of the project.

10. Quarterly Progress Report

One public question was received from Councillor Hannah Copley, City Councillor for the Abbey Ward. The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

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. Members were informed that work was progressing on the development of a strategic sensor network across Greater Cambridge, with an Invitation to Tender scheduled for issuing later in the month. It was also highlighted that the latest update on research undertaken by the Centre for Business Research would be presented on 8th December, and would cover the period between October 2020 and April 2021, providing a clearer idea of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on the corporate labour market in the region.

While discussing the Quarterly Progress Report, the Joint Assembly:

- Requested an update on progress of the Chisholm Trail and the opening of Phase 1 of the project, as well as clarification on the nature of the pain/gain settlement with the contractor mentioned in section 8.12 of the report. It was confirmed that Phase 1 was expected to open before the end of 2021, and the Transport Director informed members that the pain/gain settlement ensured that the contractor would share the financial benefits of over-performance, while also sharing the financial impacts of under-performance.
- Sought clarification on whether the Transport Works Act Order for the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme would be submitted directly by the GCP or through the County Council. The Transport Director undertook to provide a written response to the query due to the complex nature of the matter.
- Observed that the independent audit of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme had suggested that on-road interventions should also be investigated while the Environmental Impact Assessment was being carried out, and requested an update on the work, as well as clarification on whether the Joint Assembly and Executive Board would be able to consider the results of such an investigation. Acknowledging that the audit had suggested the consideration of shorter-term, on-road measures, the Transport Director informed members that a review would be completed in the next few weeks, with the results then reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- Expressed concern that figures related to current skills delivery were low, as outlined in the table in section 9.1 of the report, and queried whether the numbers were improving following the summer holidays. Noting that the data in the table was only for the period up to mid-September, the Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme informed Members that there had been improvements during the twelve weeks that schools had begun operating in a normal environment after the impacts of the pandemic and summer holidays. She assured members that the GCP held regular discussions with Form the Future on progress and paid tribute to

their achievements to date, although she acknowledged that it was important to monitor and ensure that the trend continued to improve.

- Observed that the next Gateway Review would be in 2024 and sought clarification on the process for applying for further funding beyond that review. Highlighting the importance of being able to demonstrate good progress and delivery of projects when seeking additional funding, the Chief Executive noted that it would be subject to the Government’s evolving position regarding devolution. She emphasised the important role of the Greater Cambridge region in the wider success of the country, and indicated that the Gateway Review would provide the appropriate process for the GCP to demonstrate that it could deliver even more with further investment.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on Thursday 17th February 2022.

Chairperson
17th February 2022

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 18th November 2021
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

	Question	Answer
<p>Stephen Pratt (Fendon Road Residents Association)</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Further investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel network: Cycling Plus Consultation</p> <p>In the interests of safety, how does the GCPJA propose to address travel improvements on the A1134 North-South (Perne Road, Mowbray Road and Fendon Road) and provide segregated cycle lanes at the Addenbrooke's roundabout?</p> <p>Since the temporary closure of Nightingale Avenue which is now approved to be permanent, traffic volumes on Fendon Road have increased with long lines of stationery or slow moving traffic particularly at peak times. It has caused delays to motorists using that route and to the safety of both cyclists and pedestrians who cross the road. How does the GCPJA intend to address those issues in any travel improvements?</p> <p>Similarly, the increased volume of traffic on Fendon Road has caused increased air pollution which is again a concern to both pedestrians and cyclists as well as the residents on Fendon Road. That problem may only get worse as the Addenbrooke's site expands. How does the GCPJA intend to deal with that as part of any travel improvements?</p>	<p>The discussion today is about whether to proceed to preliminary design and strategic outline business case for the A1134 scheme as well as the Hills Road scheme. Detailed issues such as those Mr Pratt references would be picked up as part of that process.</p>

Lynda Warth
(British Horse
Society)

Agenda Item 7 - Further investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel network: Cycling Plus Consultation

The responses to this cycling survey provide important guidance for the Active Travel Network. 60% of responses were from Cambridge City yet still 20 respondents ride horses. The majority of respondents felt that safety and connectivity were either 'very important' or 'somewhat important' – these factors equally apply to equestrian access. This survey supports our view that equestrians should not be excluded from safe active travel provision.

