



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly

Thursday 10th June 2021

11:00 a.m. – 4:40 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Rosy Moore	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Alex Beckett	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Business Representative
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Dr Andy Williams	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Election of Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Beckett and resolved unanimously that Councillor Bick be elected Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the municipal year 2021/22.

2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Shailer and resolved unanimously that Councillor Moore be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly for the municipal year 2021/22.

3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Lucy Scott.

Apologies for lateness were received from Helen Valentine and Christopher Walkinshaw.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillors Beckett, Milnes, Moore, Shailer and Smith to the Joint Assembly, expressed thanks to former Joint Assembly members Councillors Baigent, Kavanagh, Nethsingha, Sargeant and Wotherspoon, and paid tribute to the work carried out by Councillor Wotherspoon during his tenure as Chairperson.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Beckett declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project item (agenda item 9) as a property owner in the area covered by the study.

Karen Kennedy declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project item (agenda item 9) as a resident of the area covered by the study.

Councillor Smith declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project item (agenda item 9) as a property owner in the area covered by the study.

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

Councillor Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project item (agenda item 9), due to South Cambridgeshire District Council's interest in the Cambridge Ice Arena.

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Quarterly Progress Report (agenda item 10) as a joint sponsor of the Centre for Business Research.

Dr Andy Williams declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme item (agenda item 12) as an employee of AstraZeneca.

5. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 24th February 2021, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

6. Public Questions

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

It was noted that four questions related to agenda item 8 (Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge), four questions related to agenda item 11 (Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit) and fourteen questions related to agenda item 12 (Cambridge South East Transport Scheme). A further question related to multiple agenda items and would therefore be taken at this stage of the meeting.

Councillor Hannah Copley, Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, had asked a question as a representative of a partner organisation, which was read out to the Joint Assembly. Noting that the recently elected Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had expressed concerns about plans for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) and that GCP transport schemes continued to evolve and go through consultations, Councillor Copley asked whether an update to the Greater Cambridge Future Network map would be published. The Transport Director drew attention to the Future Network map on page 19 of the agenda and confirmed that it would be reviewed and updated following the development of GCP transport schemes or changes to external projects, such as the CAM or East West Rail.

A public question was received from Edward Leigh. The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

7. Petitions

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly that a petition containing more than 1,600 signatures had been submitted by Paul Brackley, Editor of the Cambridge

Independent, calling for homes in Glebe Road and Cambridge Road in Waterbeach to be safeguarded from demolition as a result of the Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge scheme (agenda item 8). A statement from Mr Brackley was read out to the Joint Assembly, in which it was noted that the Save Our Waterbeach Homes campaign had been established in response to concerns of residents and the local community over the impacts of proposed routes, including the demolition of homes. Arguing that such action was incompatible with the GCP's aim of improving residents' lives, the petition called on those options to be ruled out and for alternative solutions to be developed. The Transport Director clarified that when developing a scheme it was necessary to examine all options before rejecting or refining them, and he confirmed that the options that had caused concern to residents had now been ruled out.

8. Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge

Four public questions were received from Melanie Hale (on behalf of Landbeach Parish Council), Roger Hale, Shelley Mason (on behalf of Waterbeach Parish Council) and Jane Williams. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out the preferred options for a segregated public transport route between the new town at Waterbeach and Cambridge, including the Public Consultation Report and Strategic Outline Business Case. Consultation with the local community had identified support for an increase in capacity of the corridor, given ongoing traffic congestion on the A10, the expansion of the Science Park in North Cambridge and the proposed development of an additional 10,000 homes in Waterbeach in the Local Plan, although concerns had been raised over the interaction of the scheme with the village of Waterbeach. The Executive Board would be asked to consider taking forward a revised Central route option to the next stage of assessment and further development. Attention was drawn to the coverage in the report of a relocation of Waterbeach train station as a requirement of the planning consent, and although it was noted that this had not been part of initial plans for the project, it was suggested that it might be appropriate for the GCP to provide some funding for the relocation.

While considering the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that Waterbeach New Town included plans for 11,000 new homes, as opposed to 10,000 as indicated in the report. While recognising that such a large development required additional transport infrastructure, it was argued that this should be not be to the detriment of existing residents.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring that local communities and residents felt that they were being listened to and treated fairly throughout the development of the scheme. In order to achieve this, it was suggested that the revised option should be subject to further consultation before a final decision was made on the proposed route. Noting that the next stage would involve another public consultation on the final proposed route alignment(s), the Transport Director advised that accommodating an additional consultation phase prior to this would

delay the project and that the prescribed process allowed for continuous development of the final route anyway. It was also suggested that increasing the effectiveness of consultations would be more productive than increasing the number of consultations.

- Recognised the importance of ensuring the transport scheme aligned with a relocated train station but sought clarification on the proposal for the GCP to provide funding for the relocation, given a previous refusal to do so. It was argued that public funding should not be used to enable commercial development, although it was suggested that a system could be implemented that would allow for clawback of funding if the developers received more income than expected. The Transport Director highlighted that the relocation of the station was a condition that had been set by the local planning authority and informed members that the proposal to consider providing financial support had been made due to current financial problems that had arisen as a result of the condition.
- Argued that the Strategic Outline Business Case should consider the impact on surrounding villages that were also due to experience growth and expansion, such as Cottenham, and the impact of the journeys that would be made from these villages to connect to the transport scheme. While acknowledging that a new scheme in the corridor would impact surrounding villages and existing transport infrastructure, the Transport Director argued that such communities would also be impacted by other projects, such as the City Access Strategy, and that it was important to focus on the corridor itself.
- Sought clarification on what would happen to the proposed off-road route once it reached Cambridge, noting that a requirement to make multiple connections could deter people from using the service. It was confirmed that the issue would be considered during the next stage of consultation and scheme development.
- Sought clarification on the capacity of the existing busway, how it would interconnect with the new scheme and whether it represented a potential constraint on the project. The Transport Director noted that the two busways would use different technologies and informed members that connectivity between them would be considered during the detailed design stage.
- Emphasised the importance of maintaining interaction with other bodies, such as Highways England and Network Rail, given the impact of their own schemes on GCP projects.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly had indicated support for the strategic case for a transport scheme in the corridor, as well as the route options that had been proposed, subject to their further development. He recognised the importance that members had placed on the effectiveness of consultation with local residents and stakeholders and highlighted the caution that had been expressed regarding the financial implications of supporting the relocation of the train station.

9. Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project

The Head of Transport and Strategy presented the report on the Cambridge Eastern Access project, which included the results of the public consultation and the development of a Strategic Outline Business Case. While the consultation had identified strong local support for an intervention, the strategic case for the scheme had not been met, although it was noted that further development along the corridor that emerged as part of the Local Plan would be likely to affect the strategic case. It was proposed that a smaller scheme on Newmarket Road could be undertaken in the meantime to improve public transport, walking and cycling, with emerging recommendations set out in section 4 of the report. A significant level of concern had been raised during the consultation related to Coldhams Lane and the Joint Assembly was informed that the area would be reviewed in parallel with other projects, such as City Access.

