



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

## **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on  
Thursday, 6 December 2018 at 4.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:**

Cllr Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Professor Phil Allmendinger	University of Cambridge
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Cllr Aidan Van de Weyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in attendance:**

Cllr Tim Wotherspoon	GCP Joint Assembly Chairperson
Cllr Tim Bick	GCP Joint Assembly Vice Chairperson
Cllr Dave Baigent	GCP Joint Assembly
Helen Valentine	GCP Joint Assembly

### **Officers/Advisors:**

Peter Blake	Transport Director, GCP
Sarah Heywood	GCP
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme, GCP
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive, GCP
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council

## **1. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Professor Phil Allmendinger declared the following non-pecuniary interests:

1. in relation to agenda item 6; as an employee of Cambridge University, which was a landowner and agenda item 8; as a resident of Gilbert Road.

## **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Executive Board **APPROVED** the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018 as a correct record.

## **4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** and responded to public questions as part of agenda items 6 and 8. Details of the questions and a summary of the responses are provided in Appendix A to the minutes.

## 5. JOINT ASSEMBLY CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** an overview report from Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, on the discussions from the GCP Joint Assembly meeting held on 15 November 2018.

Councillor Wotherspoon was pleased to see that since the Joint Assembly's meeting, the issues regarding Histon Road had been resolved with the Histon Local Liaison Forum (LLF), and the proposed improvements were reflected in the scheme being presented to the Executive Board.

## 6. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum (LLF) summarised the outcomes of the LLF meeting which had taken place on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2018. In addition to a number of detailed comments on proposals, the LLF had agreed the following recommendations:

- That no decision be taken on a preferred route until greater clarity on the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (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.
- 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.
- 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.

Nine members of the public were invited to ask their public questions. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Rod Cantrill was invited to address the Executive Board. Councillor Cantrill made the following comments:

- The GCP had created the LLF structure to allow direct input into the development and delivery of transport schemes. The Cambourne to Cambridge LLF had sought to work with the GCP in a constructive way.
- He asked if the Board would indicate how the report took into account the work of the LLF and whether the community's preferred option would continue to be developed in parallel with other options.
- He felt that the recommendation ignored the input of the LLF and sought to drive forward a proposed option that did not have the support of the local community.
- He asked what role the LLF would play in the development of proposals going forward.

Councillor Gavin Clayton, local Member representing Cambourne, was invited to speak and made the following points:

- Cambourne residents had not been involved and their opinions had not been heard as much as they could have been so far.
- Cambourne was an important community to be considered in the GCP's decisions; it consisted of over 4300 homes.
- He had been a Cambourne resident for 19 years. He used his car on average once a week and cycled and used the bus from Cambourne the rest of the time. He was therefore well aware of the failings of public transport and the lack of cycling infrastructure between Cambourne and Cambridge. He cycled through Coton and empathised with the impacts the residents of Coton feared with an off-road solution. He would like to walk the route of the off-road option and suggested this may be useful for other councillors to do.
- Cambourne residents needed an affordable and reliable public transport service that offered swift journey times and was frequent enough to serve residents' needs to get to work and college on time. It also needed to serve night time engagements in Cambridge. The current bus service ended at 10.45pm, which was a problem if you worked or wanted to go out at night.
- Cambourne residents experienced congestion at peak times; congestion was not just in Cambridge, there were traffic jams occurring on Broad Street in Cambourne.
- Cambourne residents experienced an expensive bus service. Cambourne residents paid £7 return to Cambridge, whereas the return fare from Hardwick was £4.50. Councillor Clayton queried how Stagecoach could justify this.
- The off-road solution addressed congestion but not in the immediate short term, therefore an interim measure was needed to address the issues.
- The welfare of residents, including their mental health, was affected by having to commute and being stuck in congestion.
- A constructive debate was needed; Councillor Clayton had attended the recent LLF meeting at Comberton and did not feel it had been constructive or professional at all times.
- The clarity of arguments needed to be conveyed so that decisions could be made.
- Councillor Clayton was keen for peak time congestion charging to be looked at, with money raised from this being shared between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City.
- He suggested an employer subsidy for bus services be worked on in order to make bus services more affordable for users, as many Cambourne residents could not afford to use the bus.

