



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
15 November 2018 at 2pm

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Councillor Tim Wotherspoon | Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairperson) |
| Councillor Tim Bick | Cambridgeshire City Council (Vice Chairperson) |
| Councillor Dave Baigent | Cambridge City Council |
| Councillor Nicky Massey | Cambridge City Council |
| Councillor Noel Kavanagh | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Councillor Ian Sollom | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Councillor Peter Topping | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Councillor Eileen Wilson | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Jo Sainsbury | iMET |
| Christopher Walkinshaw | Cambridge Ahead |
| Dr John Wells | Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute |
| Andy Williams | Astrazeneca |
| Heather Richards | Transversal |

Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Councillor Ian Bates | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Claire Ruskin | Cambridge Network |

Officers/Advisors:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Peter Blake | Transport Director, GCP |
| Niamh Matthews | Head of Strategy and Programme, GCP |
| Rachel Stopard | Chief Executive, GCP |
| Kathrin John | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Victoria Wallace | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Alison Norrish and Joanna Rowell | Arup |
| Jo Baker | Mott MacDonald |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Helen Valentine and Councillor John Williams.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Baigent and Kavanagh each declared a non-pecuniary interest as members of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Apologies for absence were received from Helen Valentine and Councillor John Williams.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

10 public questions had been received. These related to agenda items 6 and 8 and would be taken at the relevant agenda items.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

6. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT

The GCP Transport Director gave a short presentation setting the Cambourne to Cambridge proposals in the context of the wider City Access proposals.

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum (LLF) summarised the outcomes of the LLF meeting which had taken place on 14th November 2018:

- The LLF requested that the Joint Assembly allowed two weeks between the meeting papers being published and the Joint Assembly meeting taking place, to allow more time for input to be provided by the LLF.
- The LLF noted that the GCP was taking forward a route and alignment that was most opposed in the public consultation and which the LLF had advised against.
- The LLF supported the principle of tunnels but was concerned about their deliverability.
- The LLF felt that the GCP's preferred route did not serve commuters from Cambourne and Bourn and would only benefit a small proportion of people.
- The preferred off-road route provided poor connectivity; it did not provide effective links to the Biomedical Campus or the Science Park. A northern route would provide better connectivity.
- The LLF technical group expressed concern that the benefit cost ratio (BCR) was one tenth of what was normally expected of public transport schemes.
- It was felt that journey times were not significantly better than on-road alternatives.
- There was concern about Mott MacDonald's environmental assessment which the LLF felt was based on a poor understanding of the importance of the wider landscape setting of the city and heritage implications within the city. The LLF asked for an independent assessment of each to be completed before the full EIA and HIA at Planning stage.

- The LLF requested to see the full Arup report that had looked at and dismissed an alternative northern route.
- The LLF requested that a panel of experts independent from the GCP, assess the economic, environmental and transport implications of the scheme.
- The LLF had:
 1. Recommended that no decision be taken on a preferred route until greater clarity on the CAM was provided; the proposed network, connectivity and funding. It was felt that the off-road bus route due to its poor connectivity to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), Science park and the city centre, its poor transport benefits and low BCR, did not stand up to scrutiny.
 2. Noted that there was only one route that was compliant with CAM. It asked that a northern off-road option be developed. It was felt that there could be major advantages to this; it could better connect with the Oxford Cambridge Expressway and developments at the Girton Interchange in the longer term, and could link with the Science Park, CBC and the North West Cambridge site.
 3. Recommended that, given the lengthy timescale involved in building an off-road scheme, an in-bound bus lane be designed on Madingley Road immediately. This would provide significant public transport benefit to the residents west of Cambridge.

Dr Marylin Treacy, Allan Treacy, James Littlewood, Roger Tomlinson, Alistair Burford and Dr Gabriel Fox were invited to ask their public questions. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which provided an update on progress with developing the business case for the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge (C2C) Better Public Transport project. Attention was drawn to the timescale of the project. An Executive Board decision on the outline business case would be sought in Autumn 2019, following a formal public consultation. There was a clear alignment between the preferred scheme and the CAM. It was recognised that an on-road scheme had less impact on the greenbelt than the off-road scheme. It was highlighted that the specific route alignment was still under development.