While considering the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Highlighted residents' concerns that Coldhams Lane had not been included as part of the project, with particular emphasis on the northern section between Brooks Road and Newmarket Road, which it was argued did not have the capacity to deal with the current volume of traffic. The Transport Director noted that the issue would be discussed as part of the subsequent agenda item (Quarterly Progress Report).
- Welcomed proposals to reduce traffic levels on Newmarket Road, although cautioned that this should be achieved through modal shifts rather than displacement of vehicles to alternative routes. Members argued that such measures needed to be part of a holistic strategy and encouraged the Executive Board to be bold in developing such a strategy. It was also observed that it would be difficult for individual projects to fulfil their maximum potential until an overall City Access Strategy had been developed.
- Noted that 79% of respondents had supported the proposal to improve public transport and associated active travel routes into Cambridge from the east of the city and argued that the subsequent proposals were underwhelming in comparison to other similar schemes, particularly in light of such a high level of support. It was suggested that waiting until the Local Plan had been published would increase the possibility of a more long-term and ambitious scheme being achievable, although it was acknowledged that there was demand for immediate solutions. The Transport Director emphasised that the GCP was not responsible for the Local Plan and could only operate within the constraints of the existing one, noting that it was not certain when a new plan would emerge. A balance was needed between short-term solutions that were sought by local communities and long-term strategies with a wider scope.
- Expressed support for the relocation of the Park and Ride site and argued that it should be able to accommodate a larger number of vehicles. It was also suggested that the layout of the roundabout at Junction 35 of the A14 had a negative impact on the accessibility of the Park and Ride site and should be improved.

- Observed that many people arriving in Cambridge via transport schemes such as the City Eastern Access project would still need to cross the city once they arrived and that the corridor would therefore require appropriate onward connections.
- Argued that an additional train station in the Cherry Hinton area of Cambridge would be beneficial for people travelling into and out of the city, although it was acknowledged that new train stations were not the responsibility of the GCP.
- Expressed concern about the proposed cycle route on Coldhams Common and argued that the current road system would be able to support parts of it instead. The Project Manager acknowledged the concerns that had been raised and informed members that the route had been included in order to connect with the Chisholm Trail. Noting that the proposal was for an improvement to the current track, he reassured members that it would not be progressed if it was not supported, although he observed that future development in Cherry Hinton and Marleigh would eventually require additional cycling infrastructure.
- Suggested that it would be beneficial for the proposed bus alignment that was indicated to use Mill Road to instead serve the Beehive Centre and surrounding shops, which were poorly served by public transport, thus improving connectivity and reducing traffic in the area. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and indicated that the alignment was illustrative and more detailed work would look at alternative route options.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly was keen to be able to develop the long-term, strategic scheme as soon as possible, noting the need for the City Access Strategy to also be brought forward as a priority in order for this to occur.

10. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme. Further to the updates, the report included the GCP's revised Assurance Framework, a request to extend the Centre for Business Research work until November 2022 at a cost of £60k, and a proposal to allocate £150,000 from the city access budget for a secure cycle parking match funding pilot.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that paragraph 11.11 of the report stated that there were eleven Greenways schemes, and it was confirmed that there were in fact twelve.
- Indicated support for the proposed secure cycle parking pilot, noting that there was a high demand for such infrastructure, and suggested that the scheme could be expanded to include community organisations and charities. Members also argued that the ability of passengers to carry bikes on public transport would further encourage cycling and the Transport Director informed members that the GCP was working with bus operators to permit this.

- Noted that the table in section 10.1 of the report included a forecast completion date of 2023 for the St Ives Greenway and clarified that it would include the cycleway between Oakingham and Cottenham.
- Expressed concern that the City Centre Access Project was labelled with an amber status in section 10.1 of the report and sought confirmation that a well-developed version would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their next meetings, given that it underpinned all the individual projects. It was also argued that in order to change the widespread preference for car usage, it would be necessary to not only provide sustainable transport alternatives, but also to convince people to use them.
- Suggested that it would be of benefit to conduct research following up on those who had been helped by Form the Future in order to establish the level of long-term success of the programme. While acknowledging that such information would be useful, the Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme noted that it was not easy to track people's progress, although she indicated that future work would attempt to obtain such data.
- Paid tribute to Form the Future and officers for exceeding key performance indicators for Skills, noting the importance of the area of work in recovery from the impacts of Covid-19.
- Welcomed that Form the Future had been able to reach so many people through virtual events but expressed concern that there were people who were not able to participate in virtual events. The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme acknowledged that events had been limited in this way but reassured members that more options would become available to people as the service expanded and government restrictions relaxed.
- Expressed support for an extension to the Centre for Business Research work, as it provided accurate data about what was happening in Cambridgeshire on which future plans for emerging from the pandemic could be based, although members requested that such future requests for funding include a more detailed indication of where the resources would come from.
- Noted that it was unlikely that the Cambridge South West Travel Hub would be considered at the Executive Board meeting on 30th September 2021 due to ongoing delays in the planning process.
- Noted that the Whittlesworth Parkway and A505 projects were pending a strategic review by the Combined Authority and County Council.

While summarising the discussion, the Chairperson highlighted the Joint Assembly's urgent call for progress to be made on the City Access Strategy in order to supplement the other schemes.

11. Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit

Four public questions were received from Dr Marilyn Treacy, James Littlewood (on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future), Heather Du Quesnay (on behalf of North Newnham Residents' Association) and Dan Strauss. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Following an introduction by the Chief Executive, the Independent Auditor presented the Independent Audit of Key Assumptions and Constraints for the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project to the Joint Assembly. The auditor had been selected following a competitive process of applicants who had not previously worked with the GCP or on the Cambourne to Cambridge project, and the GCP was not involved in the selection of the auditor or the audit process itself, beyond providing requested information. A list of constraints and assumptions underpinning the Business Case for the transport scheme was published, along with a second invitation to local representation organisations to submit evidence. Following its review, the audit concluded that the scheme aligned with national, regional and local policies on economy and transport, while stakeholder engagement had been carried out in a robust manner and the development of the Business Case had followed the necessary requirements and methodology. The appraisal, economic analysis and financial business case were considered to all be valid, while further information on the environmental impact would be established during the subsequent stage of the process. Significant impacts that had emerged since the scheme had begun, including the Covid-19 pandemic, the announcement of the East West Rail alignment, and changes to planned Combined Authority transport schemes, would be also be taken into account in the next stages of the scheme's development. The overall conclusion of the audit surmised that there was no reason for the Executive Board to delay the scheme from progressing to the next stage.

