



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Report To: Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

08 February 2018

Report From: Councillor Kevin Price, Chairperson of Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

1. Overview

- 1.1.** This report is to inform the Executive Board on the discussions at the Joint Assembly held on Thursday 18th January 2018, which the Board may wish to take into account in its decision making.
- 1.2.** Two questions were received from members of the public, both of which were taken with the Rural Travel Hubs item.
- 1.3.** Four reports were considered and the Joint Assembly also heard a presentation from Steer Davis Gleave on the conclusion of the Rapid Mass Transit scheme options appraisal. The Joint Assembly also heard a presentation from Systra on the Residents Telephone Travel Survey report that formed a part of the item reporting back on the findings of 'Our Big Conversation.'

2. Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM)

- 2.1.** The Joint Assembly welcomed the opportunity to hear the presentation from Steer Davies Gleave (SDG) and there was enthusiasm from many of the Joint Assembly members who delighted to hear about an ambitious and progressive proposition.
- 2.2.** However, a few members of the Joint Assembly wanted to wait for the full report before making a judgement. Similarly, they raised a concern about the presentation not being published in advance and about media coverage the topic had received.
- 2.3.** The Joint Assembly members had many technical questions for the representative of SDG which were answered during the course of the debate. There were some questions about the scheme operational costs and whether it would be able to operate without subsidy.
- 2.4.** There was also general agreement for there to be a significant interplay with existing infrastructure, and the Joint Assembly were very keen that transport requirements need to be considered carefully so that when this scheme is fully functional it should not have an economic or user affect on other forms of transport or areas of the county.

3. A10 Foxton Level Crossing Bypass and Travel Hub.

- 3.1.** The Joint Assembly was pleased to see Foxton Crossing back on the agenda and agreed with the overall approach recommended to the Executive Board, though there was a strong appetite amongst many of the Joint Assembly for Network Rail to make a significant contribution to costs.
- 3.2.** Members of the Joint Assembly questioned whether the number of car parking spaces previously proposed was enough.
- 3.3.** Some Joint Assembly members questioned the links with other schemes that needed to be made explicit, such as the cycleway along the old train line, both safe and more cycle parking in the vicinity of the station, and the integration with East/West rail proposals. The Joint Assembly acknowledged that a number of schemes interact in the vicinity and the solution needs to take all of these into consideration.

4. Cambridge to Ely A10 study

- 4.1** The Joint Assembly provided a range of views upon viewing this report, with some of the members disappointed that it had been perceived as a road centric scheme that had not looked at all other available options, whilst other members welcomed the prospect of focusing more on the north of Cambridge and the opportunities that the scheme provided for long distance cycle ways.
- 4.2.** The Joint Assembly also discussed how the success of the scheme in achieving modal shift was reliant on better Park and Ride facilities to the north of Cambridge, including Waterbeach train station, and that this needed to be carefully considered particularly the interplay between the public transport proposal in option one and rail.
- 4.3.** The Joint Assembly endorsed the recommendation to the Executive Board to pass this scheme onto the Combined Authority to deliver but felt that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was well placed to deliver the modal shift opportunities that option 1 in section 5.1 could bring.
- 4.4.** This discussion concluded in a suggestion that the Executive Board may wish to consider an additional recommendation to make this offer to the Combined Authority.

5. Our Big Conversation

- 5.1.** The Joint Assembly were very appreciative of the significant amount of work that has been undertaken by officers to achieve the volume of information provided and the helpful way that it was presented to the Joint Assembly, and looked forward to being able to make decisions based on evidence going forward.
- 5.2.** Members of the Joint Assembly expressed concern that the four of the top five incentives to encourage modal shift related to bus services where the Greater Cambridge Partnership has no specific influence, suggesting that the Mayor should have sight of the reports to inform the bus review that he is conducting. However, it was explained that improving the quality of public transport corridors, as per the GCP objectives, would address many of the concerns expressed.

- 5.3.** Some members of the Joint Assembly hoped that the intelligence on some of the so called 'sticks' such as intelligent charging would embolden the Executive Board to give careful consideration to these as a mechanism to achieve the aspiration of better public transport services, whilst other members of the Joint Assembly did not want the issue of affordable housing to be lost.

6. Rural Travel Hubs

- 6.1.** There was a mixed response from the Joint Assembly to the approach recommended to the Executive Board with a few members not in favour, whilst others endorsed the sites proposed.
- 6.2.** Some of those who were opposed to the approaches stated that they were worried about the conflict between achieving GCP objectives of reducing congestion and modal shift, balanced with the impact on local parishes who might see more traffic in their villages. Other members expressed concern about the rural travel hubs becoming free car parks for specific stations, the temporary approach of rural travel hubs, and that they perceived them to have no benefit for local residents.
- 6.3.** Those members of the Joint Assembly in favour of the approaches felt that there were many positives proposed and that some villages were aware of the risks but also welcomed the potential to become a modal interchange that will benefit neighbouring villages. It was acknowledged by some members that no solution was ever going to be perfect, but there was also a feeling that sometimes there was a need to try out different things to see their impact.

End of Chair report