Councillor Tom Bygott was invited to speak and made the following points:

- He supported the Cambourne to Cambridge route becoming part of the CAM metro, that the route would be built to metro standards and would operate using electric vehicles. The best route was that which did the least damage to the countryside, enabled swift journeys and would not have to be replaced at a later date.
- The on-road option would damage the environment for residents on Madingley Road, which would become urbanised. The purpose of the project should be to reduce traffic along that road and preserve the environment of the American Cemetery.
- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain, local Member representing Hardwick, was concerned about the destruction of the trees between the A428 and the St Neots Road; this could be avoided by using the north side of the A428.
- Councillors Ruth Betson and Shrobona Bhattacharya, local Members representing Cambourne, had consulted widely in Cambourne and feedback was that residents

wanted the fastest possible journey time. Time saving was most likely to encourage people to use the bus instead of their cars.

- Extra care was needed to provide the most segregated route possible; the north side of the A428 west of Madingley Mulch, would minimise contact with other road users and allow faster journey times with fewer accidents. Councillor Bygott suggested this was the safest location for a route.
- He raised concerns regarding two sharp bends near the Cavendish Lab, which Councillor Bygott thought was likely to severely impact journey times and may cause part of the route to need to be replaced after a few years at considerable extra cost.
- Councillor Bygott asked that the GCP looked at these issues as the project was developed in more detail and looked at some of the work Cambridge Connect had undertaken regarding routes.

In response to the points raised by the councillors, the Executive Board was informed of the following:

- The GCP Transport Director had agreed some next steps with the LLF Chairman in relation to the technical workshops, and a full response would be provided to the questions raised at the last LLF meeting.
- The Transport Director would compile evidence on the northern route.
- The views and involvement of Cambourne residents would be sought over the next 12 months.
- The importance of fast public transport journey times was recognised.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report providing 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 recommendations, emphasising this was an update report following the public consultation that had taken place 12 months ago and following the 6 month pause that had been requested by the Combined Authority. Members were notified there had been a drafting error in the published recommendations and in recommendation (b); 'endorse' should be read 'received'.

It was noted that an Executive Board decision on an outline business case would be sought in Autumn 2019, following a formal public consultation on phase 2, which would start in the new year.

From the initial public consultation, a desire to take forward short-term cycling and walking improvements on Madingley Road, had been identified and this would be progressed as a separate scheme.

The Executive Board's attention was drawn to the City Access paper which covered the whole of the West Cambridge Campus, and set out how a series of interchange facilities would be developed to provide for the maximum possible public transport offer.

Regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge route, Councillor Bates highlighted the need to take account of areas beyond Cambourne, going towards Bedford. The Transport Director pointed out that while these areas were outside the geographical scope of the GCP, the GCP was working closely with the Combined Authority and took account of the wider strategic development of the corridor.

Councillor Van de Weyer spoke on the proposals and made the following points:

- He highlighted the enormous growth that Cambridge was continuing to experience, which was of national importance and should be supported and enabled without damaging the attractiveness of Cambridgeshire.
- He highlighted a need to acknowledge that the GCP had not achieved as much as it had hoped, as quickly as it had hoped and in as consensual a way as it should have done.
- He felt that the Mayor was not bringing people together and was attempting to impose his views, which had blighted the work on the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor.
- Speed of delivery, quality of engagement and delivering a coherent strategy needed to be focussed on.
- He did not endorse a particular scheme at this stage, but supported enabling work to continue.
- He suggested that there had been a breakdown of trust between the GCP and the public and emphasised it was essential that the GCP had the public's trust. Councillor Van de Weyer welcomed the continued discussion and engagement with the LLF.
- Confidence was needed that the GCP was getting independent expert advice and that a range of local opinion was gathered.
- Details of the impact on the environment needed to be looked at and concerns regarding this needed to be addressed fully.
- Getting a good route that enabled residents of new communities such as Cambourne and Bourn Airfield, to reach Cambridge and employment sites in a timely way via public transport, was essential for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
- The off-road scheme would create extra road space for more cars. A balance between the attractiveness of cars versus public transport, was essential.
- Councillor Van de Weyer welcomed plans to review information on the northern route and planned interim measures. He advised the Board that he supported the recommendations on the basis that further work was still to be done.