In light of the Independent Audit's conclusion, the Transport Director presented a report outlining the proposed next steps in the process, which included progressing the preferred route in the Outline Business Case to the next stage of development, proceeding with the development of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and further consultation, while taking into account the significant changes that it had been noted as having had an impact on the route since being first developed.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Confirmed that neither the GCP or local activists had influenced the process or conclusions of the audit.
- Welcomed the clarity of the audit's conclusion that the project's assumptions and constraints were valid, and expressed hope that it would increase confidence in the project.
- Supported the project moving forward to the next stage, with particular attention being given to the impact that widespread changes could have on the project, particularly with regard to the decrease in bus travel as a result of Covid-19. While some members suggested that further analysis was required before being able to make an informed decision, it was acknowledged that some of the impacts would

be beneficial and allow for improvements to the scheme, such as potentially no longer requiring the removal of trees on St Neots Road in Hardwick, and that they would be taken into consideration throughout the next stages of the project.

- Supported the development of the EIA, observing that it would be decisive in establishing whether the project's benefits outweighed the negatives, and would confirm the validity of current assumptions.
- Considered whether the GCP should also consider alternative route options in case the detailed assessment of the preferred route in the next stage identified significant problems, although it was noted that alternative routes had already been reviewed and rejected, mainly due to higher costs and lower performance than the preferred option.
- Indicated support for moving forwards with short-term measures as a catalyst for modal shift in preparation for the final transport scheme being operational. The Independent Auditor suggested that the short-term measures could be complimentary to the long-term objectives of the scheme and would not be in conflict with later developments. The Transport Director noted that the GCP would continue to support the Combined Authority in order to ensure that services aligned to the National Bus Strategy.
- Expressed concern regarding the relationship between the GCP and local communities along the scheme's proposed route and suggested that greater attention could be given to communication and use of language.
- Expressed concern about the route when it reached Cambridge, arguing that the City Access Strategy would be fundamental in ensuring the full length of the route was efficient and successful. It was suggested that segregated routes going into the city would be necessary.
- Argued that the planned location for a Travel Hub at Scotland Farm would add a delay to the journey time that would deter people from using the service, and it was queried whether it would be preferable, in the case of the East West Rail leading to a train station in Cambourne, for the Travel Hub to be located close to the train station. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and informed the Joint Assembly that he would be able to respond once the East West Rail's Business Case was published, noting that the GCP had requested early sight of the document.
- Recognised that it was often difficult to align local needs and wishes with wider strategic objectives. It was acknowledged that the current and predicted growth in the corridor led to a need for improved public transport between Cambourne and Cambridge. It was argued that the development of an effective Local Plan required a future housing plan based on appropriate transport infrastructure.
- Considered the effects of the project on local biodiversity in the Greenbelt and noted the GCP's commitment to a 10% biodiversity gain for each scheme.

- Acknowledged that the scheduling of bus services would be determined by the level of demand generated by the emerging housing and employment growth in the area.

The Chairperson concluded that the Joint Assembly broadly supported the project moving forwards and the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board. He highlighted the importance that members had placed on assessing the impacts that factors such as Covid-19 and Combined Authority transport schemes would have on the project moving forwards, while seeking to rebuild trust and confidence with the local communities that would be affected by the scheme.

12. Cambridge South East Transport Scheme

Tony Orgee, Chairperson of the Cambridge South East Transport Local Liaison Forum (LLF), attended the meeting to present feedback from the public meeting held on 7th June 2021. While sharing the concerns that had been expressed at the meeting, Mr Orgee drew attention to issues that had been discussed related to the route and route variants, as well as proposed changes following the EIA consultation that had been carried out in 2020.

Fourteen public questions were received from Glyn Huskisson, John Hall, Roger French, Rosie Brown, Martin Goldman, Colin Greenhalgh, Lynda Warth (on behalf of British Horse Society Cambridgeshire), Gavin Flynn, Jenny Coe, Colin Harris (on behalf of Cambridge Connect), Miranda Fyfe, Peter and Susan Ray, Councillor Howard Kettel (on behalf of Stapleford Parish Council), and Barbara Kettel (on behalf of herself and Tom Robinson). The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes

The Transport Director presented the report, which was a summary of work carried out on development of the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme since June 2020, including the response to the EIA consultation, the design improvements and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), in order to seek approval from the Executive Board to submit the Transport and Works Act Order application and powers for construction of the works. Noting that the final route proposals would be considered further as part of the Transport and Works Act process, most likely through a public inquiry, attention was drawn to refinements listed in paragraph 2.2 of the report that had been made to the scheme's design following recommendations and preferences raised in the EIA consultation.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Observed that a significant factor in the route selection had been ensuring that it aligned with the planned CAM and it was suggested that if the CAM was no longer going to be developed, it would be reasonable to reconsider the different route variants. The Transport Director clarified that the decision for a segregated route had been made before the CAM project emerged and noted that significant assessment had already been carried on the route variants.

- Acknowledged that the GCP's assumptions on the cost and demolition requirements of the route had been challenged and argued that further attention should be given to the matter to protect trust and support from local communities.
- Expressed concern about how the scheme, including the Park and Ride, would interact with local transport provision within Cambridge, although it was acknowledged that the accompanying cycle route would considerably expand the cycling network in the area.
- Questioned whether the new Cambridge South train station would have the capacity and sufficient interchange functionality to interface with the Park and Ride. Noting that the train station was a responsibility of National Rail, the Transport Director assured members that the GCP was working with the organisation to maximise the effectiveness and benefits of interconnectivity.
- Noted that only 6% of parking spaces in the proposed Park and Ride had been allocated for electric cars and argued that a greater number would be required in the future. The Transport Director acknowledged the point and undertook to consider the matter, although he noted that the focus of Park and Ride sites had shifted from simply changing from a car to a bus, to facilitating various modal connections, particularly through the provision of cycling storage infrastructure.
- Highlighted the issue of the cost of travelling on buses and argued that the GCP could do more to encourage and support a lower cost.
- Noted that the scheme would require a large amount of car parking spaces at the beginning of the route and sought clarification on how large the car park could grow if demand exceeded availability. The Transport Director noted that there were currently 11,000 spaces across the network and argued that increasing the size of car parks should be done incrementally to avoid unnecessary impact in the Greenbelt.
- Noted the commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) on any one project with an overall objective to deliver 20% gain across the GCP transport schemes, and argued that this project was an ideal one to aim for at least 20% gain. It was also suggested that more detail and clarity about biodiversity could have been included in the report.
- Argued that further work was required in developing connectivity to the scheme for villages that it passed through or close to, and it was suggested that assessments of such issues should be conducted in partnership with the local communities. While it was noted that the scheme had progressively developed from its original limited scope to a scheme that took the alignment to the edge of settlements, members recognised that the over-riding objective of the project would be negatively affected by taking it further into the settlements. It was also noted that while the infrastructure was public, the provision of the bus services was controlled by private operators and therefore such decisions were beyond the scope of the GCP.

