

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 19th November 2020
2:00 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Mike Sargeant	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Lucy Scott	University Representative

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Ryan Howsham	Strategy and Programme Manager (GCP)
Simon Manville	Project Manager (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Gemma Schroeder	Project Manager Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Isobel Wade	Head of Transport and Strategy (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

The Chairperson welcomed Karen Kennedy, Director of the University of Cambridge's Strategic Partnership Office, and Lucy Scott, CEO of Eastern Learning Alliance, as new members of the Joint Assembly nominated by the University of Cambridge.

The Chairperson also welcomed Councillor Dave Baigent, who had replaced Councillor Mike Davey as a Cambridge City Council representative on the Assembly. The Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor Davey for his support as the Vice-Chairperson.

Apologies were received from Heather Richards, Helen Valentine and Dr Andy Williams.

2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Mike Sargeant, seconded by Councillor Noel Kavanagh and resolved that Councillor Dave Baigent be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/21.

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Dave Baigent declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to a number of items on the agenda as he was a member of Camcycle.

Chris Walkinshaw declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a Director of Cambridge Ahead.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 10th September 2020, were agreed as a correct record and the Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

5. Public Questions

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

It was noted that three questions related to agenda item 7 (Quarterly Progress Report), two questions related to agenda item 8 (GCP Future Investment Strategy), one question related to agenda item 9 (Public Transport Improvements and City

Access Strategy), and two questions related to agenda item 11 (Greenways: Haslingfield).

6. Petitions

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

7. Quarterly Progress Report

Three public questions were received from Anna Williams (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. It was highlighted that work was progressing as anticipated and the impacts of Covid-19 continued to be monitored across the GCP's programme. Only two projects had been identified with a red RAG status: the 'Cambourne to Cambridge / A428 Corridor' and 'Residents Parking Implementation'.

While discussing the Skills section of the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that figures in the report covered the period up to September 2020 and queried when more up-to-date figures would be available, noting that the uptake of apprenticeships had dropped significantly in other areas of the country. The Head of Strategy and Programme acknowledged there was likely to be a drop in numbers, although noted that actions supported by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their previous meetings had been designed to address this issue. She informed members that updated figures would be circulated when they became available.
- Welcomed that the number of students connected with employers had exceeded the target, paying tribute to the work carried out by officers.

While discussing the Smart Places section of the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Requested an update on the progress of the Smart Signals project, particularly regarding the County Council's position on an expansion of the programme. It was confirmed that while discussions with the County Council were ongoing, an expansion beyond the four trial junctions would be considered in the future.
- Established that a new map on the Wayfinding totem outside Cambridge railway station indicated a suggested route to the city centre that passed along Mill Road.
- Argued that the ability to respect social-distancing measures needed to be taken into account when considering Digital Wayfinding proposals.

- Suggested that invitations sent by Addenbrookes Hospital and Royal Papworth Hospital could promote alternative modes of transport to patients visiting the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). The Chief Executive confirmed that the CBC was addressing the issue on its website, while implementation and improvement to Wayfinding around the campus was also currently being investigated. She also informed the Assembly that the CBC was looking to identify representatives from the local community to engage and put forward suggestions. Acknowledging these improvements, one member further argued that attention should also be given to the information provided on letters and leaflets that encouraged campus visitors to travel by car. Another member observed that current public transport provision made it difficult for some visitors outside the city to attend appointments in a reliable manner, although it was acknowledged that the Cambridge South East Transport project would improve the situation.
- One member suggested the GCP should respond to the current County Council consultation on the Mill Road bridge, supporting closure as this promoted cycling and walking as alternative modes of transport. In response, other members commented that this was not part of the GCP's remit and it was more appropriate for individuals and the partner bodies to respond.
- Confirmed that although data on the Mill Road bridge closure had not been included in the consultation documents, it was available to the public.
- Confirmed that the vehicles to be used in the Autonomous Vehicle Project would be electric.

