



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

**Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board
Thursday 25th June 2020
2:00 p.m. – 6:20 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Members of the GCP Executive Board

Councillor Roger Hickford (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer (Vice-Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Phil Allmendinger	University Representative
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in attendance

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
---------------------	------------------------

Officers

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Simon Manville	Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Andrew Munro	Project Manager (GCP)
Richard Preston	Project Manager (GCP)
Paul Rawlinson	Project Manager (GCP)
Gemma Shroeder	Project Manager, SMART (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport Strategy (GCP)
Tim Watkins	Project Manager (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

It was proposed by Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Van de Weyer and resolved unanimously that Councillor Hickford be elected Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the municipal year 2020/21.

The Chairperson thanked Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer for his work as the previous Chairperson and paid tribute to Councillor Bates as his predecessor to the Executive Board.

2. NOMINATION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON

It was proposed by Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Hickford and resolved unanimously that Councillor Van de Weyer be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the municipal year 2020/21.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 19th February 2020, were agreed as a correct record and the Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

One member observed that the third paragraph of agenda item 6 of the minutes, while acknowledging the interruption to the meeting by protestors, had not identified their cause or the focus of their protest.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that 20 public questions had been received and accepted, and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in **Appendix A** of the minutes.

It was noted that 2 questions related to agenda item 8 (Impact of and Response to COVID 19), 1 question related to agenda item 9 (GCP Quarterly Performance Report), 4 questions related to agenda item 10 (Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery), 9 questions related to agenda item 13 (Cambridge South East Transport Scheme), 3 questions related to agenda item 16 (Foxton Travel Hub) and 1 question related to agenda item 17 (Greenways: Melbourn, Comberton and St Ives).

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

The Chairperson also noted that 3 councillors from constituent councils had requested to speak and that they would be invited to address the Executive Board at the start of the relevant agenda item.

7. FEEDBACK FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 4th June 2020.

Noting that he would highlight key considerations made by the Joint Assembly at the start of various agenda items, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly expressed frustration that agenda item 14 (Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project) had been withdrawn for a second time following extensive discussion by the Joint Assembly. He indicated that despite disagreement over a number of issues, a cross-party majority of the Joint Assembly had expressed support for the scheme moving forward as a project that would deliver benefits to the whole Greater Cambridge area. Recognising the need for alignment with the currently unfunded CAM Sub-Strategy, he argued that the proposal accomplished such an alignment and was required now, whereas the CAM would not be functioning for many years. He suggested that the GCP should provide leadership and clarity on the issue, noting that other key developments, such as the West Cambridge site or the 3500 new homes at Bourn Airfield, were being held up as a result of the delays.

8. IMPACT OF AND RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Public questions were invited from Wayne Boucher and Lilian Rundblad (on behalf of the Histon Road Area Residents' Association). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

Councillor Neil Gough, South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the ward of Cottenham, was invited to address the Executive Board. Highlighting the substantial increase to the time of bus journeys from Cottenham in to Cambridge as a result of the forthcoming closure of the inbound lane of Histon Road, he emphasised the negative impact on the educational choices and attainments of children and students who were dependent on the public transport route. Acknowledging previous efforts made by the GCP to mitigate the effects of the road closure and to provide a solution for the young people, he called for further attention to be given to the issue following the additional disruption to education that had resulted from Covid-19. The Transport Director observed that Stagecoach was gradually resuming its regular services following disruptions related to Covid-19 and suggested the Histon Road closure would have minimal impact on bus services. He informed the Executive Board that a plan for the new school year in September would be developed over the summer, although it would need to reflect the prevailing conditions at the time.

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented the report, which included details of a potential review of the GCP's programme in light of Covid-19, provided an overview of work commissioned to look at the likely impact of Covid-19 on the local economy, and detailed

the potential impact of Covid-19 on the GCP's current programme. Members were informed that the work carried out by Hatch Regeneris to understand the impact of Covid-19 on the local economy would help extend the evidence base providing scope for the eventual recovery strategy. Noting that it had previously been agreed to review the GCP's Future Investment Strategy following the completion of the Gateway Review, it was now suggested that the review should also cover the impacts of Covid-19. While significant delays to the GCP's programme were not expected as a result of the pandemic, regular reviews would be carried out to identify any issues that may arise, such as workforce absences or supply chain disruptions. Acknowledging concern about the impact on skills and the labour market, along with the difficulty in predicting such impacts, she suggested that it could also form a part of the proposed review. Members were also informed that the Modern Methods Units mentioned in section 7.1 of the report had been publically launched and were now occupied.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Recognised the importance of the work being carried out by Hatch Generis as part of the GCP's efforts to identify the impacts of Covid-19.
- Observed that certain sectors in the area were likely to be more seriously affected than others, such as the tourism sector and the University of Cambridge, which had a high number of international students.
- Expressed concern over rising unemployment and considered how the GCP could work alongside local authorities, local businesses, Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge to help support skills development, while maximising the number of jobs available.
- Recognised that knowledge intensive businesses were likely to suffer less than some other sectors and it was noted that businesses were actively looking at how they could recruit more young people or provide coaching and mentoring.
- Considered to what extent particular schemes and strategies, such as the Local Transport Plan and City Access Strategy, should be reassessed or changed as a result of evolving circumstances, noting that business cases should be appropriately revised throughout their development. The Transport Director confirmed that business cases were developed over stages and that impacts of Covid-19 would be taken in to account in all future stages.
- Recognised that the CPCA was leading local efforts on recovery planning and agreed to further consider and discuss how the GCP could collaborate as closely as possible with the CPCA on that collaboration strategy. Members emphasised the need for close collaboration between all levels of local government, organisations and businesses within the local area to overcome the short-term and long-term impacts of the pandemic, particularly with regard to an economic recovery plan.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the commissioned Hatch Regeneris work currently being undertaken to understand the impact of Covid-19 on businesses and the local economy;

- (b) Note the potential impact of Covid-19 on the GCP's Programme; and
- (c) Agree to review the GCP's Future Investment Strategy considering the impact of Covid-19 as an essential element of that review and to inform the review, use available and accessible evidence produced in respect of Covid-19, including but not limited to the commissioned Hatch Regeneris work.

9. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

A public question was invited from Jake Arnold-Forster. The question and a summary of the response is provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme and which included the rationale behind the proposal for a future investment review. Attention was drawn to the progress of Cambridge&, as detailed in section 28 of the report. Members were informed that the company was in its second phase of development and in discussion with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) on how it could be involved in the growth service for which the CPCA was holding a procurement process. A further £50k investment was being sought from the GCP in order to advance the initial organisational set up, and emphasis was given to the time critical nature of its development given the intense efforts that would be required to recover from the effects of Covid-19. It was noted that the Joint Assembly had requested the business case for Cambridge& and that it had been included as an appendix to the report.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Clarified that the Transport Director was in the process of liaising with the Service Director of Highways and Transport at the County Council in order to provide a written response to the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly as to why the County Council had paused the implementation of new resident parking schemes for twelve months. It was observed that an original condition for the resident parking schemes had been for the concurrent development of Park and Ride sites on the outskirts of Cambridge, and further confirmation was requested as to whether the phasing of such sites was in line with the development of resident parking schemes.
- Expressed support for the work being carried out by Cambridge& and the importance of actively promoting inward investment.
- Welcomed the launching of the Modern Methods of Construction for Temporary Housing Units and suggested that further opportunities should be put forward for similar projects, especially given the relatively low costs involved.
- Argued that greater budgetary considerations should be given to skills and looking at behaviour change as a result of Covid-19, rather than large infrastructure projects. Unemployment would increase and businesses would face difficulties, with many young people finding themselves in unexpected circumstances. It was acknowledged that the GCP did not have internal skills resources, it had the ability and expertise to commission to organisations that would be able to provide necessary support.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note progress across the GCP programme, including spend during the 2019/20 financial year; and
- (b) Invest a further £50k into Cambridge&, to enable the delivery of Cambridge&'s services over the course of 2020, as set out in section 28.

10. PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS AND CITY ACCESS STRATEGY: UPDATE AND SUPPORT FOR COVID-19 RECOVERY

Public questions were invited from Lynda Warth (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire British Horse Society), J O'Dwyer, David Wrathmall and Ericka Jacobs. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Transport Director and Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which provided an update on the City Access project, including how it could support Covid-19 recovery work, building on the short term measures that had been identified by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in February 2020. Members were provided with up-to-date data which indicated that road traffic levels in the first three weeks of June were approximately 20% higher than the three preceding weeks. Cycling numbers had also increased by around 10%, although it was noted that cycling figures were more complicated to analyse as sensors deployed along commuter routes had seen a drop and then a rise as more people had been cycling for leisure and recreational purposes. The Executive Board was informed that the monitoring of temporary measures would enable a gathering of wider data on overall cycling levels. Although footfall in the city centre had decreased by 80% in April, numbers had risen since shops had begun to reopen on 15th June and were now 40% lower than before the lockdown. Benefits from these reductions in movement included improved air quality, faster and more reliable journeys on public transport, and decreased running costs for transport operators.

Attention was drawn to the three proposed priority areas for immediate investment and implementation detailed in section 5.2 of the report, which were creating space for pedestrians and cyclists, providing transport support for people and businesses to recover, and public transport recovery. The Executive Board was informed that the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee had considered the full list of schemes to be taken forward, with an intention to develop an expanding network of key routes that would include surrounding villages and Park and Ride sites. Final recommendations would be made to the Highways and Transport Committee once detailed design had been completed, and information on schemes would be provided to all affected parties ahead of their implementation, with consultations to be held during the trial period.

The Head of Transport Strategy emphasised that potential long-term changes to travel behaviour were still being analysed and future reports would provide further analysis once it had been carried out.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that long-term measures had been due to be considered at the meeting and while acknowledging the need for their deferral in order to accommodate the impacts and emerging trends, as well as allowing for greater attention to be given to short-term measures, it was emphasised that long-term measures were also crucial to the recovery process.
- Sought clarification on the consultation processes for residents and other affected people regarding the schemes being considered by the GCP and the County Council, observing that experimental schemes should provide evidence that affected people had been properly consulted. One Member suggested a dedicated point of contact that could receive comments and concerns raised by members of the public. The Head of Transport Strategy confirmed that transparent consultation would be carried out with local communities and feedback sought from affected people in order to capture their concerns. The Project Manager observed that such concerns needed to be identified on a scheme by scheme basis so that the monitoring framework could provide evidence when judging schemes at the end of the trial period.
- Considered how work could be expanded to free up space in the city centre, further reducing conflict between cars, pedestrians and cyclists, while alleviating congestion for public transport. It was noted that the County Council had to fulfil a deadline in order to secure further funding, but it was argued that the wider agenda should not be forgotten. The Head of Transport Strategy recognised an opportunity to consider how temporary schemes, following monitoring and consultation, could evolve into permanent schemes, noting that some schemes were more appropriate for such extensions than others. She informed the Executive Board that the GCP was working with a wide range of partners, including the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council's planning team, in order to consider the medium term responses of the recovery effort.
- Expressed concern over the impacts that access restrictions would have on disabled people, given their reliance on motorised vehicles for moving around the city. The Project Manager highlighted the importance of ensuring that disabled people and disability groups were provided with clear information on what measures would be implemented and how they would be affected. He noted that many of the schemes involved restrictions for through access but not for residential access or other required access, such as that for disabled people, and it was therefore important to establish routes that would still be available. However, he acknowledged that some schemes involved complete restriction to access and careful consideration would have to be given to how access for disabled people would be managed in line with those schemes already in place. Reduced access to Blue Badge parking bays was a further issue under consideration.
- Acknowledged the objections raised to some of the proposed schemes, but given the opportunity to implement a wide variety of schemes on a temporary basis, it was suggested that the GCP should act boldly, as recommended by the Citizens' Assembly. One member argued that the negative impacts were largely minimal and were outweighed by the positive impacts, although it was suggested that greater emphasis could be placed on the positive impacts.

- Observed that gridlock in one part of the city often quickly spread to other parts of the city, with one member suggesting that camera based schemes that could be unlocked intelligently could assist in alleviating such disruptions.
- Proposed further areas for potential schemes, including cycling and walking around Cambridge train station, Mitcham's Corner, Mill Road, park and cycle schemes, and public access to eBikes.
- Suggested that the success of schemes was largely dependent on their compliance and enforcement, with one member proposing dedicated enforcement personnel. The Project Manager noted that enforcement was an important aspect of all the schemes, with some involving physical measures and others involving camera enforcement. He informed the Executive Board that the GCP was liaising with the County Council to ensure that the correct enforcement infrastructure was adopted in order to deliver the desired benefits and to avoid potential legal challenges.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note that work to collect data on the transport impacts of Covid-19 is underway, and consider any early impacts on the city access strategy;
- (b) Agree a prioritised and refined package of short-term measures that supports Covid-19 recovery, with the following key elements:
 - Supporting the County Council's programme of road-space reallocation by funding and delivering the measures set out at para 5.6 on an experimental basis, as well as any further measures requested by the County Council and agreed by the Executive Board.
 - Supporting recovery through measures to enable more people and businesses to travel sustainably, including providing additional cycle parking, expanding access to ebikes and working with partners to develop a freight pilot.
 - Continuing to work with partners and operators to support the recovery of public transport; and
- (c) Note that the work to develop a set of packages of medium-longer term action will be brought to an Executive Board meeting.

11. RESPONSE TO CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Board received a report which set out the GCP's proposed response to the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly's recommendations on reducing congestion, improving air quality and providing better public transport in Greater Cambridge. Acknowledging that due to Covid-19 the current situation had changed significantly since the recommendations had been made to the GCP, the Head of Transport Strategy emphasised that the long-term plans being developed by the GCP would incorporate the feedback that had been provided by the Citizens' Assembly. She highlighted the proposal for a 'one-year on' report would be brought to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board later in the November and December meetings to provide an update on the response, which would coincide with the next stage of the City Access Strategy.

While discussing the report, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly suggested that the response could include further details on the discussions held by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at previous meetings, along with the resolutions that had been agreed, in order to provide clarity and commitment to the narrative. The Head of Transport Strategy agreed to include the information as an appendix to the response.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Agree the response to the Citizens' Assembly at Appendix 1 of the report;
- (b) Agree that in addition to producing a 'one-year-on' report, officers be asked to consider how Citizens' Assembly participants could be more frequently engaged and updated as part of developing the longer-term city access proposals; and
- (c) Agree that, going forward, officers should include a section in relevant reports detailing the contribution of projects to implementing the response to the Citizens' Assembly's recommendations.

12. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN – CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTONOMOUS METRO (CAM) SUB-STRATEGY

The Transport Director presented the report, which outlined the CPCA's CAM Sub-Strategy and reviewed how it might impact decisions on GCP projects, particularly with regard to the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme. He emphasised that the GCP had taken steps to ensure its schemes complied with the Local Transport Plan and that this continued to be the case following the consultation on the Sub-Strategy. Therefore, the GCP was proposing to continue with its planned schemes.

The Executive Board resolved to:

Note the report.

13. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT SCHEME

Tony Orgee, Chairperson of the Cambridge South East Transport Local Liaison Forum (LLF), attended the meeting to provide an update on his presentation to the Joint Assembly. He emphasised the request for local communities, representatives and stakeholders to be involved throughout the scheme's development, noting that at the Joint Assembly meeting officers had acknowledged the need for better communication and consultation and that two further meetings had been organised by the GCP. He also suggested that schemes should be put on hold in order to allow business cases to be reconsidered following Covid-19, and argued that alternative route options should not to be ruled out yet.

Councillor Amanda Taylor, County Councillor for Queens Edith's Division, was invited to address the Executive Board. While welcoming the GCP's principles of improving active travel infrastructure and road safety, she argued that the proposals fell short of such objectives due to the cancellation of one of the Phase 1 schemes to construct an underpass close to the Gog Magog Hills and Wandlebury Country Park on the A1307. Highlighting the danger currently faced by those crossing the road in the area, particularly those crossing to

reach the bus stop for services in to Cambridge, she informed the Executive Board that the scheme's cancellation had been announced without prior consultation, although she acknowledged that it was agreed at the Joint Assembly to reconsider the issue following further consultation. Expressing concern over the lack of evidence for the decision, she sought clarification on who had made the decision to cancel the project and how it aligned with the aforementioned principles. The Transport Director acknowledged that further consultation was required and had been arranged, while the planning application had been withdrawn in order to allow such discussions and work to continue.

Public questions were invited from Howard Kettel, Lynda Warth (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire British Horse Society), Sam Davies, Dr Charlotte Vacogne, Sarah Brown, Stuart Newman, Clare Arthurs and Eleanor Clark. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Chairperson of the Joint Assembly welcomed the further consultations that had been arranged and argued that it was important to avoid overlooking such engagement in the future, as such omissions detracted from the otherwise high level of consultation carried out by the GCP. Observing that the Joint Assembly had not disagreed with the proposed route alignment, he suggested that clarification on the reasons for not consulting on alternative options would be beneficial. He also requested that the Executive Board pay particular attention to the future role of the Babraham Park and Ride site, given that the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme was likely to draw traffic further in to the city.

The Executive Board received a report that included details of objections received in response to two Phase 1 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that were required for the previously agreed short term programme of works, and a review of the technical work and public consultation undertaken to date contributing to the production of the Outline Business Case (OBC) for Phase 2 of the scheme. The Transport Director drew attention to the scheme's development process, as shown in section 4.6 of the report, and emphasised that the final decision and full business case would be considered at a later meeting of the Executive Board, following formal consultations and an environmental impact assessment. The Project Manager highlighted the extensive consultations that had been held and demonstrated to the Executive Board how the potential hub locations and subsequent route options had culminated with the proposed location and route alignment.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that in line with the overall Greater Cambridge strategy, job growth was mainly occurring within the Green Belt while housing was being developed outside the Green Belt. It was argued that there were insufficient alternatives to car travel for moving between the two areas, with the route under discussion being one of the key corridors.
- Recognised the strength and variety of opinions from members of the public regarding the potential impacts on communities and the countryside and agreed that further work was required on landscaping and biodiversity issues. Members noted the extensive public involvement in various aspects of the scheme's development and recognised that support for schemes was often not expressed as fervently as opposition.
- Acknowledged the need for further consultation with residents of Stapleton and Shelford in order to resolve issues regarding the edges of settlements and to strengthen

confidence in the analysis that had been carried out and the process that had been followed. The Transport Director recognised the need for further consultation and emphasised the role of public engagement in improving and solidifying schemes.

- Observed the high level of support that the railway alternative route had received from local residents and communities. One member argued that it was not feasible to have a safe train and safe fast public transport route alongside each other, as had been demonstrated by safety issues and accidents that had occurred in similar circumstances south of Cambridge railway station, and that the decision should be based on technical assessments. Another member suggested that the route option could be continued to be developed alongside the preferred route option, with a final decision to be made later in the scheme's development process. The Transport Director observed that the detailed design stage of the preferred route alignment required design work on a yard by yard basis, which would be impractical to carry out on multiple route options. He noted that all routes had been robustly considered, in line with Department of Transport guidelines, and emphasised that the evidence case had been clear in presenting only one preferred solution. Detailed questions raised by residents and other affected stakeholders would be considered appropriately as part of the design process.
- Expressed concern about the impact that the proposed route would have on the Gog Magog Hills, although welcomed the potential benefits that the scheme could have for developing Nine Wells. Supported further spending on mitigations to protect the environment and conceal the scheme as much as possible. Further spending was supported on mitigations to protect the environment and conceal the scheme as much as possible, while members expressed frustration that environmental impacts were not assessed at an earlier stage of the process.
- Questioned whether the Park and Ride site would be large enough and whether it would provide sufficient cycle parking and storage space. The Transport Director assured the Executive Board that calculations had projected that the site was large enough, noting that the CPCA had developed plans to complement the scheme by extending it further to the east. While cycle parking details would be established during the detailed design stage, he suggested that increasing usage of eBikes would require secure cycle parking.
- Observed that while the Babraham Park and Ride site was ideally located for commuters walking to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), it was not suitable for those who needed to make a connection to Cambridge Science Park. One member suggested that it should be considered how to connect the Park and Ride site to the Science Park in a way that avoided the city centre.
- Clarified that any potential changes to the scheme due to external impacts, such as Covid-19, could be made throughout the development process.
- Recognised the need to adapt schemes to accommodate future usage by CAM vehicles.
- Supported the need for the proposed Phase 1 TROs.

The Executive Board resolved to:

CSETS Phase 1

- (a) Make the Traffic Regulation Order to control parking at Linton High Street (objections received);
- (b) Make the Traffic Regulation Order for a west bound bus lane at Linton (objections received);

CSETS Phase 2

- (c) Note the results of Public Consultation;
- (d) Endorse the key conclusions of the OBC presenting a preferred high quality public transport, walking and cycling route as outlined in section 9.0 of the report;
- (e) Endorse the key conclusions of the OBC in relation to a travel hub location;
- (f) Request that officers undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment for the route and prepare a Transport and Works Act Order application;
- (g) Approve the procurement of Legal services to support the preparation of a Transport and Works Act Order
- (h) Approve a revised budget for the CSET Phase 2 project;
- (i) Require officers to keep the scheme details and business case under review to ensure that the Full Business Case and final design reflects any changes arising from the LTP substrategy consultation, as well as emerging proposals from EWR and the CAM tunnelled and regional route sections; and
- (j) Require officers to develop a strategy for sustainable and carbon neutral solutions, and environmental improvements including protection and enhancement of the Nine Wells nature reserve.

14. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda. While acknowledging the significant time, effort and expense that had been attributed to this project to date, Members noted that one of the GCP's main purposes was to resolve traffic and transport problems and deficiencies. Moving forward, Members called for greater openness and engagement with the CPCA, along with independent analysis, to ensure that the best route was found and agreed on by all involved in the scheme.