- Acknowledged concerns that building stops outside of villages could encourage development in the surrounding areas.
- Sought confirmation as to whether consideration of demolitions included those properties that were currently not built but held outstanding planning consent. The Transport Director confirmed that such properties were material consideration and been included in the EIA, as required.
- Welcomed the refinements that had been made to the scheme in response to some of the issues that had been raised during the consultation and highlighted the strategic and economic importance of connecting the key centres in the area.
- Acknowledged concerns that had been raised about the scheme passing through the Greenbelt, but observed that Greenbelt policy permitted such construction if a viable alternative could not be found after careful examination. It was further suggested that the scheme represented a thin strip of development that would be well-concealed and surrounded by biodiversity. The Transport Director noted that planning law ensured that no further development would be permitted in the Greenbelt on the back of the construction of transport infrastructure.

In summary, the Chairperson indicated that the Joint Assembly supported the project proceeding to the next step, notwithstanding reservations about certain aspects of the scheme. He noted particular emphasis on the need for further work to consider connectivity with the communities close to the route so they had access to the service and the call for the project to reach a BNG of 20%.

13. Date of Future Meetings

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was due be held on Thursday 9th September 2021 and the programme of meeting dates up to the end of 2022.

Chairperson
9th September 2021

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 10th June 2021
Question from Representative of a Partner Body

From	Question	Answer
<p style="text-align: center;">City Councillor Hannah Copley</p>	<p>The newly elected Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has significant concerns about the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), there is much opposition to the so-called “preferred” Southern Route for East-West Rail, and the GCP transport schemes are evolving as shown in the quarterly transport update report. However, there appears to be no revision to the schematic “The Greater Cambridge Future Network 2020”, which provides a holistic overview and helps to show how the various schemes are integrated. Would the GCP therefore provide such an update as a matter of urgency, so that we can understand the progress being made towards a fully integrated, sustainable and environmentally sound transport system that will not require urgent re-adjustment in the near future?</p>	<p>It is understood that the CPCA may amend or cancel the CAM programme, and that there has been a strong response to the East West Rail (EWR) corridor proposals.</p> <p>Continued dialogue is ongoing on CAM and EWR and we await confirmation of the formal position via a refresh of the Local Transport Plan</p> <p>The GCP will continue to update the network schematic on the basis of changes to the position of CPCA, EWR and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The GCP will also continue to develop and deliver its Integrated Transport Programme in line with Government guidance including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major transport corridors. • Greenways and cross city cycling. • Histon, Milton Road, etc. • City Access.

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 10th June 2021
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

From	Question	Answer
Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Items 8, 11, 12: Busway and Park and Ride Car Park Schemes</p> <p>Are new roads, exclusively for buses, and 2,000 space car parks in the Green Belt really the only and best way to spend the City Deal and planning gain money?</p> <p>The Cambourne, A11 and Waterbeach busway schemes have a budgeted cost of £340 million. Officers will have told you that these schemes are the only way to “unlock” new housing agreed in the last Local Plan.</p> <p>However, that is no longer the only, nor indeed the top, priority for the region’s future. Decarbonising road transport, reducing water extraction, restoring ecology, reducing toxic air pollution, reducing illness from inactivity and social isolation, and eliminating deaths on the roads are increasingly urgent priorities.</p> <p>Modal shift is the key to achieving all the transport objectives: people make more trips on foot, cycle, bus or train instead of driving. That will also reduce, and eventually eliminate, congestion. It may be hard to imagine, but that is the future we have to create.</p> <p>Once road congestion is under control, busways serve no purpose. Infrastructure with a design-life of over fifty years will become redundant within ten years.</p>	<p>We would agree entirely that decarbonising road transport, reducing water extraction, restoring ecology, reducing toxic air pollution, reducing illness from inactivity and social isolation, and eliminating deaths on the roads are increasingly urgent priorities alongside unlocking of housing opportunities for local people.</p> <p>The GCP’s proposals are well aligned with many of the potential remedies.</p> <p>But the remainder of the question simply fails to understand the challenge that Greater Cambridge faces and the reality of our choices of interventions. The fact is that we are a hugely successful, growing area. That has created enormous pressure on both transport and housing.</p> <p>To respond to the transport challenge, we need new integrated infrastructure, new services and to refocus the city centre away from the private car. To achieve more people using public transport, it needs to be reliable, frequent and affordable and you need all of these elements to achieve that.</p> <p>Today’s agenda covers some of our infrastructure proposals, modelled on the hugely successful Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.</p>

	<p>Ex-councillor Ian Bates said at the last board meeting that he now agreed with Cllr Bick that the GCP needed to develop a revenue stream to support an expansion of bus services. That would make possible an alternative strategy with better outcomes for all transport objectives.</p> <p>That strategy would replace building busways and car parks with investing, alongside the Combined Authority, in ‘pump-priming’ new, extended and expanded bus services; building more safe cycling infrastructure and highly-connected travel hubs; installing localised bus priority measures and smart traffic management systems; and much more.</p> <p>People voted in the last local election for change. So, ask the officers: what other options can they offer you to recommend to the Board to take forward?</p>	<p>The last Joint Assembly meeting considered the City Access and Public Transport services proposals and these will be brought back to the next meeting in detail.</p> <p>Together these initiatives, along with Greenways, Cross City Cycling, Cambridge South Station, state of the art traffic signals and the like, form part of our integrated strategy.</p> <p>We will continue to work closely with the CPCA to deliver successful solutions for the Greater Cambridge area.</p>
<p>Melanie Hale Chairman, Landbeach Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</p> <p>1 Will you arrange a proper consultation on the Revised Central Option before it is taken forward to the Executive Board? It is scheduled to come up at their next meeting on 1 July but this should be delayed. The route has changed significantly (re. p169 of 617 in the Agenda pack) and should not be considered an Option until it has been properly consulted on. It would have a significant impact on Landbeach residents, heritage and farmland. It would be very undemocratic to select an Option which has not even been consulted on.</p> <p>2. Can you confirm that you are fully considering the interests of existing communities? Your preferred Options do not really serve Waterbeach village</p>	<p>1. During the first public consultation we outlined “corridors of investigation” for a public transport route between the new town at Waterbeach and Cambridge.</p> <p>Through the course of the consultation period we discussed these options with a large number of stakeholders, local residents and Parish Councils, including Landbeach Parish Council.</p> <p>The revisions that have been made to the original Central Option have been made reflecting those discussions.</p> <p>At the next stage of the project more work will be done to assess the viability of the two broad options that have</p>