While discussing the Transport section of the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Suggested that current signage on the A14 regarding the closure of the inbound lane on Histon Road failed to direct road users to exit at junction 33, instead of junction 32, which resulted in major congestion in northern areas of the city. The Transport Director acknowledged the concern and undertook to investigate.
- Commented on works being carried out on Histon Road and hoped that this would be completed before the start of the next academic year, to minimise the impact on students who had already suffered as a result of Covid. It was confirmed that the project was on track for completion in summer 2021, and that the GCP had an agreement with Stagecoach to provide more support if difficulties arose during the course of the scheme's delivery.
- Asked for an update on the planned review of resident parking schemes in Cambridge, noting that many residents were impatient to hear what was happening, particularly those that were very much in favour of schemes in their area. The Transport Director emphasised that the suspension enforced by the County Council was temporary and that a review would be carried out in early 2021, with the expected involvement of the GCP, allowing for a further update to be potentially provided at the Joint Assembly meeting in February 2021.
- Clarified that no progress had been made regarding the proposed Oakington Rural Travel Hub. While confirming that it had not been decided to abandon the scheme,

the Transport Director informed the Assembly that there were no immediate plans to progress the scheme.

- Observed that section 13.7 of the report indicated a decision on the planning application for the West of Cambridge Package scheme was expected by the end of 2020, although there was only one further County Council planning committee meeting before the end of the year. It was confirmed that the matter had been deferred and would be considered at the committee's meeting on 28th January 2021.
- Acknowledged that the Heathrow third runway decision would have implications on all major schemes across the country and would need to be considered alongside the impacts of Covid-19.
- Agreed to ask the GCP Executive Board to determine the next steps for the Cambourne to Cambridge project without further delay, emphasising the need for clarity on public policy such a large and important scheme. While recognising a difference of views among members, the Assembly acknowledged that an established consensus amongst the majority had been expressed at previous meetings.
- One member highlighted the need for progress with the scheme in order to maintain alignment with the East West Rail project, while another member suggested that the scheme should be considered from a broader perspective.
- Sought further detailed information on the technical comparison of alternative routes for the C2C project that had been carried out by consultants engaged by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), which had not been published. The Transport Director observed that at the recent meeting a member of the CPCA Transport and Infrastructure Committee had requested that the report be made public and that the CPCA had agreed to do this. It was noted that at that meeting CPCA officers confirmed some of the details of the general appraisal and reported that the appraisal had been based on a number of factors and on none of the criteria had the CPCA's indicative proposal performed better than the GCP's proposals. On a number of the criteria the CPCA's proposals had scored worse.
- Clarified that the process established by the Department for Transport required the GCP to analyse, consult on and revise a single route alignment. Although it was possible to introduce alternative routes later in the process, the Transport Director noted that this would provoke challenges from transport officials and inspectors. It was suggested that the Joint Assembly should be provided with the opportunity to consider any alternative route proposed by the CPCA. One member observed that alternative routes had already been considered and discarded in favour of a preferred route, suggesting that consideration of further routes would lead to further significant delays to the project's delivery, while also creating unreasonable expectations for affected communities and stakeholders.
- Confirmed that if the Executive Board decided to progress the C2C scheme, the next stage would be to carry out a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment and

consultation. That stage would involve the GCP developing design proposals and mitigation proposals to overcome any challenges that had been raised. The Transport Director confirmed that the final approval of the project would not be sought until after these statutory processes had been completed.

8. GCP Future Investment Strategy

Two public questions were received from Lynda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society) and Roxanne De Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, County Councillor for Melbourn and Bassingbourn division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. While welcoming the synergy of the various Greenways schemes across the network, she raised concerns about current levels of multi-use path maintenance and sought clarification on how the GCP would ensure that the Greenway schemes, once built, were properly looked after. The Transport Director noted that the GCP was working with the County Council to ensure the necessary resources for maintenance were available and undertook to provide an update when a plan had been finalised.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which included an updated version of the Future Investment Strategy (FIS) following the first gateway review, which also took into consideration the impacts of Covid-19. Originally developed and agreed by the Executive Board in March 2019, the FIS outlined how the GCP would invest in order to maximise the benefits for residents and businesses in Greater Cambridge through delivery of the City Deal. Despite a significant drop in movement and economic activity during the pandemic, it was proposed to continue with significant investment in sustainable transport infrastructure to support growth and environmental objectives, such as the partner councils' net-zero carbon commitments.