Councillor Topping queried whether there would be sufficient time for the outline business case for this route, to take account of the Combined Authority's strategic business case. The route needed to be consistent with the longer term aspiration for the CAM. Given the immediate need, he suggested that an on-road solution would be deliverable more quickly, cost significantly less and would allow more time for a longer term CAM system to be developed. The GCP Transport Director pointed out that the GCP recognised the challenge of delivering very large projects and that the phasing of delivery was important. This would be addressed in the strategic business case. Officers would look at options for potential interim short term solutions and report back on this.

Councillor Sollom raised concerns about the off-road route. He queried:

- The Red Amber Green [RAG] scoring of the public acceptability in the Mott MacDonald report, which did not reflect that the off-road option was not favoured by the public.
- The significant difference of the wider economic benefits between the schemes and asked how these calculations had been reached. He suggested that more detail be provided about this.

- Why the northern route had been rejected when the Arup report suggested that it had been competitive. He felt this route had greater potential to link to the wider network, fit better with wider project objectives, had far greater local support and should therefore be looked at again.

Councillor Sollom requested:

- Further consideration and detail of the wider heritage aspects across the whole of the off-road option, not just focussing on the SSSI.
- That extensive landscaping be included in the mitigations.
- An explanation of why the on-road route did not open up the sites in the Local Plan to the same extent as the off-road route.
- That two CAM compliant schemes be compared.
- An interim on-road solution be worked on.

Councillor Sollom commented that residents in the area understood the need for a segregated route and to develop a scheme that connected communities such as Cambourne and Bourn, with employment centres in the city. However they did not think the solution presented was the best option and there was no evidence of other options being presented. He felt that trust had broken down between the GCP and stakeholders.

Councillor Bick expressed support for the proposals and hoped the Executive Board would move forward with them. He stressed the importance of the GCP providing a first class public transport system to enable residents of existing and future new developments outside the city, to access Cambridge city. The recommended route was not predicated on the CAM and it was likely the GCP would still be looking at this option without this.

Andy Williams commented that travel routes that were reliable, regular and offered a journey time of 30 minutes or less from Cambourne to Cambridge city centre, CBC and the Science Park, was the step change businesses were seeking. The current public transport journey time of 90 minutes from Cambourne to CBC, was not acceptable to businesses or employees. The GCP needed to aim for an aspirational scheme. He commented that the 30 minute journey times outlined in the report via the preferred route, were not reliant on the CAM or tunnelling. He suggested that the aspirations of each scheme needed to be made clear in future reports.

Heather Richards suggested Madingley Road cycling improvements could be a quick win and should be focussed on.

Councillor Baigent supported the proposals. He pointed out that the arguments for a northern route had already been listened to, the route had been discounted and he felt that this should not be revisited. Madingley Road could not be expanded to the extent that was needed to accommodate the commuting traffic from existing and future new developments outside the city.

Jo Sainsbury suggested a need for transparency and summary of the discussions that had already taken place on this scheme. Access to past reports should be ensured. Old ground should not be revisited. She commented that from a business perspective, journey time was paramount to transport solutions and reducing these was the only way to get people out of their cars. The GCP had a unique opportunity to do something different in the longer term; an on-road solution was short term and a long term ambitious solution was needed.

The GCP Transport Director, Arup and Mott MacDonald representatives responded to the points raised:

- Arup had been providing technical advice to the Combined Authority around the buildability and technical aspects of the CAM. The Joint Assembly was informed that an underground system could be built.
- The strategic outline business case would follow the Green Book Treasury principles and would be available in the public domain in January/February 2019.
- Officers would look at an interim on-road solution and would inform members of a timescale for this work.
- The evidence around the northern route would be pulled together into a single document.
- Work was ongoing on the East/West rail and a consultation was expected in early 2019. The GCP was in regular discussions with constituent authorities.
- There was much more work to be done on mitigation and nothing had been ruled out.
- The off-road option had performed significantly better than the on-road scheme at public consultation.
- Assurance was provided that the heritage and environmental aspects along the route had been considered. More detailed surveys had been undertaken and local wildlife sites had been included in this. The two most significant sites in terms of heritage and the environment at a national level, were along the on-road route. Further surveys were ongoing.
- The assessment of patronage was based on work that had been carried out on the benefit cost ratio and was based on committed development. Wider economic benefit considered the potential development that could result if the scheme was in place. A fully segregated scheme that was future proofed and could operate without congestion in the long term, would enable development more successfully than an on-road alternative that would eventually fail at key points along the route, due to congestion.
- Officers clarified that not all focus was on journey time.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder offered to meet with Joint Assembly members to discuss this scheme and the issues raised at the meeting, before or after the December Executive Board meeting. The LLF Chairman was also welcome to attend this meeting.