Alan Hiscox, Director of Safety for the British Horse Society has stated regarding the creation of cycle lanes:

'I think the risk to horse riders having cyclists pass them on the nearside and vehicles pass them on the offside is very high and is a significant safety issue.

A cyclist suddenly appearing on one side may well cause the horse to move the other way into the path of a vehicle on the road. This arrangement should never be planned.'

Please will the GCP confirm they will apply this important safety advice when planning ETROs and cycling projects, in particular, giving consideration to the use of appropriate, inclusive signage?

The highest response to purpose of journey was 'leisure' at 84%. Yet the fact that equestrian access is for leisure and not commuting, is used as a reason to exclude, or not provide for horses, or to change vital existing rural

As set out in the report, 98% of respondents to the consultation indicated they never rode horses. It would therefore be disproportionate to give equal priority to equestrian uses across all active travel projects. This is particularly true of the cycling plus routes identified within the city which have the potential to support thousands of people walking and cycling but very little potential or appetite for equestrian uses.

The GCP has already committed for active travel schemes in more rural areas to consider the provision of soft surfaces where appropriate and feasible. All schemes are subject to a road safety audit which would include consideration of all users.

	<p>surfaces to hard top commuter cycle surfaces.</p> <p>Will the GCP please confirm that, with the importance of leisure access having been identified in this survey and is already well known for other users (walkers, dog walkers, runners, equestrians etc.), soft surface user leisure provision will be given equal priority in all active travel projects especially the LCWIP and Greenways?</p>	
<p>Anna Williams (Camcycle)</p>	<p>Agenda item 7: Further Investment in the Greater Cambridge Active Travel Network: Cycling Plus Consultation</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes the additional investment proposed as part of the Cycling Plus project and the addition of the Addenbrooke's roundabout to the A1134 North-South scheme. In light of the recent death of Anna Garratt-Quinton at this junction, we urge you to go further than just considering improved provision – it's time to finally make this safe for the thousands of pedestrians and cyclists who use it each day. No more lives must be lost or families left suffering.</p> <p>Both the proposed schemes include multiple junctions – how these are addressed will be essential to whether the changes succeed or fail. A scheme is only as good as its weakest link, and too often dangerous junctions deter people from cycling or, in the worst cases, lead to harm. The 91% of respondents to the Cycling Plus consultation who wanted to see junctions improved are supported by the 612 people who have signed Camcycle's recent petition for safe junctions. Many signatories have witnessed or experienced collisions. This is a sample comment:</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

	<p>I've personally witnessed the aftermath of 3 serious collisions involving cyclists on Cambridge roundabouts, all around 7.45-8am while on the way to work. This latest one resulted in the death of a colleague. Enough is enough. Please stop killing us!</p> <p>Both the Catholic Church junction (part of the Hills Road scheme) and the Addenbrooke's roundabout have been changed in the last decade using active travel funding. Safety concerns were ignored at the time. In 2013, discussing the Catholic Church junction, the county council's cycling champion said: "We can't go all the way this time."</p> <p>In 2021, Camcycle says: we must go all the way now.</p> <p>We ask the GCP if it will commit in these two schemes to prove high-quality, safe junctions that are fully compliant with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20?</p>	
Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Foxton Travel Hub</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</p>	<p>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>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>Question. To what extent is there planned integration of this infrastructure and its timing for the four schemes?</p>	
<p>Annabel Wright (Foxton Parish Council)</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Foxton Travel Hub</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This 3rd iteration of the Travel Hub design has reduced the car parking spaces to 200 and cycle parking to 100 but it still fails to address the very serious concerns about the safety of pedestrians crossing the busy A10 to and from Foxton Railway station. The A10 is a problem to cross for both able bodies and disabled people at present but the Travel Hub will increase the number of road crossings which could increase the risks for accidents. What assurances can the GCP give that this major design flaw will be addressed? Will a bridge over the A10 be considered? 2. As the car parking spaces have reduced to 200, is this travel hub really needed at this time? If one of the aims is to encourage rail use to the new Addenbrookes (Cambridge South) station, what are the estimates for the usage of the train from Foxton? Covid has meant a reduction in travel. Is it value for money to have a £9 million infrastructure project for 200 car parking spaces? That is £45,000 per car space! 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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). The pedestrian crossing has a central refuge, been designed to DMRB (design manual roads & bridges) and have been through the RSA 1 process. 2. The demand figures for the site are in excess of 900 with the Cambridge South Station. The scheme has evolved to be fully multi-modal – rail, bus and cycling. The value for money assessment is based over 500 spaces. It will be reviewed as part of the Full Business Case (FBC) which will be presented back to the GCP Executive Board before a decision is made to construct the scheme.