Attention was drawn to a survey of local businesses that the GCP had carried out with Cambridge Ahead, as detailed in section 2.18 of the report, which suggested that although changes were expected in issues related to future working practices, it was not possible to say at this stage when they would occur, how widespread they would be or even what form the changes were likely to take. Despite such uncertainties, it was argued that investment in public transport would nevertheless continue to be of high importance and the report proposed a reallocation of £50m to support this objective. It was highlighted that if the spending contained in the report, as well as that of accompanying reports on the agenda, was approved by the Executive Board, planned over programming would reach £121m. While it was argued that such a figure was appropriate given current uncertainties, additional funding or scheme prioritisation would become necessary in the future.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Clarified that alongside £500m Government Investment Fund grant funding, an estimated £103m matched funding had also been obtained to date. The Chief Executive acknowledged that opportunities for additional matched funding would

need to be identified in the future, for example through Section 106 contributions, borrowing, recoverable investment or income generation.

- Highlighted the importance of ensuring that the cycling network was wholly connected, without gaps in infrastructure provision between different schemes, although it was noted that part of the funding detailed in the FIS was intended to achieve exactly that objective.
- Suggested that greater focus could be given on identifying why people were deterred from cycling and identifying ways in which to encourage them. Members were informed that the GCP worked closely with the County Council on this, with engagement carried out to identify why people chose different modes of transport and how they could be influenced to change to more sustainable modes. It was also observed that support was given to cycling initiatives, such as Love to Ride.
- Considered whether it was preferable to either have a small number of electric buses across Greater Cambridge or to ensure all buses in the network complied with Euro 6 standards, especially given the lack of the charging infrastructure necessary for a large-scale electric bus network. The Head of Strategy acknowledged the dilemma, observing that Euro 6 buses continued to pollute, while electric buses were expensive. She argued that it was important to analyse how they performed in the Greater Cambridge environment and whether it would be necessary to progressively advance through different technologies with the final objective of zero emission vehicles.
- Argued that greater focus should be placed on expanding the capacity of transport interchanges to cope with continuously increasing numbers of commuters travelling into Cambridge. The Head of Transport Strategy informed the Assembly that around 11,000 additional parking spaces had been proposed as part of the scheme, although she acknowledged the need to improve onward connections. The long-term impact of Covid-19 on patterns of travel into Cambridge was still uncertain and being analysed.
- Observed that people with disabilities would not necessarily be able to benefit from improvements made to cycle infrastructure and public transport, and it was argued that greater attention should be given by the GCP to the needs of people with disabilities. The Assembly was assured that the requirements of people with disabilities were considered in the development of each individual project, as well as across the GCP's programme as a whole.
- Supported further investment in cycling schemes and zero emission buses, although members expressed concern about plans to fund this by reducing planned expenditure on improving public transport services by two thirds of its £75m budget. While it was recognised that there was an opportunity to secure some short term gains during the pandemic situation, it was argued that this should not detract from the ability to make equally fundamental changes to public transport. In supporting the report's proposals, the Joint Assembly asked the Executive Board to identify how the £50m reduction would be made up if and when the funding became necessary for longer term improvements.

- Suggested that the GCP should encourage and support the relevant bodies to work on overcoming potential water supply constraints as part of its own work on utilities' capacity issues.

9. Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy

One public question was received from Roxanne De Beaux (on behalf of Camcycle). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which provided an update on the city access project and the delivery of short term measures, while setting out work on potential packages of longer-term intervention. Despite the severe impact of the pandemic on public transport, it remained crucial to tackle issues of congestion and air quality in order to achieve net zero carbon commitments. Attention was drawn to figure 1 in section 2.17 of the report, which summarised the development of five packages of measures, including the short term, medium term and long term, taking into account the recommendations of the Citizens' Assembly and building on the three key themes of creating space for people, being environmental and zero carbon, and delivering high quality, affordable public transport.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Argued that the City Centre Freight Pilot failed to take into consideration the significant level of home deliveries that were causing an increasing number of issues in residential streets. The Head of Transport Strategy noted that the pilot was initially aimed at the city centre to establish how the businesses were serviced and how they serviced their customers, although she acknowledged concerns about residential deliveries and suggested that the pilot could be expanded in the future.
- Emphasised that the short term measures should all be implemented by the time the impacts of the pandemic began to become less severe, as their objective was to alleviate issues during the pandemic. It was confirmed that all the measures in the report would be either completed or substantially under way by the end of 2021, in accordance with the program that was agreed in February 2020, although one Member argued that the end of 2021 would be too late.
- Observed the growing appetite around the country for short term measures such as road closure schemes, and suggested that consideration should be given to developing further schemes in Cambridge and other towns in the Greater Cambridge area. It was also emphasised that measures should be monitored once implemented, in order to assess whether they should become permanent installations. The Assembly was assured that the GCP continued to work closely with the County Council on the programme of current and future road space reallocation. All the measures had been implemented by the GCP through Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders, and following the monitoring and consultation processes, a report would be presented to the Joint Assembly and