	<p>(population 5000+) or Milton (population 4600+). 3. Why have you constrained the study area so that Cottenham (population 6000+) is not included? A Western Option which is further west could be designed to benefit Cottenham residents.</p>	<p>been put forward. This will include further and much more detailed engagement with communities Further formal consultation on the specific routing options that are put forward at the end of this process.</p> <p>2. One of the benefits of the revised central option is that it allows for enhanced between the proposed public transport route and the villages of Waterbeach, Milton, and Landbeach.</p> <p>This means that selected services would be able to pass through the villages, and then join with the public transport route for a more direct onward journey.</p> <p>3. The focus of this project is to focus on the current transport issues within the A10 corridor but is also able to mitigate the effects of the major new developments at Waterbeach and north east Cambridge. Other areas such as Cottenham will be looked at by other areas of our programme including our City Access & PT work</p>
<p>Roger Hale</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</p> <p>1. The Revised Central Option has not previously been consulted on. On what basis can a new option be included in the decision making without democratic consultation?</p> <p>2. Neither the Revised Central Option, nor the Western Option serve Waterbeach or Milton villages. How is this consistent with the following statement in the report: "Response to the public consultation suggested that public transport connectivity to the villages of</p>	<p>1. During the first public consultation we outlined “corridors of investigation” for a public transport route between the new town at Waterbeach and Cambridge.</p> <p>Through the course of the consultation period we discussed these options with a large number of stakeholders, local residents and Parish Councils, including Landbeach Parish Council.</p> <p>The revisions that have been made to the original Central</p>

	<p>Waterbeach and Milton was also a very important factor that should be considered"?</p> <p>3. If Waterbeach and Milton villages are not served by two of the proposed routes, the proposed scheme does not fully address the purported need for better public transport in the Study Area. Why therefore is the Study Area constrained not to take in the villages further west? Cottenham is poorly served by public transport and a route further to the west, along the edge of Cottenham, could address this.</p>	<p>Options have been made reflecting those discussions.</p> <p>At the next stage of the project more work will be done to assess the viability of the two broad options that have been put forward. This will include further and much more detailed engagement with communities. Further formal consultation on the specific routing options that are put forward at the end of this process.</p> <p>.</p> <p>2. One of the benefits of the revised central option is that it allows for on road links between the proposed public transport route and the villages of Waterbeach, Milton, and Landbeach. This will be assessed further and discussed with communities during the next stage of development</p> <p>3. The focus of the project is the A10 corridor, but is also able to mitigate the effects of the major new developments at Waterbeach and north east Cambridge. Other areas, such as Cottenham, will be looked at under areas of our programme including the City Access work</p>
<p>Shelley Mason Parish Clerk & RFO, Waterbeach Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</p> <p>The approach to dealing with the transport issues at Waterbeach appears to those not directly involved to be very fragmented – please can you provide an explanation of the overall blueprint for Waterbeach that explains the relationship of this scheme to the others and how all of them relate to each other.</p>	<p>The GCP programme has been developed to support sustainable economic growth and the delivery of the Local Plan</p> <p>The Network map in paper outlines the infrastructure elements – City Access proposals, discussed at the last Assembly and which will come back to the next Assembly, outline proposals to include bus services etc.</p>

<p>Jane Williams</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</p> <p>The revised central option has been significantly changed as shown on page 169 of 617 of the agenda pack and was not included in the consultation that ended on the 14th December 2020. Does the Joint Assembly agree that a further consultation is undertaken before W2C is progressed to the next stage and that a new consultation is also appropriate on the grounds that the revised central option bypasses Waterbeach village and in tandem with the proposed relocation of Waterbeach station to the New Town, residents especially the less mobile and financially able will not have as much access to public transport as they do at present. Does the GCP Joint Assembly agree that a new consultation may change residents views and therefore the revised options? Bearing this in mind and considering that proposals to dual the A10, relocate Waterbeach Station to the New Town and W2C are currently unfunded, developers of the New Town Urban & Civic and RLWE's transport plans are substantially underfunded, Cam Metro scrapped by the Mayor of which W2C is a part, loss of huge swathes of the Cambridge Green Belt, farmland and habitat, does the Joint Assembly agree that the GCP and the Combined Authority work together to provide sustainable, accessible, affordable transport for Waterbeach residents at least cost to the public purse and the environment?</p>	<p>During the first public consultation we set out our ideas for possible areas of investigation for a public transport route between the new town at Waterbeach and Cambridge.</p> <p>Through the course of the consultation period we discussed these options with a large number of stakeholders, local residents and Parish Councils – changes reflect that.</p> <p>At the next stage of the project a lot more work will be done to assess the viability of the two broad options that have been put forward. This will include further and much more detailed engagement with communities, and indeed a further round of formal consultation on the specific routing options that are put forward at the end of this process.</p> <p>The strategic case in the paper makes clear the need for action – the A10 is busy now and the Waterbeach New Town will place significant further pressure on the area.</p> <p>GCP will continue to work with CPCA and others to improve public transport options along the A10 corridor.</p>
----------------------	---	---

<p>Dr Marilyn Treacy</p>	<p>Agenda Item 11 - Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</p> <p>The mayor has withdrawn support for the CAM and the major transport infrastructure scheme now being proposed is EWRail with a station planned for Cambourne. Against this background, I would like to ask members of the J.A. (rather than the officers) whether they have doubts that the deeply unpopular and environmentally destructive C2C off-road busway scheme with its route through the Cambridge greenbelt is really justified. Given the withdrawal of the CAM and the implementation of a fast rail link from Cambourne to Cambridge and knowing the local geography and commuter destinations, who in their right minds would now endorse a £195m off road busway that runs from Cambourne to Grange Road? The audit raised major issues that have been glossed over in the auditor’s conclusions and officers comments. If the purpose of the JA is to scrutinise, why is it not performing its function?</p>	<p>The purpose of the audit is to review the continuing validity of the assumptions and constraints underpinning the C2C scheme, not to evaluate the merits of different options. The conclusions reached are appropriate to the scope of the audit. Recommendations are made to address some oversights and the changing policy context for the scheme, but these do not invalidate the assumptions and constraints that remain valid in the corridor. Therefore, the audit concludes that there is no reason why the scheme should not proceed to the next stage.</p>
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive CPPF</p>	<p>Agenda Item 11 - Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</p> <p>Cambridge PPF has identified a number of significant factual errors in the C2C Independent Audit report. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The EWR does not provide an alternative to travel [to] the City Centre.” [Key Finding 7 on p7 / p 312 of the agenda pack]. It will take about 17 minutes by train from Cambourne to Cambridge central station, adjacent to the CB1 business district. From there it is a 20-minute walk, a 6-minute cycle ride or a 5-minute bus ride to the city centre. By comparison, the forecast C2C journey time from Cambourne to the city centre is 31 minutes. How is 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The travel times quoted are estimates of the in-vehicle journey times that do not take account of the total door-to-door travel times or the transfer times that are incurred at the stations in Cambourne and Cambridge, nor the frequency of public transport services. Several submissions made by individuals and organisations make assertions that EWR would replace the need for the C2C without providing any evidence. It is reasonable to assume that EWR will abstract some travel demand in the corridor – as commented on in S.5.2 of the Audit. Rather than speculate on what might be the impact of the EWR the