Claire Ruskin emphasised how fortunate the area was to have so many jobs and so much growth. A means of getting people to their jobs and colleges was needed, without using cars and more needed to be done for the residents that lived further outside the city. People needed to be enabled to live where they could afford and to be able to get to work without needing a car. She indicated her support for swift interim measures that could be implemented before 2024, and the recommendations.

Councillor Bates informed the Executive Board that he had walked the proposed off-road route, had walked around Madingley Mulch and was familiar with Cambourne and the A428. He had used public transport from St Ives to Cambridge, which in his experience was well used because it was frequent, reliable and people used the Park and Ride as parking was free.

While there were unanswered questions that needed to be addressed, Councillor Bates expressed his support for the recommendations.

Professor Phil Allmendinger also expressed support for the recommendations and commented that:

- The bigger picture needed to be presented.
- Access to the city needed to be restricted.
- The conversation regarding intelligent charging and how the revenue generated from this could be used to tackle congestion in a holistic way, needed to be restarted. Other parts of the country such as Bath, were starting to consider this.
- He requested the Local Plan Inspector's report be brought to the fore, to develop the case going forward.

Councillor Herbert speaking on the proposals made the following points:

- He highlighted that the Executive Board was not taking a final decision on the scheme. Before a final decision was taken in 2019, there would be further public consultation and more information would be known about related matters, such as whether Highways England would be taking forward improvements to the Girton Interchange.
- The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme was much needed and it needed to stand alone; the off-road option did this and was not reliant on the CAM metro.
- This scheme was part of the overall plan to tackle public transport issues; the 50,000 daily journeys to and from Cambridge, were largely due to the lack of reliable public transport.
- Reliable public transport journey times were not achievable at peak times along the current on-road route.
- The northern route had been looked at in considerable detail, with reports presented to the Executive Board in October 2016, and had significant additional environmental detriments; for those and other reasons, this had not been considered to be deliverable.
- Councillor Herbert thanked the LLF for its work and appreciated that sometimes it and the GCP were not in agreement. He recognised that the LLF had much to contribute.
- Councillor Herbert supported the interim measures for Madingley Road.

The recommendations were put to the vote and the Executive Board agreed unanimously to:

- a) **NOTE** the outcome of the public consultation and the work to date developing the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport project;
- b) **RECEIVED** the key conclusions of the Interim Report in relation to this:
  - i. **AGREED** that Phase 1, Phase 2 and a Park and Ride location continue to be developed towards an Outline Business Case for a High Quality Public Transport route between Cambourne and Cambridge;
  - ii. For Phase 1, **NOTED** that the recommended off-road route, defined as the Specific Route Alignment providing a new public transport corridor between Madingley roundabout and Grange Road best meets the strategic and policy objectives of the Greater Cambridge Partnership; and
  - iii. **AGREED** to develop options for Phase 2 between Cambourne and Madingley roundabout for further Business case assessment including a public consultation and that this section of the route and final recommendation for a preferred Park and Ride site, be presented in the final Outline Business Case;
- c) That the outcome of further work required as a result of recommendation (b) above be included in the final Outline Business Case which will be presented for Board approval in accordance with the current programme (October 2019);
- d) **REQUESTED** that officers develop detailed technology and design solutions and draw up landscaping and ecological design proposals which would enhance the potential impact of the off-road option solution on the rural environment and ensure maximum transport benefit;

- e) **AGREED** that cycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements identified for Madingley Road are taken forward for delivery developed in detail as part of a separate project;
- f) **AGREED** that, following the review by the Combined Authority, proposals for the Cambourne to Cambridge High Quality Public Transport corridor align with the features of a rapid transport network (CAM);
- g) **AGREED** that through the CAM Programme Board, officers ensure that the interface point at the eastern end of the scheme aligns with the work on the tunnelled section of the CAM network; and
- h) **AGREED** that the ambition for the preferred mode for the scheme once open is an autonomous electric rubber-tyred metro, subject to final business case, and that any interim mode required will be an electric vehicle to ensure a beneficial impact on air quality.