Executive Board to seek recommendations for the County Council on which schemes should be considered for becoming permanent.

- Observed that various Clean Air Zones had been postponed in other parts of the country and requested further information on their proposed inclusion in the long term strategy.
- Questioned whether a phased approach to implementing measures aligned with the Citizens' Assembly call for bold action and expressed concern that the city access programme was still in the design stage. Although passenger numbers currently remained low on public transport, it was argued that the situation could develop quickly, with a sudden return of users once the pandemic became less severe, and a phased approach could leave public transport services unprepared. It was also suggested that phasing would take time and remove the opportunity to shape and tailor projects, inevitably leading to a reactive approach. The Head of Transport Strategy noted that there were limits on how much could currently be done, due to evolving government guidance and the ongoing situation for transport operators and providers. Short term measures had been developed and then postponed as a result of the pandemic, including fare pilots and service increases, and these could be implemented at short notice when it became possible to do so. It was noted that while there were limits on what could be done in relation to bus services, the GCP was able to work on cycling initiatives while reducing the number of cars on the roads and levels of pollution.
- Clarified that the next review point mentioned at the end of recommendation (b) for the Executive Board would be in June 2021, and not June 2020 as indicated in the report. It was argued that this should be brought forward to allow more time for the development and implementation of schemes.
- Suggested that people would not wish to return to previous levels of road usage now that they had experienced drastic changes in road space during the pandemic, and argued that the GCP should be demonstrating how the future could look, with less traffic and better public transport.
- Welcomed the extensive evidence included in the report but argued that more attention should be given to large scale measures and projects rather than short term schemes. The Transport Director noted that the pandemic had created exceptional circumstances but acknowledged the Assembly's concerns and undertook to reflect on what further action could be taken.

10. Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly: One-Year On Report

The Head of Transport Strategy presented the report, which included an update on progress that had been made over the past year by the GCP in response to the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly held in September and October 2019. A follow up workshop had been held in September 2020 in order to provide participants with an opportunity to review the original recommendations in light of the impacts of the

pandemic. It was proposed that a further update report could be presented one year down the line.

Noting that previous items on the agenda had involved discussion on the Citizens' Assembly, the Joint Assembly expressed its support for the report.

11. Greenways: Haslingfield

Two public questions were received from Lynda Warth (on behalf of Cambridgeshire British Horse Society). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which included an update on progress with developing the Greenways, outcomes from recent public consultations, and an outline of scheme details and budget proposal for the Haslingfield Greenway. It was noted that the scheme was the final Greenway to be presented at this stage of development, with all schemes returning to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for final approval in 2021.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the adaptations made to the route by officers following public consultations that had presented multiple different points of view.
- Expressed concern about the onward journey along Barton Road at the northern end of the route.
- Observed the narrowness of the footbridge over the M11 that would be used on the route and questioned whether modifications would be made to the bridge. The Project Manager confirmed that the bridge would not be modified, although officers were looking to improve the approaches or raise the parapets. He noted that as a minimum there would be mounting blocks on either side so that a horse could be led across.
- Suggested that sections of the route passing through Grantchester were narrow and would present constraints to cyclists. The Project Manager acknowledged that the width was not ideal and suggested that it would be necessary for users to give way to each other, although he noted that conversations were ongoing with neighbouring landowners.
- Expressed concern about the Grantchester Road crossing being on a 40mph stretch of road without a signalled crossing. The Assembly was informed that the design would be measured to calm or slow the traffic, while shortening the distance to cross. The detailed stage would involve a workshop for local people to discuss the best options.
- Welcomed the benefits to horse-riders offered by the scheme.

12. Date of Future Meetings

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday 24th February 2021.