15. MADINGLEY ROAD WALKING AND CYCLE PROJECT

The Transport Director presented the report, which contained the results of consultations that had been held on the Madingley Road cycling and walking project, as well as the

recommended preferred option. Broad support had been expressed for both options that had been put forward, although option 2 received a slightly higher level of support due to having a greater impact and this support had been reinforced by the Joint Assembly. The Transport Director noted that the Joint Assembly had identified the possibility of linking Grange Road and Madingley Road junction in order to open up the Burrell's Walk and West Road access.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the work that had been carried out in order to identify a preferred option, noting the limited routes in to Cambridge and difficulties in improving them.
- Identified the area as a particularly problematic section for public transport.
- Welcomed the development of walking and cycle routes to colleges and work locations to the west of Cambridge.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the outcome of the public consultation held from 12th January to 3rd March 2020;
- (b) Endorse the preferred option 2;
- (c) Approve the development of detailed scheme design in preparation for construction;
- (d) Approve the negotiation of the land and rights required for the delivery of the scheme; and
- (e) Note the commitment to ongoing dialogue with local stakeholders as part of the scheme development process.

16. FOXTON TRAVEL HUB

Public questions were invited from Annabel 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 included an update on progress made on the Foxton Travel Hub project and a proposal to progress to the preparation of a Full Business Case. He emphasised that further work needed to be carried out with the local community to ensure that it understood how it would benefit from the connection of multiple modes of transport.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Highlighted the importance of further consultation and engagement with the local community, noting that they would not necessarily be the primary beneficiaries of the scheme and would be required to deal with its direct consequences.

- Observed the importance of capturing traffic as far out of the city centre as possible.
- Expressed concern over the safety of the level crossing and suggested that a bridge should connect the Travel Hub to the railway station.
- Emphasised that the connection between the A10, railway station, Guided Busway and future Melbourn Greenway would make it a genuinely multimodal Travel Hub.
- Suggested that priority should be given to Greenway cycle users during the scheme's detailed design stage.
- Acknowledged the importance of the views expressed by Hauxton residents.
- Argued that the construction of a bridge or underpass on the A10 should be a priority for National Rail. It was also confirmed that East West Rail was regularly consulted on proposals and route alignments.
- Supported the proposal for the Travel Hub to initially include 350 spaces and subsequently expand in a flexible process.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the findings of the public consultation;
- (b) Endorse recommendation of preferred site and associated infrastructure;
- (c) Endorse recommendation to develop green infrastructure which may include solar PV canopies above car parking spaces;
- (d) Approve the preparation and submission of a planning application for the proposed site;
- (e) Approve the negotiation of the land and rights required for the delivery of the scheme and the use of CPO, Side Roads Orders, parking enforcement and changes to speed limits;
- (f) Approve working with Network Rail to develop a scheme to work in partnership deliver a pedestrian crossing to support to scheme; and
- (g) Note the commitment to ongoing dialogue.

17. GREENWAYS: MELBOURN, COMBERTON AND ST IVES

A public question was invited from Lynda Warth (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire British Horse Society). The question and a summary of the response are provided at **Appendix A** of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on the development of the Greenways programme and outline budgets for the Melbourn, Comberton and St Ives schemes. The Executive Board was informed that discussions were ongoing with

Cambridgeshire County Council and Hertfordshire County Council regarding the bridge at the western end of the Melbourn Greenway, which enjoyed considerable support and had received offers of financial support. As part of the development of the Comberton Greenway, it had been proposed by the Joint Assembly to include improvements along Adams Road, following the change to the preferred route of the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project. Noting that the cycling facilities that already existed in St Ives suffered from maintenance problems due to flooding, the Transport Director confirmed that part of the St Ives Greenway proposal involved ensuring that those existing facilities could be fully utilised throughout the year.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed progress on the schemes and observed that rather than just being routes in to and out of Cambridge, they served to enhance the high-demand rural network of cycling. While commuters would make use of the routes, people would also be able to safely travel between villages.
- Identified that there would be direct economic benefits resulting from the link between Melbourn and Royston, as demonstrated by widespread support by local businesses and organisations, including offers of financial contributions.
- Welcomed the inclusion of improvements to Adams Road in the Comberton Greenway. One member suggested that there were more important areas of the city to look at, especially given the fact that students, who represented most of the traffic cycle traffic along the route, would not be using it for most of the year due to Covid-19, although it was noted that the projects took time to complete and therefore students would probably have returned by the time works had been completed.
- Sought clarification on whether concrete was the best surface material for the St Ives Greenway, with regard to future renovations to the routes or adaptations to any different or more flexible form of transport. The Transport Director confirmed that the County Council was being consulted on the most appropriate surface material to use, in order to require as little maintenance as possible in the future. He emphasised that the objective was to enhance the cycle network to the greatest possible degree, and that any enhanced capacity given to other forms of public transport would also be welcome as a genuine alternative to the car.
- Recognised that eBikes should be able to use the Greenways but expressed concern that other forms of vehicles, such as motorbikes, would make use of the routes.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the progress made in developing the Greenways, working with local communities and stakeholders to date;
- (b) Note the outcome of public consultations;
- (c) Approve the scheme proposals and an outline budget of £6.5m for the Melbourn Greenway;

- (d) Approve the scheme proposals and an outline budget of £9m for the Comberton scheme;
- (e) Approve the scheme proposals and an outline budget of £7.5m for the St Ives scheme;
- (f) Approve the development of detailed scheme design in preparation for construction;
- (g) Approve the negotiation of the land and rights required for the delivery of the scheme; and
- (h) Note the commitment to ongoing dialogue with local stakeholders as part of the scheme development process.

18. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that the 2020 and 2021 meetings would start at 4:00 p.m., instead of 2:00 p.m. as indicated on the agenda. It was therefore noted that the next meeting was due be held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday 1st October 2020 and that the remaining meeting dates for 2020 and 2021 were as follows:

- 4:00 p.m. Thursday 10th December 2020
- 4:00 p.m. Thursday 18th March 2021
- 4:00 p.m. Thursday 1st July 2021
- 4:00 p.m. Thursday 30th September 2021
- 4:00 p.m. Thursday 9th December 2021