## 7. CITY ACCESS AND BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS - UPDATE

Councillor Tim Bick was invited to address the Executive Board and made the following comments:

- City Access should have been the centrepiece of GCP policy around which other initiatives had been calibrated. Its absence had left the GCP unable to provide a complete context for its other schemes, which had led to them receiving more opposition than would have been the case.
- Failure to approach City Access in an open minded and strategic manner, led to the ill fated road closures scheme.
- Accessible first class public transport, safer walking and cycling, cleaner air and less wasted time was the cause for which this policy area was working.
- The public needed to be given the opportunity to consider and evaluate the range of options.
- Road charging needed to be discussed with the public to let them reach a view on this and what it could offer. Road charging was an important option, which officers had described as potentially the most effective option.
- Councillor Bick expressed his support for the recommended approach, which he felt was honest and evidence based and he congratulated officers on a clear, fair and practical report. He encouraged the Executive Board to support the recommendations.
- Councillor Bick queried whether the estimated cost of £20 million to put in place a first class transport system, was ambitious enough and commented that it seemed arbitrary.
- He queried the fairness of the suggestion that revenue support for public transport could come from a form of general taxation, and whether this was deliverable; Councillor Bick was not aware of any power that would enable this to be achieved.
- Regarding the table which compared alternative measures, Councillor Bick suggested inclusion of a further criteria for comment against each of the measures, called 'backfill potential', to help people understand the dynamics. For example, the prospect of some measures being successful in reducing car usage by only a certain class of users, would enable other car users to take their cars out uninhibited on the roads and fill this space up, thereby cancelling out the gain that had been made.

The GCP Transport Director responded to Councillor Bick and presented the report, which outlined the GCP's transport vision and the challenges it faced. He referred to:

- The £20 million estimate which was based on evidence suggesting the existing public transport offer needed to be doubled.
- Locking in the benefits was critical and how this was done would need to be demonstrated to decision makers. Phasing and reassigning road space would be critical.
- There were emerging Mayoral and Combined Authority powers to allow business levies to be raised.
- The Transport Director was looking at the issues in the villages and how they would benefit. This work was ongoing, with a particular focus on Cottenham.

Councillor Herbert made the following comments on the proposals:

- He highlighted the public transport issues in Cottenham, which had been raised at the Joint Assembly meeting.
- The £20 million cost for a first class public transport system had been suggested by Councillor Wotherspoon. He explained this was based on a pro-rata comparison between Greater Cambridge and Greater London and the amount of subsidy given to London's public transport.
- All Joint Assembly members were of the view that this was an urgent challenge and wanted the Executive Board to address this as a matter of priority.
- Clear questions should be asked to enable meaningful engagement with the public.

Councillor Bates proposed the following amendment to the recommendations (changes to the original wording shown in strikethrough/bold text):

The Executive Board is recommended to:

- a) Note the work to date on the City Access Programme;
- b) Agree to undertake a second big conversation exercise to obtain public feedback on the options to ~~invest in and significantly improve public transport and manage demand for road space~~ contained within the report **with the exclusion of the demand management proposals**;
- c) **Request that officers undertake no further work on demand management as an option; and**
- d) ~~e)~~Continue to work on developing a final package of City Access proposals and public transport improvements, incorporating public feedback, for the Executive Board's consideration in 2019.

Councillor Bates explained the following reasons for the proposed amendment:

- Other phased measures needed to be put in place and reported back on before demand management was considered, to determine whether it was actually needed. Examples of measures to be put in place first were:
  - Travel planning with schools and businesses; congestion was much reduced during the school holidays.
  - The enhancement of traffic lights and signals to improve the flow of traffic.
  - The extension of Park and Ride.
  - Further implementation of residents parking; only four of 26 areas had been implemented.