7. CITY ACCESS AND BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS - UPDATE

The GCP Transport Director presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on the City Access workstreams, with a focus on developing options for securing a step-change in public transport, reducing congestion and improving air quality in Greater Cambridge. The public transport offering needed to go far beyond what already existed, with significant improvements in journey time and reliability needed.

Councillor Wilson commented that the diagram of proposed routes excluded many villages; it was important that the residents of these villages knew that they would not be overlooked. As the local member for Cottenham, one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire, Councillor Wilson pointed out that the bus from Cottenham to Cambridge took one hour and as such, was not a viable option for people commuting to work. Furthermore she pointed out that neither the stations nor Addenbrooke's could be reached from Cottenham without changing buses. The Oakington Rural Travel Hub would link to the guided busway however there was no bus service that linked Cottenham to Oakington and the busway. For people who would have to drive from Cottenham to the travel hub, only 41 parking spaces were proposed. Cottenham was a community of over 6000 residents, which would increase to 8000 with future development, and a good public

transport solution was needed.

Councillor Massey commented that it was vital that the city access project also focussed on villages outside the city. She suggested the reintroduction of the bus and bike service may be an option for rural communities to access their rural travel hubs. Faster and affordable public transport was needed across the city and from the villages, which was cheaper for people to use than their cars. Extremely low public transport fares were needed. She pointed out that people living within the city had to change buses to get to the train stations and hospital, which was not acceptable. A better public transport system was needed now; she pointed out that Newmarket Road was at a standstill at peak hours and the weekends, and development in the area would make this situation worse.

Councillor Kavanagh reiterated previous comments regarding the need for cycling improvements and felt this point had not been made strongly enough in the report. He suggested the GCP should build on the alternative modes of transport people were already using, such as cycling. More people would cycle if they felt it was safer to do so, therefore segregation of cyclists from other road users should be a top priority. A network of segregated cycle routes and safe junctions for cyclists was needed across the city, expanding what had already been achieved on Hills Road and Huntingdon Road.

Christopher Walkinshaw welcomed the report, in particular the emphasis it put on capacity issues. He suggested that reference to the number of people coming from outside the area and capacity issues on orbital routes, was missing from the report.

Andy Williams commented that the city access scheme was the top priority scheme for businesses. The importance of improving city access from surrounding areas needed to be emphasised.

Councillor Topping felt there was not enough in the report to explain the attraction of the proposals for the villages of South Cambridgeshire. He pointed out that economic growth was happening in South Cambridgeshire rather than Cambridge city.

Dr Wells commented that the emphasis on journey times was key however the way in which this would be achieved needed more discussion. He echoed the need to keep in mind the South Cambridgeshire villages and where people from these villages interchanged.

Councillor Baigent suggested that in order to make public transport more attractive, disincentives may be needed to encourage its increased use. He emphasised the need to be able to move around Cambridge quickly and cheaply by public transport and pointed out that it was quicker to get around Cambridge by bicycle. He suggested the GCP should be increasing the argument to provide cheaper and free transport around the city and South Cambridgeshire, in order to get people out of their cars.

Councillor Wotherspoon expressed concern about intelligent charging, pointing out that representatives from Transport for London did not think that congestion charging would work in Cambridge, as the city did not have the critical mass nor the universal access to public transport that was needed to make such a charge fair and equitable. A way of funding a public transport network without penalising drivers for having to use their cars to get into central Cambridge, was needed.

Councillor Bick welcomed the report, pointing out that more car free roads would make cycling safer.

The wording of questions being asked of the public and the information that accompanied the questions, was vital. Councillor Sollom expressed support for the idea of a citizens' assembly.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder was keen to ensure that rail was progressed. He highlighted the need to include residents who lived just outside the South Cambridgeshire border in public consultation, as many of these residents commuted to Cambridge.

8. HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS - FINAL DESIGN

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the final design for Histon Road. He explained that following the public consultation, changes had been made to the scheme to ensure that all aspects of it conformed with regulations, were considered safe and provided a good balance of functionality for all road users. The Joint Assembly was informed that given the contentious issues that remained regarding the Histon Road/Gilbert Road/Warwick Road junction, a further Histon Road LLF meeting would be held on 26 November 2018.