Chairperson
24th February 2021

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	Questioner	Question	Answer
1	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Firstly, regarding item 10.8, Camcycle would like to ask officers which four junctions in Cambridge have been selected for the Smart Signals trial? There are many areas of the city where those walking and cycling must undergo long waits or the need to press ‘beg buttons’ despite pedestrian and cycle flows being higher than motor traffic flows, or where non-motorised users have to navigate complicated two-stage crossings.</p> <p>We’d like to know the criteria on which junctions have been selected for this trial. We would recommend that improving safety for those walking, cycling or wheeling must be the first concern, followed by a need to prioritise sustainable transport by improving the directness and convenience of key walking and cycling routes.</p>	<p>The following junctions have been selected for the Smart Signals trial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Hood junction (Cherry Hinton. Road/Queen Edith’s way). • Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction. • Hills Road/Cherry Hinton Road junction. • Cherry Hinton Road/Clifton Road junction. <p>The Robin Hood junction is being upgraded early next year with a revised layout and new signal equipment which will lend itself to the installation of new sensor equipment as part of the trial. The junction is well used by local bus services, pedestrians and cyclists, where delays are experienced by all modes during peak periods.</p> <p>The latter three junctions have been selected because of their close proximity, which will allow the pilot to test and assess the co-ordination of Smart Signal technology across a small network of signal controlled junctions. These junctions are located on key public transport routes and are heavily used by cyclists and pedestrians and are where significant delays are experienced by users of all modes throughout the day.</p> <p>Along with assessing the benefits for sustainable transport modes and reviewing the impacts on delays</p>

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

			for all modes, the trial will also consider safety implications for all users.
2	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Our second question is regarding the timescales for delivery of new sections of the cycle network. In previous meetings we have stressed the need for accelerated delivery of the Greenways, and looking at table 11.1 we are concerned that the Eastern Access project is listed as due for completion in 2027. We hope that the aspects noted in the consultation as 'short term actions that could be delivered by 2025' such as new segregated cycle lanes on Newmarket Road could be rolled out much sooner than that and, in fact, follow on from experimental measures to reallocate roadspace planned for phase two of the county council's Covid-19 walking and cycling schemes. This is particularly important as there has been a fatality at the Barnwell roundabout already this year.</p>	<p>As noted by the questioner, the consultation for Cambridge Eastern Access is currently ongoing. If there is support for the programme then Phase 1 would be delivered during 2023/2024.</p> <p>The proposed programme for the delivery of the Greenways schemes is a realistic forecast which is heavily on how land negotiations progress. The team has previously committed to expedite scheme delivery when possible.</p>
3	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>We'd also like to ask about delays to the Chisholm Trail. Why has the opening of the jetty been moved to spring 2021 and is phase two still on schedule to complete in 2022 as listed? What are the designs for the route at the station end of phase two?</p>	<p>The opening of the jetty has been delayed to early 2021 due to the ground conditions being worse than pre-commencement investigations indicated. The poor ground conditions require increased temporary works to facilitate the installation of a culvert.</p> <p>A review of the delivery and programme for phase 2 is due to be carried out. A new programme will be published on its completion, which will aim to deliver</p>

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

			the trail aligned with other proposed developments in the area.
--	--	--	---

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

4	Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p><i>Active Travel</i></p> <p>Active Travel is defined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan as ‘walking, cycling and horse riding’. I very much appreciate the GCP’s use of this term in these meeting documents. However, the GCP definition of Active Travel on pg 175 is :</p> <p>‘any means of travelling that requires physical activity, such as cycling or walking’.</p> <p>Since the GCP’s projects need to comply with the LTP, the definition should be the same.</p> <p>The discrepancy between these two definitions is important because every reference to Active Travel improvements across Greater Cambridge calls for improvement of the ‘cycle network’. This Assembly has been informed on several occasions of the negative and dangerous impact on horse riders created by improvement to the cycle network which excludes provision for equestrians.</p> <p>The GCP sustainable transport programme acknowledges the need for equestrian provision:</p> <p>‘The GCP is creating safe and easy routes for more active travel journeys to accommodate</p>	<p>The GCP uses the definition of active travel as set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan.</p>
---	--	---	---