- On road/off road parking.
- Road closures to increase the flow of traffic.
- Low paid workers could not afford a demand management charge.
- 49% of poor air quality was caused by buses and coaches; this needed to be addressed with Stagecoach.

The proposed amendment was not seconded and therefore fell, however the points raised by Councillor Bates were noted.

Claire Ruskin suggested that access needed to be fair and not punitive; intelligent charging would be fair. Technology was more able to facilitate intelligent charging and excluding this would be illogical.

Professor Allmendinger suggested that measures needed to be evidence based and supported the inclusion of intelligent charging.

Councillor Van de Weyer emphasised the need to aim for a coherent City Access strategy that had as much public support as possible. Open public consultation was vital. Councillor Bates' concerns regarding the lower paid were understood. The impact of all options and all residents needed to be clearly understood.

Councillor Herbert supported looking at a range of options on demand management. Businesses needed to be engaged with. There was not a good enough quality public transport alternative with the reliability, range of hours and range of services that was needed. There was also a near monopoly bus service provider, which would not deliver what was needed. Radical improvement was needed. Poor air quality needed to be addressed with investment needed in electric buses and electric vehicles. Businesses, major employment hubs and the university needed to be involved.

Councillor Bates suggested the Big Conversation regarding intelligent charging, needed to be expanded to a wider geographical area to include areas such as Haverhill, which was outside the GCP's boundaries. He pointed out that many people who lived in surrounding areas, worked in Cambridge. The GCP Chief Executive reassured Members that the GCP wanted to build on the Big Conversation and widen this.

Councillor Bates informed the Executive Board that the County Council bus subsidy was £1.7 million across Cambridgeshire and whilst most bus services were self-supporting, smaller villages did not have a bus service. The rural isolation this brought needed to be addressed.

Following further discussion, Councillor Bates confirmed he would reluctantly support the recommendations set out in the report..

The Executive Board:

- a) **NOTED** the work to date on the City Access Programme;
- b) **AGREED** to undertake a second big conversation exercise to obtain feedback on the options to invest in and significantly improve public transport and manage demand for road space contained within the report; and
- c) **AGREED** to continue to work on developing a final package of City Access proposals and public transport improvements, incorporating public feedback, for the Executive Board's consideration in 2019.

## 8. HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS

Councillor Mike Todd-Jones and Lilian Rundblad were invited to speak as Chair and Vice Chair of the Histon Road LLF. They provided an update on the meeting, which took place on 26 November 2018 and had been called due to the changes that had been made to the Histon Road scheme design since the last LLF meeting. Officers were congratulated for taking steps to address concerns expressed at the Joint Assembly meeting. It was noted that the LLF had agreed the following resolutions:

- To request the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board to direct that in consulting with the residents of Histon Road between Blackhall Road and Brownlow Road, the officers, including the landscape designer, take into consideration incorporating into the design a three metre high steel-mesh fence with climbers, verge with seeded grasses and semi-mature trees planted in the verge by every other fence panel as replacement of present hedges between Blackhall Road and Brownlow Road. Further, that negotiations with the County Council would ensure that the area would be maintained by Highways as well as any drainage construction required between the verge and private properties.
- To request that the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board direct the officers to incorporate unambiguous pedestrian priority at minor road junctions.

Public questions were invited from Lilian Rundblad, Anna Crutchley and Matthew Danish. Details of the questions and a summary of the responses are set out in Appendix A of the minutes.

The Chairperson drew the Executive Board's attention to public representations received from Molly and John Snedden, details of which had been circulated to the Board.

The Joint Assembly Chairperson provided an overview of the Joint Assembly's discussions regarding Histon Road. There had been a feeling at the meeting that this scheme did not provide bus, cycling or walking improvements. He congratulated the officers for the work that had been done to redesign the scheme following the Joint Assembly meeting.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the final design proposals for Histon Road. The Executive Board was informed that dialogue was ongoing regarding boundary and landscape issues. The lessons learnt from the Gilbert Road junction design would be applied to other schemes.