	<p>East West Rail not an attractive alternative?</p> <p>2. “Current delay on the A1303 ... in the westbound PM Peak [is] between 50%-75% slower speeds than night-time average speeds.” [Section 3.2 on p19 / p324 of the agenda pack]. Analysis of data provided by GCP’s Smart Cambridge programme shows there is no significant delay to traffic westbound at any time of day. There is therefore no benefit to be gained from building a westbound busway lane.</p>	<p>audit concludes that the EWR should be brought into the appraisal framework as stated in Audit Comment A15, p53, and in the Recommendations.</p> <p>2. This information was extracted from the Outline Business Case which uses data compiled from traffic surveys as documented in the modelling reports. It is one of eight transport constraints listed in S.3.2. The question refers to the current situation but as pointed out in the OBC and summarised in S.3.2 the demand generated by the growth in housing and employment will generate ever greater levels of demand for travel in and around Cambridge, with approximately 29% increase in trips during the AM peak, 31% increase during the PM peak and 38% increase during the interpeak period by 2036, and will thereby exacerbate current congestion issues.</p> <p>The Audit finds that the OBC is not as transparent as it should be in presenting projections of future travel demands in the A427/A1303 corridor, as discussed in the review of the Strategic Economic Case: Transport User Benefits (S4.2.1) and commented on in Audit Statement A8 (p.34). The Audit concludes that: “It would be helpful to compare the model outputs on general traffic as well as ridership on the C2C to understand better the impacts of the developments as well as the C2C scheme” (S.7.2.2 Options Development: Preferred Option Impacts, p.74); and in the Recommendations, “More testing of travel demands under different scenarios would be helpful, in understanding the long-term impacts of the scheme on general traffic in the corridor as well as on bus ridership” (p.77).</p> <p>3. The Audit presents the published information on the Girton</p>
--	---	---

	<p>3. “Development of a new all-ways junction or any other development at Girton Interchange would most likely need to be delivered by Highways England and therefore beyond the control of local stakeholders.” [Section 6.6.2 on p66 / p371 of the agenda pack]. Junction 7a on the M11 is being delivered and part-funded by Essex County Council. A consortium of stakeholders, including GCP, could co-fund and deliver a major transport hub at the Girton Interchange.</p> <p>These misunderstandings clearly influenced the auditors’ conclusions in denying that East West Rail radically alters the business case, and in rejecting ‘quick win’ in-highway proposals and ‘fixing’ the Girton Interchange. We ask Assembly members to recommend to officers that they seek corrections to the audit report before it is presented to the Board on 1 July.</p>	<p>Interchange as it exists in the CPCA Local Transport Plan and Highways England committed schemes. The Audit is not able to speculate on alternative delivery mechanisms or the prospects for an all-ways junction at the Girton interchange. Claims are made in several submissions that fixing the Girton interchange would solve the transport issues in the A428/A1303 corridor without providing any evidence. Improving a road junction that encourages more traffic will not contribute to transport strategies of the GCP and CPCA in shifting car users to public transport?</p> <p>There is no need to amend the audit report in the light of these questions.</p>
<p>Heather Du Quesnay Chair, North Newnham Residents’ Association</p>	<p>Item 11 Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</p> <p>NNRA welcomes the publication of the audit report on the Cambridge to Cambourne scheme.</p> <p>Will the Joint Assembly please reaffirm its commitment to the safety of the 5900 cyclists a day who use Adams Road as the main route between the West Cambridge site and Grange Road and ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment takes account of the environmental factors affecting this important part of the West Cambridge Conservation Area which led 3300 people to sign a petition against the use of Adams Road for buses?</p>	<p>Adams Road is not part of the recommended preferred route for C2C.</p> <p>The GCP intends to promote improvements to the safety of cyclists using Adams Road as a part of the Comberton Greenway, and should be in a position to discuss proposals with local residents in the near future.</p>

<p>Dan Strauss</p>	<p>Item 11 Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</p> <p>As one of the organisers of the Save Your Cycle Route petition of 3300 signatories, which urged the GCP not to use Adams Road, the busiest cycle route in Cambridge, as the final stage of the C2C, I welcome the Audit report.</p> <p>Leaving Adams Road Bus-free will improve the safety of 6000 cyclists a day.</p> <p>However, more needs to be done on Adams Road as cycle traffic is set to double as the West Cambridge site grows. When will parking be removed and traffic-calming measures introduced?</p>	<p>Adams Road is not part of the recommended preferred route for C2C.</p> <p>The GCP intends to promote improvements to the safety of cyclists using Adams Road as a part of the Comberton Greenway, and should be in a position to discuss proposals with local residents in the near future</p>
<p>Glyn Huskisson</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p><u>Babraham to Bio-Medical Campus proposed Busway and Park and Ride</u></p> <p>A 2020 King's college, London study found that pm2.5 particulates from tyres and brakes are 1000 times more harmful than car exhausts as they cause and exacerbate asthma and COPD. Pm2.5 particulates have been known to be dangerous for some time. Bus tyres are large so they will cause significant pollution in what is currently clean air in our countryside. Did you consider this factor when opting for a busway e.g. in your environmental assessment, or when you stated that the busway would be 'cleaner' and 'improve air quality'?</p>	<p>The assessment has considered emissions of PM2.5. This includes emissions from exhausts, tyre and brake wear and road abrasion for all road emission sources, including buses. The data used in the assessment was taken from DEFRA's Emission Factor Toolkit.</p> <p>The air quality assessment shows that the scheme has no significant effects on PM2.5 concentrations and total PM2.5 concentrations along the route remain well below the relevant air quality standards.</p>

<p>John Hall</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>If the Joint Assembly acknowledges that, since the vote/choice approx two years ago for the proposed South Eastern route, on which this proposal rests, that firstly, through the efforts of the GCP, the public is much better informed about the advantages and disadvantages of the route, and secondly, that much has changed, including the future of flexible working, the global climate and environmental sensitivity of the public, local conditions on water stress, local decisions on the Cambridge Metro etc,</p> <p>... then would the Joint Assembly therefore recommend to the board, that in view of the reduced urgency following the pandemic, that, it is only reasonable that a further vote /choice should be held by a more informed public, or their locally elected representatives, to affirm support for the proposal against some of the other recent alternatives that have been suggested as improvements?</p>	<p>In Greater Cambridge people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode. In this situation the strategic case for the CSET scheme remains strong.</p> <p>It is currently too early to make any reliable assessment of the long-term impact of COVID-19 on travel demand within the CSET study area. The business case for the scheme will, in accordance with DfT requirements, continue to be reviewed and updated as new data becomes available</p>
<p>Roger French</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>A report published in March 2021 by expert consultants i-Transport, commissioned by Stapleford and Gt Shelford Parish Councils and supported by local crowdfunding, found that the Shelford Railway Alignment (SRA) was a viable route option and Mott MacDonald had substantially over estimated the extent of demolition required. The GCP’s own ‘independent’ assessment also found that design compromise was not considered a ‘show stopper’ that rules out the feasibility of the SRA at this stage.</p> <p>How can this be squared with a senior Officer of the GCP making a public statement* “We know that the proposal will</p>	<p>The alternative route using the alignment of the former Cambridge-Haverhill railway through Stapleford and Shelford has been evaluated by GCP and is included in the report. That evaluation, in accordance with DfT requirements, continues to show issues of cost, impact on local properties and on the railway as being significant.</p> <p>The development of the project has been informed by community and stakeholder engagement since its inception in 2016, in accordance with DfT requirements.</p>