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

		<p>Greater Cambridge's growing number of cyclists, along with those walking and horse-riding.'</p> <p>Yet ...</p> <p>3. Options and Emerging Recommendations pg 71</p> <p>3.6. Firstly, recognising the opportunity to encourage active travel and build on the emergency measures and existing GCP spend commitments, it is proposed that an allocation is made to enable targeted investment in gaps in the cycling network. Planned investments through the GCP programme, as well as by partners, will significantly improve the cycling network across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>It is essential that any investment to resolve gaps or make improvements are to the Active Travel Network in Greater Cambridge to benefit and safety of all active travellers – this includes road space reallocation projects.</p> <p>Please will Board Members approve this hugely significant change?</p>	
5	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 8 – GCP Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is pleased to see recognition of the important role cycling can play in addressing local</p>	<p>The Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan will be a key factor in deciding where to invest</p>

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

		<p>issues and contributing to GCP goals in the Future Investment Strategy report. It's clear that people want to cycle more, the government wants people to cycle more, businesses expect their employees to cycle more and public feedback from consultations and the Citizens' Assembly recognise cycling's role in tackling air pollution, congestion and climate change.</p> <p>We therefore strongly welcome the proposal for new investment to enable targeted investment in gaps in the cycling network and new criteria assessing whether transport schemes support the delivery of net-zero carbon objectives across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>We'd like confirmation that this investment will be led by the forthcoming Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan and ask when the plan will be published? Also, will investment in routes be spread across links within the city and out in the wider region so that rural communities share the benefit of improvement to active travel links?</p>	<p>additional funding in the active travel network, alongside other factors such as feasibility and value for money of potential schemes. Development of the Plan is led by Cambridgeshire County Council, who are aiming to consult on the draft plan in the new year.</p> <p>GCP investment in active travel includes the Greenways, supporting people to cycle in from villages, as well as investment within the city. If the Executive Board approve this additional allocation, further work will be undertaken to identify which schemes should be taken forward, looking across the whole Greater Cambridge geography.</p>
6	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Public Transport Improvements And City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes more detail on the city access strategy and supports the short-term measures being implemented to encourage more people to walk and cycle. More secure cycle parking at workplaces and in the city centre is very important to address issues of cycle theft, particularly when seeking to increase</p>	<p>Thank you for your questions. Taking the short-term measures first, I can confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The e-cargo bike loan scheme has a provisional start date of January 2021, subject to timely delivery of the bikes.

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>uptake in the use of e-bikes. We also strongly support the city centre freight pilot with increased use of cycle logistics.</p> <p>Questions on short-term measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the start date for the e-cargo bike loan scheme? 2) When are tranche 2 roadspace reallocation schemes likely to be implemented? 3) Has any support for those with disabilities who would like to cycle been investigated? Currently, there are significant financial barriers to those seeking access to adapted cycles such as handcycles or tricycles. <p>Camcycle also supports a more widescale programme of roadspace reallocation to create safe and attractive active travel routes and agree that if this is coordinated with a review of car parking and the city road network hierarchy, and communicated well as a whole scheme, it is more likely to achieve high levels of modal shift and public support. However, we believe that the recommendations underestimate the impact that could be had by fast, ambitious action. For example, Leicester's pop-up cycle network (11 miles in 10 weeks) has already increased cycling by 45% and school street schemes in London have had a huge impact on modal shift.</p> <p>Questions on long-term schemes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government confirmed the emergency active travel fund allocations on 13 November. The GCP is working with the County Council on implementation of the tranche 2 roadspace reallocation measures. We expect to implement the GCP schemes in the New Year and will be able to give a firmer timeframe shortly. • In terms of supporting people with disabilities to cycle, the report proposes further work to maintain access to the city for people with disabilities and this will include looking at ways of improving access to sustainable travel options such as cycling. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In taking forward both short and longer-term work, the GCP continues to look at lessons from other places, including those you mention. For example, Paris was included in one of the European Studies drawn on in the 'Lessons from Elsewhere' paper and Rachel Aldred included Seville as a key example in her Citizens' Assembly presentation last year. 2. In terms of the longer-term, the paper sets out some of the challenges we currently face arising from the pandemic and its impact on public transport and travel patterns. It's also clear that there are areas where we can make progress – including with road space
--	---	---