Chairperson
10th September 2020

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

No*	Questioner	Question	Answer
7	Wayne Boucher	<p>Agenda Item 8: Impact of and Response to Covid-19</p> <p>Covid-19 should have caused a re-analysis of all GCP projects, in particular the traffic projections for both cars and buses. Has the GCP done this for the Histon Road project? The bus lane as it stood was only going to give a couple of minutes saving during the rush hour on the inbound side, and none on the outbound side. What do the projections say now?</p>	<p>Histon Road, and schemes like Milton Road, are public transport, walking & cycling schemes. At the present time walking and cycling improvements are even more important than before...</p> <p>The impact on longer term travel trends is the subject of much speculation. Future demand will continue to be kept under review.</p> <p>Data on traffic/journeys across Greater Cambridge are discussed in the Public Transport and City Access report.</p>
13	Lilian Rundblad, Chair, HRARA	<p>Agenda Items 8, 9, and 10: Comments relating to Histon Road Scheme</p> <p>Histon Road Area Residents' Association wishes to raise the question of whether the plans as currently drawn up for the restructuring of Histon Road require fundamental reappraisal in the light of the radically different circumstances now affecting traffic flow in the area. Our world has changed and will probably never be the same again. Far fewer cars are using the road; more people are cycling and walking.</p> <p>In 4 days the closures enabling construction of an obsolete plan will start. New cycling and walking proposals adopted 16/6/20 within the Covid-19 Temporary cycling proposals ETRO by Highways (Space to Breathe) affects the Histon Road outbound lane. Key elements of the programme (Item 7, 2.5).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of car parking along the road is already planned (no signs posted) 2. Reallocation of traffic lanes to accommodate bidirectional or contraflow cycle lanes – there are presently no cycle lanes in southern area; present cycle lane northern area is 0.91m wide! - photo Victoria Junction 22/6 3. Removal of railings – photo Victoria Road Junction 22/6 4. Installation of cycle parking – additional sites required 	<p>Histon Road, and schemes like Milton Road, are public transport, walking & cycling schemes. At the present time walking and cycling improvements are even more important than before...</p> <p>The impact on longer term travel trends is the subject of much speculation. Future demand will continue to be kept under review.</p> <p>The construction plans for Histon Road ensure that there is cycle lane provision for both inbound and outbound cyclists when the one way traffic closure is put in place.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>Item 8 – 6.2 Only tree/hedge clearing and replanting in north and unfinished Victoria Junction. No preparations for closures.</p> <p>Item 9 – The Histon Road project in the Government’s Report was a major reason for the additional £400m to be released. 24.11 - HRARA expects that the additional costs for the urgent ETRO necessary during the construction period will be adhered to.</p> <p>Item 10 – No mention of Histon Road in this report. Perhaps included in Maintenance page 108.</p> <p>HRARA asks the GCP EB to direct the officers to ascertain that the safety for cyclists and pedestrians will be available on 29th June on Histon Road outbound lane when closure starts, following the Highways Key Elements’ programme ETRO.</p>	
1	Jake Arnold-Forster	<p>Agenda item 9: GCP Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>With reference to the Abbey Chesterton Bridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the cycle/foot bridge be open? • When will riverside access under the existing railway bridge be restored? 	<p>Work on the Chisholm Trail Phase one has continued through the Coronavirus lockdown period, but progress has slowed.</p> <p>Accordingly the current programme is only indicative. In response to the specific questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 is currently scheduled to be fully open late 2021 • Targeting jetty connection can be reopened in Autumn 20

<p>15</p>	<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>Reallocation of Road Space Projects</p> <p>5.5 “The aim is to create a network of safe routes on key corridors, that will encourage cycling within the city but also from Park&Ride sites and nearby towns and villages.”</p> <p>The definition of Active Travel in the new Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan includes equestrians. There are nine references to ‘Active Travel’ in the report yet no reference to equestrians nor any reference as to what space has been allocated for their use.</p> <p>The 25,500 horses in Cambridgeshire have the right to be ridden on every highway in the county (except motorways). They must be actively provided for and protected in the reallocation of road space schemes and not simply forgotten and left in the traffic flow on a reduced carriageway with fast moving cyclists tight up to their left hand side and vehicles on their right.</p> <p>Where highway signage currently excludes equestrians, a county wide policy needs to be adopted. Unless the GCP / Road Safety Audit deems the safest place for horse-riders to be is on the carriageway with the traffic and accepts the consequences of that decision, we propose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A blanket policy giving horse riders the legal right to use all routes including those marked with the blue “pedestrian / cycle only” or cycle stencil sign <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All restrictive signs must be replaced with "pedestrian, cycle AND horse riders only” sign and used in future projects <p>The Board has a duty of care to all lawful road users therefore will the Board agree that approval for these projects will include a caveat that safe provision for equestrians must be included and identified?</p>	<p>The two proposals made are for the County Council to consider as the Highway Authority, and we have passed this question to them to respond directly.</p>
-----------	--	--	--

<p>6</p>	<p>J O'Dwyer</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>At the recent Joint Assembly Board meeting a question was asked if disability organisations were consulted. It was answered along the lines of, "It's rather difficult at the moment but we'll let them know".</p> <p>Public body you have duties under the Equality Act 2010 -The Equality Duty has three aims. It requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate unlawful discrimination, • advance equality of opportunity, • foster good relations. <p>Due regard means consciously thinking about the three aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making. This means that consideration of equality issues must influence the decisions reached by public bodies.</p> <p>An efficient transport system is essential for a society to function. For disabled people to fully participate in society, a fully accessible transport system is vital.</p> <p>If you accept that the best people to represent disabled people's interests are disabled people, then I would like to know who you are consulting with from the disabled community to fulfil your Equality Act duties?</p> <p>On viewing your website, I was unable to find any information on equal opportunities or disability except for knowledge on website accessibility. If it is there, it should be easier to locate.</p> <p>Just as important are the areas of housing and employment. I found no reference to 'Lifetime Homes' or 'Lifetime Neighbourhoods' or information about skills training for young disabled people in your website documents.</p> <p>Disabled people's needs should be mainstreamed at the design stage and not bolted on at the end, which is invariably more expensive and far less 'fit for purpose'.</p>	<p>Covid has had a disproportionate impact on various vulnerable groups in our community and many of the measures proposed in the paper are aimed at creating space for all non-motorised users which will be particularly important to disabled members of our community.</p> <p>The County Council as the Highway Authority is leading work to deliver road space reallocation to support social distancing and active travel during the Covid-19 pandemic, and has tasked the GCP with developing and delivering schemes to support this work.</p> <p>To expedite delivery of the schemes, as requested by Government, the measures are being introduced on an experimental basis. Consultation is undertaken once the measures are in place.</p> <p>Following implementation, a wide ranging consultation exercise will be undertaken for each scheme which will include disability groups.</p>
----------	------------------	---	---