	<p>require us to knock down a lot of homes and commercial properties”. Will the GCP now agree to pause and review in detail the alternative routes in accordance with industry recognised and transparent optioneering processes which are evidence based?</p> <p>*ITV Anglia early evening news 3/6/21</p>	<p>The Statement of Community Involvement records how community and stakeholder engagement has influenced the development of the CSET project and the rigorous route appraisals has led to the preferred route being chosen.</p>
Rosie Brown	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>According to the National Planning Policy framework, ‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’. And yet the proposed Stapleford CSET Busway stop is adjacent to a 47 hectare potential development site for 987 houses, with over 800 further home developments proposed in proximity to the busway stops between Hinton and Haverhill roads. This proposed development is all situated within Green Belt land and the housing and Busway projects are inextricably linked.</p> <p>The proposed development will, in aggregate, result in significant sprawl and environmental impacts- including loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity, more cars on the road, unsustainable levels of water use, and erosion of flood resilience. These cumulative environmental impacts of the Busway and associated property development will never be subject to strategic evaluation.</p> <p>The CSET busway scheme was classified as poor value for money per DfT methodology before C-19 impacted working patterns and the CAM project was scrapped, and this is without taking into consideration the cumulative impacts that come from the proposed large scale destruction of our Green Belt.</p>	<p>The CSET scheme is subject to a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the scheme and takes into account ongoing developments in the planning process.</p> <p>The existing housing development that is being built at present has been taken this into account in the EIA for the CSET scheme.</p> <p>The independent assessment by Planning consultants concludes that the degree of harm to the Green Belt from the proposals (would be between Moderate, Moderate-Minor and Minor with appropriate planting, assessed in the context of the surrounding environment) will, with careful and robust landscaping and retention of as much of the existing vegetation as possible, harm to the Green Belt would be minimised. – we have committed to do this.</p> <p>This assessment will be reported in the Environmental Statement that will be submitted as part of the TWAO application.</p> <p>The business case for the scheme will continue to be reviewed and updated as new data becomes available, this includes the BCR.</p>

	<p>I discuss with my children the need for more affordable public transport in this area but I am unable to explain to them the logic behind carving their local environment into bitesize chunks for property developers, or how encouraging people to drive to a 2,000+ space park and ride facility will take us towards carbon neutrality. How can the GCP continue to propose the CSET 'white elephant' to current residents, taxpayers and future generations? Please pause the scheme and rethink smarter, sustainable public transport solutions for this area.</p>	
<p>Martin Goldman</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>Since COVID-19 our way of living is challenged. Our outlook and our future vision transformed.</p> <p>Aspects of Cambridge transport access - Waterbeach, Northstowe, Cambourne, Bedford, Great Abington - are being addressed separately. No Linton or Haverhill. An even more fragmented Cambridge approaches.</p> <p>East-West Rail - without public consultation - rejects a northern route. They plan to divide communities. Viaducts twice the height of our houses are proposed to carry noisy trains with smelly and dangerous diesel freight fumes to be broadcast far and wide. No electrification!</p> <p>The wisdom and practice of professional consultants claim to quantify value and economic benefit. This is in the process of having its principles challenged. The how of its measurement and for whom.</p>	<p>In Greater Cambridge people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode. In this situation the strategic case for the CSET scheme remains strong.</p> <p>It is currently too early to make any reliable assessment of the long-term impact of COVID-19 which is why the CSETS business will continue to be reviewed and updated as new data becomes available – in accordance with DfT guidance</p> <p>The GCP does have an Integrated Strategy to respond to the transport challenges in our area - we need new infrastructure, new services and to refocus the city centre away from the private car. Today's agenda covers some of our infrastructure proposals, modelled on the hugely successful Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, but modernised to be electric vehicles and adopting less intrusive guided technology.</p> <p>The last Joint Assembly meeting considered the City Access and Public Transport services proposals and these will be brought back to the next meet in detail.</p>

	<p>The wisdom of hindsight is wonderful. 25 years ago a campaign for a railway to link Cambridge to St Ives was defeated. We got the guided bus, with half the number of promised passengers. It is 8 kilometres short of the Edinburgh-London mainline. Freight cannot use it. Two thirds of the time it is empty.</p> <p>Another bus route is proposed, dividing the Gog Magog Hills. Perversely, it does not align to existing routes. More congestion. More opportunities to litter the Green Belt with housing.</p> <p>More than any other part of England, wildlife has declined in Cambridgeshire. A call for a Nature Network is made. A band of opportunity exists: Fulbourn, across the Gog Magogs, Wandlebury, Trumpington Meadows and Coton.</p> <p>Pressure for recreational space close to our homes has risen. We need to create more practical opportunities to generate and reinforce our physical and mental wellbeing. We need to link our overview of these individual issues in a longer-term vision - one to avoid compounding historic planning failures.</p> <p>Where is the joined-up thinking in Cambridge area transport strategy?</p>	<p>Together these initiatives, along with Greenways, Cross City Cycling, Cambridge South Station, state of the art traffic signals and the like form part of our integrated strategy.</p>
<p>Colin Greenhalgh</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>Given the current poor business case for CSET, why is the new economic model not being made available for public scrutiny and does this not undermine the credibility of the methodology and the resulting projections?</p>	<p>The new economic model is currently in draft form and being reviewed – this will inform future developments of the scheme. The model will be published when complete.</p>

<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambs British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>Issues for Consideration:</p> <p>2.2 Wherever possible, feedback received has been incorporated into the scheme’s design. The following key refinements have been made to the scheme’s design following recommendations and preferences raised in the consultation. A number of design refinements have been made following the EIA consultation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian and cycle access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve subject to landowner agreement; <p>This should include equestrian access – these routes have been used on a permissive basis by equestrians for over 25 years. Please could the Joint Assembly confirm that any permissive access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve will be negotiated for all non motorised users and not just pedestrians and cyclists?</p>	<p>It has been provisionally agreed that the bridleway status will extend up to where the Active Travel Path diverges from Passenger Travel Route, allowing equestrians to use permissive paths at Nine Wells.</p> <p>There will also be ability for equestrians to use the land to the east of the route (between the route and hedge) where there will be wide area of open grass than then leads up to Nine Wells and the existing permissive paths in the area.</p> <p>Equestrian access to the Nine Wells Nature Reserve will be further considered with landowners during the next stage of design.</p>
<p>Gavin Flynn</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>The CSET as planned bypasses existing centres of population and carves a swathe of destruction across our local greenbelt. Moreover, a tarmac road is carbon-intensive, as is the 2,000-space carpark needed at Babraham to support CSET. The latter will undermine local bus services by attracting people into their cars.</p> <p>Given all three Council’s stated support for sustainability, doubling nature and preserving green spaces as part of their strategy for climate change, and the recent Cambridge Nature Network with its emphasis on the Magog Hills, will the GCP</p>	<p>The CSETS was originally envisaged to serve the business parks only. Following consultation proposals to move closer to villages were included.</p> <p>The vehicles that will use the travel hub at Babraham are already using the A1307 to access Cambridge. They are congesting our roads and limiting the effectiveness of our local bus services. The CSETS scheme will significantly improve that situation.</p>