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

		<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Why were cities which have achieved significant modal shift to cycling in a short time not included in the Lessons from Elsewhere report? E.g. Seville, Paris, Ghent?2) What timescales are envisaged for packages 3a, b and c? Are these dependent on the existence of the GCP's new Busway and Greenway schemes?	reallocation and addressing air quality issues. This would mean implementing the packages in a phased way – starting with further measures around road space and air quality, then reviewing and adding more measures at future points.
--	--	--	---

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

7	Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 11 – Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p><i>Proposed Form of Greenway</i></p> <p>As this Assembly has previously been informed, whilst supporting the creation of multi user Greenways, the BHS needs to ensure that the existing amenity for horse riders is protected. To manage expectations and inform Assembly members before the £8m outline budget is approved, please could Peter Blake confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haslingfield to Hauxton : the existing Bridleway will be kept in its original state and the new path is in addition to the Bridleway? • Haslingfield to Cantelupe Farm: 'improvements' will be suitable for equestrians? • M11 Bridge: will be suitable for horse riders through upgrade or by use of mounting blocks? • Cantelupe Farm to M11 Bridge: this long, straight, grassy bridleway track that is open and safe for a canter will be retained and the new path is in addition to the Bridleway? • Upgrade of an existing footpath to link to the M11 Bridge: will be a Bridleway? • A link northwards to the Barton Greenway and follow Bridle Way and The Baulk path: will be in addition to the Bridleway? • Path from the M11 bridge to the Bridleway : will be upgraded to a Bridleway? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haslingfield to Hauxton: the existing Bridleway will be kept in its original state or enhanced, and the new all-weather, multi-user path is in addition to the Bridleway, not at the expense of it. • Haslingfield to Cantelupe Farm: improvements will be suitable for equestrians. We will be in discussion in due course • M11 Bridge: is intended to be suitable for horse riders through upgrade of approach ramps and increasing parapet heights (subject to designs being agreeable to Highways England as the bridge structure is a HE). • Cantelupe Farm to M11 Bridge: the existing Bridleway will be kept in its original state or enhanced, and the new all-weather, multi-user path is in addition to the Bridleway, not at the expense of it • Upgrade of existing footpath link to the M11 Bridge will be a Bridleway • The link northwards to the Barton Greenway: will be in addition to the Bridleway, not at the expense of it • Path from the M11 bridge to the Bridleway : will be upgraded to a Bridleway
---	--	--	---

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M11 Bridge to Burnt Close Grantchester: will be upgraded to a Bridleway? • Broadway to The Baulk path (north east end): will be upgraded to Bridleway with safe access for equestrians? • Cambridge Rugby Club to Barton Road and The Baulk: will be upgraded to Bridleway with a safe crossing of Grantchester Road for all users? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M11 Bridge to Burnt Close Grantchester : will be upgraded to a Bridleway • Broadway to The Baulk path (north east end) will be upgraded to Bridleway with safe access for equestrians. • Cambridge Rugby Club to Barton Road and The Baulk: will be upgraded to Bridleway with a safe crossing of Grantchester Road for all users.
8	Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 11 – Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p><i>Haslingfield to Hauxton</i></p> <p>Equestrian Access Groups were persuaded not to oppose the creation of a shared pedestrian / cycle path through Harston, despite having strong evidence of historic equestrian usage, on the grounds that a safe off road link would be provided for equestrians from Trumpington Meadows Country park to the Harston bridleway network.</p> <p>We feel very strongly that the decision not to create a new bridge to allow off road access to Trumpington Meadows Country Park is a missed opportunity for both the Melbourn and Haslingfield Greenways. This would create a much safer option for all users than having to use a path alongside the busy A10. The Hauxton P&R development with increased traffic will only exacerbate the existing danger at this point.</p>	<p>The option for a bridge to provide off-road access to Trumpington Meadows Country park was removed from proposals following strong objections to the proposal through the public consultation process, including from the Wildlife Trust. Objections were largely on the grounds of environmental and ecological impact of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Our proposals for the Haslingfield Greenway do not prevent this from being revisited at a point in the future.</p> <p>The alternative route will come closer to the A10 but will provide a safe route for all Greenway users.</p>

Appendix A – 19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions and Responses – Listed by Agenda Item

		Given the serious potential safety impact, please could this decision be revisited with a view to finding a suitable solution to allow this connection to be made which would be acceptable to the Wildlife Trust?	
--	--	--	--