Public questions from Anna Williams, the Windsor Road Residents' Association and Lilian Rundblad were invited. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Joint Assembly acknowledged written representations received from Nick Flynn, Roxanne de Beaux and Daniel Thomas, which had been circulated to members before the meeting.

Councillor Massey expressed concern at the number of public representations that had been received by Joint Assembly members, which expressed a feeling of betrayal by the GCP. She highlighted the need for cyclists to feel safe and pointed out that Hills Road had demonstrated that segregated cycle routes worked as an increase in cyclists had been seen here.

Councillor Wilson was pleased that the GCP was going back to the LLF to discuss the changes to the proposals. She was concerned that local people had taken a lot of time contributing to the public consultation and did not feel included in the subsequent changes to the scheme. The safety of cyclists was a concern and if they did not feel safe in a shared environment with pedestrians, they would cycle on the road which led to conflict between cyclists and drivers.

Members expressed concern at the changes to the proposals, which it was felt disadvantaged cyclists. It was pointed out that if cyclists did not feel safe and were discouraged from cycling, congestion would get worse. Members were disappointed that following the changes, the scheme would deliver little change for cyclists and pedestrians. Members felt that segregation at the Gilbert Road junction was needed.

Heather Richards pointed out that in order to achieve mode-shift to cycling, Histon Road needed to be looked at as a whole as a cyclist's entire journey needed to be safe in order to achieve mode-shift from bicycles to cars.

Some members considered that doing nothing about the junction at Kings Hedges Road, was a major safety concern for cyclists and pedestrians. There was significant concern that there had been a complete failure in the public consultation process regarding this project.

Councillor Topping commented that in comparison, the A1307 public consultation had

gone exceptionally well.

Some members felt that this issue should come back to the Joint Assembly following the LLF meeting, before proposals went to the Executive Board. A vote was taken on this with six members voting in favour of this. As the majority of members did not consider this necessary, it was agreed that the proposals would go straight to the Executive Board following the LLF meeting. Feedback from the LLF meeting would be presented to the Executive Board and the Joint Assembly Chairman would report the Joint Assembly's concerns.

In response to the concerns raised regarding the public consultation, the GCP Transport Director made the following points:

- The GCP recognised the concern about the Gilbert Road junction and pointed out that the proposals balanced a number of key priorities. The key concern was the safety of all road users. Officers would look at what could be done to resolve the issue and would discuss this with the LLF.
- All junctions in all schemes would be looked at in their own right.
- He explained that there was a safety concern on Histon Road due to the conflict between walkers and cyclists. Safety Officers considered that a segregated cycle system potentially allowed cyclists to come into conflict with pedestrians too quickly, whereas shared space would continue to slow cyclists down. Officers would continue to look at this to find a mutually agreeable solution.

Officers clarified that no changes were proposed to the Kings Hedges Road junction. This had been looked at in detail however it had been decided that the junction was out of scope of the scheme. Officers considered it prudent to leave this junction until it was known how the Darwin Green junction would look and how the area would function. Councillor Bick requested the GCP look at this junction when the appropriate time came.

The GCP Transport Portfolio Holder asked the GCP Transport Director to liaise with County Council officers regarding Darwin Green. He also requested that the County Council's Safety Officers be asked to attend the Histon Road LLF meeting.

9. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on progress across the GCP programme. In addition to the routine budget and performance monitoring information, the report contained an overview of cycling projects and an update on the recent skills procurement exercise. In relation to the latter, Members were informed that tender returns for the provision of a skills service had not been of sufficient quality to award a contract. The GCP hoped to go back out to market in the new year and would in the meantime work with procurement experts to try and improve the quality of future bids. The GCP would also work with companies who may be interested in bidding, to help them understand the procurement process.

Referring to the Smart Places progress report, it was noted that phase 2 status was shown as 'green' although detailed actions had yet to be agreed. It was suggested that this be reviewed at the next Working Group. The same report referred to a bid for 'C-CAV2', the next round of funding for development of autonomous vehicles. It was noted that if successful, this would potentially extend the scope outside the city into surrounding villages, including the potential development of autonomous vehicle hubs. Consideration would need to be given to how to engage these communities in a wider debate on this.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would take place at 2pm on Wednesday 27 February 2018, at the Guildhall in Cambridge.

The Meeting ended at 5.40pm