	listen to public demands for an open and transparent reassessment of alternatives to their proposal?	Experience from the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway does not support the assertion that local bus services will get worse. Rather, improved journey times & reliability encourages patronage...
Jenny Coe	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>An integrated transport strategy for Cambridge and beyond would bring CSET together with East West Rail, existing rail lines, greenways, expanded on-road bus services, pedestrian routes and restrictions on car access to the city centre in a strategic, joined up manner, rather than hoping that they will all somehow magically come together to solve congestion and pollution and serve an expanding city over the coming decades: given that the new Mayor proposes to review the Cambridge Autonomous Metro, can the GCP justify why it does not appear to be pausing and reviewing its CSET plans to avoid developing a key part of Cambridgeshire transport infrastructure as a silo?</p>	<p>The CSET project has been assessed as a stand-alone scheme in accordance with DfT requirements.</p> <p>As the paper outlines, it also forms part of an integrated transport system as it is one of four corridor schemes being planned by GCP. We will continue to work with partners like the CPCA to further integrate activities across our geography.</p>
Colin Harris Cambridge Connect	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>Given it has been demonstrated that a technically feasible alternative CSET route via the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford is possible, and that this has been accepted by the GCP consultants Mott Macdonald and Atkins, and that a full appraisal of this alternative as put forward by the Great Shelford and Stapleford Parish Councils in the independent i-Transport report has never been carried out, will the GCP undertake to make a full comparative appraisal of this alternative, including full consideration of the environmental, landscape, social and heritage aspects as well as transport benefits, and please provide a full justification for the answer?</p>	<p>The appraisal has been carried out and is available in the papers as appendices to the main report. In summary, the Railway Alignment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerably more expensive. • Requires the demolition of local properties. • Creates impacts with the railway line.

Agenda Item 12 – CSETS

The village Great Abington already has a bus service with a journey time of just 13 minutes into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). The only real problem with this existing service is its infrequency (only two buses per hour, reducing to just one per hour after 7pm) and its excessive cost (return fare for an adult is £7, and £4.85 for a child). Similarly, Sawston has an existing service that's only 21 minutes to CBC (three per hour, reducing to one per hour after 6pm; same prices).

In London's huge "Transport for London" area, equivalent bus journeys would only cost £1.55 one way for an adult (including a change of services in Cambridge to go on elsewhere within an hour), with a daily fare cap of £4.65; and the buses would be completely free for children up to age 16.

The difference between London and Cambridgeshire is of course that in London the buses are not run for profit by private companies. Cambridgeshire could use this model. Running many extra buses along the existing road routes would also have none of the huge environmental impact that all of your proposed new construction of tarmac route, parking provision, concrete flyovers, etc. will have: all that excessive production of CO2 in the construction process is counter to the national aim to reduce carbon emissions in order to combat the climate emergency, and it is simply not necessary if the ultimate goal is just to provide extra bus services. And Park&Ride just "bakes in" reliance on the private car, rather than helping people to move away from car ownership.

My question is: Will the GCP now work with the Mayor to direct its funds towards franchised bus services on existing

The GCP will work with the new Mayor, and continue to work with CPCA officers to improve transport services locally.

Franchising is one reasons why fares & services in London are better. Hundreds of millions of pounds of revenue subsidy (£700m) and strong public transport infrastructure are some of the other reasons.

Miranda Fyfe

	roads, and abandon this environmentally damaging and unnecessary new infrastructure?	
Peter and Susan Ray	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please confirm that there will be a Public Inquiry for this project and if there is not to be a PI, is there an option for the planning application or equivalent to be "called in" by the Secretary of State, particularly in view of the huge Covid impacts and need to spend public money very wisely? 2. In light of the events of 2020/2021 and their potential impact on the future, and with GCP citing cost as a reason not to consider another option, has the GCP considered reviewing the least expensive option for the SE Transport project? If not why not? 3. To whom (Cambridge City Council, Cambridge County Council, Secretary of State or someone else?) do I have to make representations for a Public Inquiry to be held on the South East Transport mass transport project, and by what date, if any? Who should I contact in those organisations please? 	<p>The decision on a Public Inquiry will be one for the Secretary of State although we fully expect there to be one.</p> <p>Low cost options have been considered as part of the business case as per DfT requirements.</p> <p>Details of the Public Inquiry will be made available to allow for representations from interested parties.</p>

<p>Cllr Howard Kettel FRICS Chair Stapleford Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>Only air quality, greenhouse gases and noise has been included in the GCP report on the Economic Case covering Environmental Impacts. However the Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) includes monetising environmental, social, heritage and other “non-market “features of the project. Why is it that the BCR which is “poor” (at 0.71) takes no account of these key environmental impacts?</p>	<p>The assessment adheres to DfT requirements</p> <p>Whilst air quality, greenhouse gases and noise impacts are monetised and included in the BCR calculation, other environmental impacts are not. – they were qualitatively appraised to inform the overall Value for Money for the scheme.</p> <p>A Social Impacts Appraisal and Distributional Impacts Appraisal were also carried out in accordance with DfT’s requirements.</p> <p>(including accidents, physical activity, security, severance, journey quality, option and non-use values, accessibility, and personal affordability and how these would be experienced across different population groups).</p> <p>The BCR is simply one metric for assessing the scheme’s Value for Money, with wider non-monetised impacts such as environmental impacts, social and distributional impacts, and wider economic benefits such as the scheme’s ability to support new development and employment sites, and the creation of new jobs, GVA uplift, land value uplift, and increasing the job catchments area, all informing the overall Value for Money.</p> <p>The economic appraisal, including BCR will be re-considered at Full Business Case stage.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Barbara Kettel and Tom Robinson *</p> <p>* Duplicate questions being combined</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</p> <p>With the CSET busway operating at capacity on opening (i-Transport Report commissioned by Gt Shelford and Stapleford Parish Councils) how will the vision for growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus be accommodated, and with the limited road capacity in central Cambridge preventing the implied exponential increase in the number of buses, should a more scalable system and future-proofed infrastructure be planned such as light rail?</p>	<p>CSETS will not open at capacity on Day 1 and is an entirely scalable solution – one of its benefits.</p> <p>One of the shortcomings of the I-Transport Report is that it ignores the ability to increase service frequency to meet increasing demand – as has occurred on the existing Cambridgeshire Guided busway.</p> <p>A study into mass-transit options for Cambridge did not favour light rail and those cities that do have light rail are in the main much larger than Cambridge.</p>
--	---	---