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>How many disabled people work in your organisation, this will indicate how serious you take the concept of 'equal opportunities'.</p> <p>I welcome your comments on the above.</p>	
18	David Wrathmall	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The changes to road access in Cambridge City are being forced onto the population without consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either with local residents. • & it appears without involvement with their elected representatives. <p>Many specific safety and practical concerns have been raised by residents about the individual schemes but have not been addressed.</p> <p>For example, it is doubted whether GCP have consulted with the emergency services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutting these access roads will force emergency vehicles onto roads that are already at breaking point. • Putting at risk the 8-minute emergency response time. <p>Although 'rat-running' is an issue, in the absence of public transport, roads to be closed are used daily by many residents, including those with mobility issues, to reach medical, educational and retail infrastructures.</p> <p>A recent petition to Peter Blake, received 300 objections to one particular road closure (Nightingale Avenue).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that GCP understand that the same residents that object to these road closures in their petition ALSO support improved cycling safety in their communities. • Residents understand their local environment very well and & believe that 2-way car traffic and safe cycling schemes can <u>co-exist side by side</u>. 	<p>Supporting more people to cycle and walk will be vital during the pandemic and as we recover, and the Government has asked local areas to reallocate road space to support this.</p> <p>The County Council – with input from GCP, other partners and stakeholders – has identified a series of measures that will create more space for walking and cycling, in order to support social distancing and encourage more active travel. The aim is to create a network of safe routes on key corridors, that will encourage cycling within the city but also from Park&Ride sites and nearby towns and villages.</p> <p>To expedite delivery of the schemes being undertaken by the GCP, the measures are being introduced on an experimental basis. Consultation is undertaken once the measures are in place.</p> <p>As well as seeking public feedback on the projects, the changes will be monitored through deployment of traffic sensors to record traffic levels and speeds. We will also be monitoring traffic levels across the wider city road network</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents understand these road closures will go-ahead for a trial period of 6 months. • Residents are <u>now</u> waking up to the fact that decisions that have a serious impact on their lives are made without any communication let alone consultation. • These road closure trials will <u>now</u> be monitored very carefully by residents. <p>In order to bring residents into the consultation process over the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could GCP explain to residents the evaluation criteria that resulted in the decision to impose these road closures? • How will the GPC appraise the success or failure of each trial to determine if the changes should be made permanent or reversed? 	
21	Ericka Jacobs	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>As a resident of Bateman Street in Newtown, I was interested to hear about the proposed Temporary cycle/pedestrian scheme proposals in my area. We have a huge number students walking and cycling to and from school, combined with busses, taxis and private motor vehicles ‘rat running’ down Bateman Street, along with school parents dropping off and collecting students. This leads to frequent conflicts on the road, often leading to dangerous situations and not a few near-misses and actual accidents, particularly involving cyclists. I see the need to improve not only the existing conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, but also to increase space for social distancing given the need to encourage more people to walk and cycle during the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>However, I note that some of the proposed changes, including in Newtown, indicate that there is an intention to “prohibit motor vehicles at all times on the following short sections or road:....” There is no language indicating that access will be maintained, for instance, for emergency vehicles, busses or indeed residents.</p>	<p>Supporting more people to cycle and walk will be vital during the pandemic and as we recover, supporting social distancing and the Government has asked local areas to reallocate road space to support this.</p> <p>The intention is that access to all parts of the Newtown area will be maintained but in some cases the routes available may be longer and potentially less convenient by motor vehicle.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		Please can you confirm whether such access will be maintained, and if so, change the wording to reflect this?"	
12	Howard Kettel	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The Mott MacDonald ‘CSET Phase 2 Shelford Railway Alignment: Design Development & Feasibility Assessment’ report (May 2020) confirms that the alternative railway route is technically feasible, and with realistic performance assumptions performs at least as well as the chosen route.</p> <p>The alternative Shelford Railway Alignment would avoid unnecessary damage to the unique, relatively unspoiled and historically important landscape adjacent to the Gog Magog Hills. It would avoid damage to Green Belt lands which are very important to the setting, and to nearby communities for recreation and amenity, and are of economic value for farming. The alternative would also bring considerable economic benefits to local communities by connecting them directly into the public transport network.</p> <p>Will the GCP pause the scheme and submit the alternative Shelford Railway Alignment to public consultation?</p>	<p>The precis of the technical report is incorrect. The report concludes that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The railway alignment would have lower benefits and significantly higher costs of £29m; • Journey times for the majority would increase and patronage would reduce; • Significant impacts in Gt Shelford including taking of gardens and demolition of up to 4 homes, and commercial property. • The route has deliverability and compatibility problems with the existing main railway line, EWR and the CAM proposals. <p>The route was discounted as part of the options sifting process because DfT guidance says you can only progress options that are feasible and deliverable.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

<p>16</p>	<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>6.12 ‘ the main objective of the Cambridge South East Transport Phase 2 project ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve active travel infrastructure and public transport provision for South East Cambridge. • Improve Road Safety for all users of the A1307 Corridor <p>The LTP states the Greenways will deliver new and improved segregated links from Cambridge for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The Linton Greenway forms part of the CSETS project. The LTP also specifically states that equestrians will be included on the non-motorised user path alongside the A1307.</p> <p>The inclusion of equestrians on other transport projects is embedded within the LTP therefore the GCP must not exclude us as is proposed on the A1307 crossing schemes at Magog Farm and Hildersham cross roads and has already occurred on the Sawston Greenway.</p> <p>The Board has a duty of care to all residents therefore will the Board agreed that any approval for these projects includes a caveat that equestrians must be included in any provision for other non-motorised user groups?</p>	<p>In the design of the Linton Greenway, GCP’s intention has always been to provide enhanced facilities for all Non-Motorised Users where feasible.</p> <p>Officers will continue to work with local stakeholders and the highways authority to that end.</p> <p>In terms of the crossing at the Magog Farm shop, a request has been made to the Local Planning Authority to formally withdraw the planning application in order to allow for a period of further stakeholder engagement on the proposals.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation events are planned for 21st and 28th July 2020 to review the proposals.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Sam Davies</p>	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The GCP's commitment to providing an NMU-compatible underpass between Wandlebury Country Park and Magog Down has been part of the CSET Phase 1 project definition since 2017. It therefore came as a surprise to learn at June's LLF that this commitment had been dropped by project officers without adequate consultation or exploration of satisfactory alternatives.</p> <p>The A1307 in this location severs local people's ability to access south Cambridge's two major outdoor recreation destinations. It is a 60mph road on a steep incline and includes sections of dual carriageway. Officers have proposed a small traffic island between the carriageways as a substitute for the underpass, which suggests that they are either ignorant of, or have no</p>	<p>GCP has set up stakeholder engagement sessions on 21st and 28th July 2020 to discuss the underpass scheme and review options to secure a safe and useable crossing of the A1307.</p> <p>A request was made to the Local Planning Authority to formally withdraw the planning application.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>interest in, the needs of cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. They have attempted to justify this on the grounds that, because there are no safe crossings elsewhere along the A1307, none is required here – but there is no site elsewhere on the A1307 with two major outdoor attractions and such a potentially high density of NMUs.</p> <p>Officers apologised for the breach of trust at both the LLF and the Joint Assembly meeting and have set a date for a stakeholder workshop in late July – but in the meantime they have already submitted a planning application for the inadequate traffic island I describe above.</p> <p>Given the stated ambitions of all three Councils represented on the GCP to support sustainable transport, and the GCP's own commitment to improving quality of life for residents, I ask Board Members to affirm that it is reasonable to expect delivery of a means of crossing the A1307 in this location which is both safe and useful; and to request that officers withdraw the current planning application and resume meaningful discussion with relevant stakeholders about how this will be achieved.</p>	
9	Dr. Charlotte Vacogne	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Will you re-examine the proposal to change the guided busway route to make it go through the old railway as suggested in this plan?</p> <p>https://www.cambridgeppf.org/south-east-cambridge-busway</p> <p>Can the local residents consider legal/other ways to fight this proposal, until when?</p> <p>Cutting through the stapleford and great shelford green belt will damage the environment, the view, cut through pedestrian paths used by joggers, families, to relax, walk around. I further reduce the green space that is so precious and becoming increasingly rare around Cambridge.</p> <p>The cheaper and easier option doesn't have to be the go-to option.</p>	<p>The technical report on the old railway line route concludes that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The railway alignment would have lower benefits and significantly higher costs of £29m; • Journey times for the majority would increase and patronage would reduce; • Significant impacts in Gt Shelford including taking of gardens and demolition of up to 4 homes, and commercial property. • The route has deliverability and compatibility problems with the existing main railway line, EWR and the CAM proposals. <p>The route was discounted as part of the options sifting process.</p> <p>The independent assessment by LDA concludes that the degree of harm to the Green Belt from the proposals would be between</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