	<p>3. The multimodal aspects of a true Travel Hub have still not been addressed. A proposed bus scheme to connect to Whittlesford Parkway - not confirmed - a bus turning circle in the car park and 100 cycle spaces do not go nearly far enough. Where are the plans for cycle connectivity with the villages surrounding Foxton? If the aim of this scheme is to encourage people to NOT use their cars, why is this not part of it? Currently this design is a car park with a few 'green' add-ons. Will the GCP take the design back to the drawing board after having listened to Foxton and other villages' views?</p>	<p>3. The bus scheme to connect the local villages to the Travel Hub is one of the recommendations in the paper. The Foxton Travel Hub is Multi modal as it provides connectivity to rail, bus services, the local Greenway, and proposes to have a facility to charge electric bikes and scooters, and also ties in the Barrington Cycle way that is being delivered as part of a S106 contribution and provides an equestrian route as part of the design</p>
<p>Reverend Anthony Mitchell (Bar Hill Parish Council)</p>	<p>Agenda 9 – Electricity Grid Reinforcements: Update and Next Steps</p> <p>How will the electricity grid cope with the planned move towards electric cars by 2030 and will this include plans to encourage more off-peak charging?</p> <p>The use of renewable energy means an increase in power supplied to the grid along with decentralized power transmission. How will the grid cope with these changes and the need to store electrical power?</p>	<p>The GCP is developing an ambitious programme of public transport schemes that will ensure a high quality, network that is sustainably operated and managed. Indeed, that's a core element of why we are doing this work, to understand how we can make sure we facilitate a process of electrifying the public transport network. As the OBC and JA papers set out, there is more work we need to do around demand analysis to understand the requirements of the existing and future public transport networks and how the GCP can play a role in ensuring they are futureproofed.</p>

<p>Councillor Hannah Copley</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Some residents have raised concerns about impact and value for money of some Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership projects which are being delivered, and about overspends on some projects. Is the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership currently externally reviewed/audited either for individual projects as well as overall for how it is meeting its objectives and value provided? If not, will the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Joint Assembly recommend this in order to provide a higher degree of confidence to residents impacted by ongoing projects?</p>	<p>The GCP ensures regular review and scrutiny through a range of mechanisms. They form a core element of the GCP's governance arrangements. This Joint Assembly is a fundamental part of that structure and scrutinises the GCP's delivery performance and expenditure on a quarterly basis. The GCP is also subject to central Government scrutiny and assessment. The GCP underwent a detailed, Central Government led Gateway Review which reported last year. Given the progress that was demonstrated by the GCP, the Review determined that a further £200m of government grant would be released in order to continue to deliver the GCP's programme. Another such Review will take place in two years' time.</p> <p>In terms of direct financial control mechanisms, CCC is the GCP's Accountable Body and therefore the GCP operates in line with CCC's Financial procedure Rules.</p> <p>In addition, the GCP abides by an Assurance Framework that has been agreed with HMG. The GCP Assurance Framework (available here) sets out an HM Treasury prescribed process for how GCP schemes are assessed in terms of value for money and investment decisions.</p>
---	---	---