			<p>Moderate, Moderate-Minor and Minor with appropriate planting, assessed in the context of the surrounding environment.</p> <p>With careful and robust landscaping and retention of as much of the existing vegetation as possible, harm to the Green Belt would be minimised</p> <p>The project team will continue to dialogue and engage with stakeholders on mitigation measures to be taken forward.</p>
19	Dr. Charlotte Vacogne	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I live in Haverhill Road and the busway cuts in the fields right behind my backyard. This will produce a small 'triangle' of field stuck between the back of all Haverhill Road houses to the east, the busway and a section of the footpath to the south.</p> <p>There are deep worries that this will open the door to 'develop' and build on this triangle of land. This will defeat the purpose of us having bought the house (the main reason was the open wheat fields at the end of the garden). I would like to have reassurance of some sort that this won't be the case.</p>	<p>All development is subject to the Local Plan and the local planning process.</p>
10	Sarah (Rosie) Brown	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The GCP proposed route for the south-east busway boxes-in the village of Stapleford with three level crossings (existing railway plus two more for the busway). Given that the existing railway crossing already results in significant vehicle tailbacks down Hinton Way / Station Road, the addition of up to 16 buses per hour on the busway will increase this traffic significantly. In this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is the proposed route and additional road crossings considered acceptable by GCP, given that emergency vehicles will inevitably be delayed accessing houses, in particular those located between crossings (eg Leeway Ave)? This route will impede fire, police and ambulance access to residents and result in significant negative health and safety impacts. 	<p>The crossings will be traffic signals similar to the existing Guided Busway, and not railway type level crossings that close for a significant period dictated by railway signalling.</p> <p>An assessment has been made which shows that the proposed traffic signals with bus priority would generate a minimal and infrequent traffic impact. No build-up of queued traffic will occur.</p> <p>The impact on air quality of the scheme will be fully evaluated in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for an approved preferred scheme. However, the small level of changes in traffic and lack of significant queuing is not anticipated to cause any significant changes to air quality.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the impact to local resident health from the increased NOx and particulates from increased static vehicle traffic at these multiple crossings? Will local air quality standards be exceeded? A 2018 report from Public Health England notes that air pollution is the leading cause of early death. - Would the costs of tunnelling under the roads (in place of road crossings) make the cost of this route on a par with / more than the old Cambridge - Haverhill railway route? - Is concern over this topic (and possibly others) the reason why there has been no stakeholder consultation on the alternative route options in recent months? If not, what was and how is it fair to local residents to move ahead with a scheme that will have negative health impacts and decrease quality of life? <p>Given the lack of consultation with local communities in the past months regarding the south east transport busway, and the fact that questions asked in the previous GCP meeting were deferred until later in the agenda <i>and then not answered</i>, please answer this question now.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Question 9 on railway option.</p> <p>Three public consultations have been held, in 2016, 2018 and 2019. All of which featured a public transport route between the A11 and Cambridge.</p> <p>The route currently proposed emerged from workshops with the Local Liaison Forum, to which all local councillors were invited along with key local stakeholders. held in 2017.</p> <p>The route was subject to public consultation in 2018 and 2019.</p> <p>The proposals have been presented to the Stapleford Annual Parish Meeting in 2018 and 2019, and also meetings of the Local Liaison Forum.</p>
11	Stuart Newman	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I am a resident on Granhams Road, Great Shelford.</p> <p>The Great Shelford village council concluded that they could find little to recommend the plan as it goes past Shelford without providing a suitable stop for residents of Shelford to use. I can't see this on the list of public responses.</p> <p>This, however, must surely be a material objection where one of the key objectives of the plan is to improve links between the villages. How is the plan achieving this stated objective?</p> <p>Can I ask that further consideration is given to Granhams Road and Hinton Way. Both have railway crossings which disrupt them and the proposed new busway will cross these roads within a few hundred yards of the railway crossings. This has potential safety concerns as well as likely severely reducing access for residents on these roads.</p>	<p>The Gt Shelford and Stapleford stops will increase the number of households within accessible distance of high quality public transport by 20% with the majority of these being in Stapleford.</p> <p>For Sawston, a further 444 households would be within this distance of the stop, giving an overall total of 1,058.</p> <p>Some busway services could loop through Stapleford and Gt Shelford and routing of existing buses will be considered to improve accessibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Question 9 with respect to the alternative railway route.</p> <p>Please refer to the answer to Question 10 for the impact of the proposed road crossings.</p>

<p>14</p>	<p>Clare Arthurs</p>	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>In relation to the proposed level crossings on Hinton Way, Granham’s Road and Haverhill Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What traffic modelling/research has been done to analyse the impact of these crossings on traffic flow on these routes, particularly during peak times? 2. What measures are proposed to prevent the villages being disadvantaged in terms of access by emergency vehicles? 3. What modelling/analysis has been done to establish the impact of idling traffic and increased congestion on air quality and noise pollution for local residents? 4. What measures are proposed to reduce/manage the impact of increased roadside parking along these streets? <p>More generally:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What evidence do you have regarding likely levels of use of this busway? In particular, what are the projections of use from villages such as Stapleford, Shelford and Sawston (which are disproportionately affected) as compared with those from further away? 6. Will the cost/benefit analysis be revisited to take into account the financial impact of Covid and Brexit? 7. Will GCP revisit this project to take into account reduced levels of employment and/or increased numbers of people working from home post Covid? 8. How are you going to make GCP communicate effectively with and be accountable to local stakeholders in this project? 	<p>Please refer to the answer to Question 10 for the impact of the proposed road crossings.</p> <p>Officers will work with the emergency services through the detailed design process</p> <p>A Department for Transport compliant environmental appraisal report has been carried out and published as an appendix to the Outline Business Case;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in air quality from any of the scheme options were judged to be minimal; • Assessment of noise impacts concluded that all scheme options would result in minor adverse impacts. • A full assessment of the impacts of an approved preferred scheme on air quality and noise will be carried out as part an full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) <p>The scheme provides park and ride capacity for up to 2500 cars Demand forecasts indicate that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66% of trips would be from the A11 Travel Hub site; • 29% from the Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford stops. <p>The long term impact of Covid-19 on travel habits is at present unknown. Public transport walking & cycling scheme and we are being encouraged by Government to develop active travel solutions</p> <p>If permanent changes in transport demand resulting from Covid become apparent this will be subject to re-assessment during the Full Business Case</p>
-----------	----------------------	---	---

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>9. What consideration has been given to building a large Park and Ride on the proposed site, and running fleets of (Electric) buses to the Genome, Babraham and Biomedical Campuses, and on into town? This would reduce traffic to very local traffic, which could be further reduced by the provision of regular bus services.</p> <p>10. What consideration has been given to introducing a congestion charge, in isolation or in combination with an extended P&R scheme as set out above?</p>	<p>The development of the project has been informed by community and stakeholder engagement since its inception in 2016. This has included the establishment of a Local Liaison Forum for the project and three formal public consultations. The Statement of Community Involvement records how community and stakeholder engagement has influenced the development of the CSET project</p> <p>The proposals include Park and Ride from the A11 Travel Hub to the Biomedical Campus and central Cambridge. Public transport connections and active travel routes will also be provided between the Travel Hub, Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus.</p> <p>GCP's City Access project is proposing complementary measures to reduce reliance on car travel and free up the city centre's congested road space, to run better public transport services.</p>
20	Eleanor Clark	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>What research has been done and what evidence do you have regarding likely levels of use of this busway? In particular, what are the projections of use from villages such as Stapleford, Shelford and Sawston (Which are disproportionately affected)?</p> <p>How does the cost / benefit analysis stack up now post Covid and Brexit? It is widely expected that both employment and working patterns will fundamentally change after these events?</p>	<p>The scheme has been subject to Department for Transport compliant traffic modelling (webTAG). Demand forecasts indicate that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66% of trips would be from the A11 Travel Hub site; • 29% from the Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford stops. <p>Please refer to Question 14 regarding impacts of Covid and how these will be considered.</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

2	Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>The Outline Business Case states that the travel hub must be a ‘multi-modal interchange’, yet the proposal presented to the GCP Executive Board is for a 750 space car park with little consideration given to integrating with other travel modes such as bus and cycling. This does not contribute to the scheme’s objective of maximising the potential for all journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport and The Board’s stated aim to develop public transport, walking and cycling improvements in the A10 corridor.</p> <p>Counter to these aims, the number of proposed parking spaces has more than doubled in size during the project thereby seeking to encourage rather than restrict car use.</p> <p>Given the aim to increase use of sustainable transport, create a multi-modal interchange, and the significant changes to travel patterns caused by the Coronavirus pandemic, will the GCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review the long-term demand and need for car parking? b) Re-design the travel hub to create a fully multi-modal interchange with less emphasis on parking and more on sustainable travel modes, in line with the GCP’s objectives?and c) Delay making any decisions on this proposal until such work has been completed? 	<p>The impact of Covid-19 on future travel trends is a matter of considerable speculation. The impacts, if known, will be included in the development of the Final Business Case.</p> <p>The scheme delivers clear multi-modal benefits; cycle and pedestrian facilities including linking with the Melbourn Greenway, integrating local bus & rail provision and actively exploring options for delivering a new pedestrian footbridge.</p> <p>The report also makes clearly that an ongoing dialogue with the local community is essential to maximise benefits for the Foxton area.</p>
3	Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>Foxton Parish Council would support a fully integrated, multi-modal travel hub as part of a strategic approach that includes bypassing Foxton level crossing. Moreover, in its response to the consultation, Network Rail stated that the creation of a large parking facility and resulting increases in vehicle and pedestrian movements would increase risks associated with the level crossing. The Outline Business Case also recognises that the level crossing is a key cause of congestion on the A10 in the Foxton area.</p>	<p>The proposal for a level crossing bypass was originally being considered as a parallel scheme to the Foxton Travel Hub.</p> <p>Following the completion of the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC), the scheme to the Strategic Transport Authority, the Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), for its consideration.</p> <p>GCP officers continue to regularly consult CPCA officers on the progression of the Level Crossing Bypass Scheme. At present, the</p>

Appendix A - 25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>Section 2.7 of the Outline Business case clearly shows that the proposal presented to the GCP Executive Board would stand in the way of any future level crossing bypass.</p> <p>What engagement has the GCP had with the Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority and Network Rail to seek a strategic solution that includes the problems caused by the Foxton level crossing?</p>	<p>construction of a bridge or underpass at Foxton is included in the Combined Authority’s Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>The recommended option would not preclude the development of the level crossing bypass.</p>
4	Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>One of the scheme objectives is to “contribute to enhanced quality of life for those living and working in Greater Cambridge”. In the proposal presented to the Board, the emphasis is on improving access to employment and economic opportunities in Cambridge and offers no benefit to residents of Foxton and surrounding villages - all part of Greater Cambridge. In fact the increase air and noise pollution will have a detrimental impact on those living and working in Foxton.</p> <p>42 per cent of respondents to the 2019 consultation stated that they preferred neither the North or South option yet a ‘do nothing’ option was not included in the Outline Business Case. In addition, many respondents made specific comments on the negative impacts of the proposals.</p> <p>What account has been taken of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Those that supported neither option; and b) The negative impacts on Foxton raised by respondents to the consultation, particularly those in response to questions 2 and 4? 	<p>The public consultation showed that 42% of respondents preferred neither site option whilst 54% preferred one of the two proposed locations.</p> <p>It is notable that one of the recommendations of the Report, is to work with the local community and stakeholders to develop a package of local mitigation measures to address the potential concerns of stakeholders.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any air quality issues along the A10 corridor between Royston and Cambridge.</p> <p>Appraisals indicate that both Travel Hub options would result in slight adverse noise impacts. Despite this, the assessment of noise sensitive receptors showed that existing noise sources, primarily from the A10 and railway, are likely to remain as the predominate sources of noise pollution.</p>

<p>17</p>	<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 17: Greenways</p> <p>The Board is being asked to approve the scheme proposals for three Greenways. These include proposals to cover with tarmac, over the majority of their width, several bridleways which are currently rural, grassed paths e.g. the Whitwell Way. The amenity of a bridleway includes being able to chat whilst riding side by side with a friend, so path width is important for equestrians.</p> <p>Since 1968, horse riders have willingly shared their bridleways with cyclists but we oppose the roadification of the Public Bridleway Network as has recently occurred at Reynolds Drove. We also oppose allowing the soft surface preferred by many users to be reduced or removed. There are many alternative surfaces on the market suitable for all users and far more appropriate for the countryside than tarmac.</p> <p>Will the Board agree to prohibit the use of tarmac for these Greenways on existing bridleways, field edges and rural locations and require a more sympathetic and suitable material be used instead? Will the Board also agree that their approval includes the protection and preservation of the bridleway amenity for horse riders?</p>	<p>We agree that alternatives to Tarmac are available and should be properly considered in the context of the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Decisions on surfacing material will only be finalised at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>A wide soft/grassy path alongside a wide hard-surfaced path is the proposed solution for Greenway paths, where space permits. Provision for some landscaping and appropriate planting to minimise visual impacts is also included in the project.</p> <p>The surface of Greenways must be suitable for all-weather/year-round use and it must be accessible to all potential users of the Greenways.</p> <p>Prohibiting the use of tarmac in all rural locations would not be an appropriate approach, however, we agree that care should be taken when choosing to use tarmac and alternatives will be properly considered.</p> <p>The project will protect, preserve and aim to improve bridleway amenity for all Non-Motorised Users including horse-riders.</p>
-----------	--	---	---

* numbering refers to order in which the questions were received

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Question from Partner Organisation Representative
Notice in Advance**

No*	Questioner	Question	Answer
5	Cllr Neil Gough and Cllr Eileen Wilson	<p>Agenda Item 8: Impact of Covid-19 with reference to Histon Road Cycling and Walking Project</p> <p>We understand that the Histon Road closure will commence end June. We have both spoken at this Board before about the impact on students from Cottenham who attend further education in Cambridge and are dependent on public transportation. These students already face a typical 75-90 minute bus journey which will increase still further once the Histon Road closure is in place and the diversions are operating. We very much appreciated the widespread recognition at the Assembly and the Board of the need to put something in place for these young people, as any significant extension to the journey times is likely to impact educational choices and attainment. Since then, these students have suffered disruption to their education from Covid-19. Has the GCP prepared a plan to mitigate the consequences of the Histon Road closure for this group of young people or will they just have to put up with the impact on their education for the greater good?</p>	<p>Stagecoach is confident that in the short term there will be minimal delays to bus services when Histon Road is closed inbound given that the road network is relatively quiet.</p> <p>Over the summer we will need to see how the situation is evolving, and assess any impacts of the diversions on the affected public transport routes.</p> <p>Towards the end of July, officers will aim to discuss with Stagecoach their plans for School/6th form bus routes affected by the diversion for the beginning of September.</p>

* numbering refers to order in which the questions were received