The Executive Board discussed the report:

- Councillor Van de Weyer commented that the result regarding the Gilbert Road junction, demonstrated what could be achieved. It needed to be reinforced that drivers did not have priority when entering cycle lanes.
- Councillor Herbert highlighted that Histon Road was a constrained road, which had not been a safe route for cyclists or pedestrians. The scheme was very different to how it had begun, and had been much improved by the public engagement that had taken place.

The Executive Board unanimously **SUPPORTED:**

- a) The final design for Histon Road as shown in the plans in Appendix B of the report as a basis for moving to the detailed design stage, including preparation of the final business case and contractor procurement; and
- b) The Landscaping Strategy as set out in Appendix A of the report.

## 9. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which updated the Executive Board on progress across the GCP work streams. The Board was informed that the GCP was revisiting the market regarding the skills apprenticeship service procurement, with a view to appointing a provider in the early Spring.

The Executive Board discussed the report:

Claire Ruskin expressed support for the joint procurement of a transport consultancy framework. She suggested that thought should also be given to the appointment of a Joint Transport Director.

Councillor Bates requested the inclusion of the information on the Gateway Review in the next report.

The Executive Board reviewed the Forward Plan identifying items for discussion at future meetings. It was noted that the South East Transport Scheme would be considered at the June 2019 meeting and the Waterbeach Public Transport Route would be considered in December 2019.

The Executive Board:

- a) **NOTED:**
  - i. The update on the proposed GCP Apprenticeship Service procurement exercise.
  - ii. The update on GCP cycling projects.
  - iii. The communications update.
- b) **AGREED** to the joint procurement of a transport consultancy framework.

## 10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019 at 4pm.

**The Meeting ended at 7.12 p.m.**



<b>Appendix A</b>			
<b>Questions for Agenda Item 6: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project</b>			
	<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
6a	Mal Schofield	<p>The Arup Report includes a Summary Position Paper. My question to the Board, once again, challenges the lack of an agreed integrated strategic overview covering the present and future transportation network. Please see Figure 4 Illustrative CAM concept (attached).</p> <p>Over 10 existing and permanent infrastructure elements are excluded. Additions already determined, include the new notion of "Metro Hubs".</p> <p>All Consultancy inputs should consistently reflect both what exists and what might well be added as critical components of a comprehensive infrastructure. It is the network that will deliver the meaningful modal shift towards alternatives to the car.</p> <p><b>Question. Have Arup delivered</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. a useful and value for money insight</b></li> <li><b>2. fully discharged their role and professional responsibilities as a "critical and intelligent friend"?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Arup were commissioned by the Combined Authority (CA), and a summary report was published and presented to the CA Board in October. Since its publication, the GCP has pursued an extended position paper, included as Appendix 2 to the Executive Board report, in order to share more detail with stakeholders.</p> <p>It would be for the CA, as the commissioning authority, to comment on the performance of Arup.</p>

<p>6b</p>	<p>Carolyn Postgate</p>	<p><b>Does the Board have the courage to draw back from making a terrible, costly and destructive mistake?</b></p> <p>Despite the vast amount of money, time and energy already spent promoting a predetermined off-road route, defined as the Specific Route Alignment, the case has not been made for the sacrifice of Madingley Hill, Coton and the West Fields for an unproven “greater good”.</p> <p>It will not fulfil any of the stated Project Objectives (see Agenda Public Reports Pack page 23, 7.3):</p> <p>It will not “achieve improved accessibility to support the <b>economic growth</b> of Greater Cambridge” since it does not link seamlessly to major places of employment.</p> <p>It will not “deliver a <b>sustainable transport network/system</b> that connects people between Cambourne and Cambridge along the A428/A1303” since there is no detailed plan for integration with a future transport network.</p> <p>It will not “contribute to enhanced quality of life, <b>relieving congestion</b> and improving air quality within the surrounding areas along the corridor and within Cambridge City Centre” since there is no guarantee that electric buses will work or that bus journeys will be affordable.</p> <p><b>Does the Board instead have the vision</b></p>	<p>The Executive Board is not taking a decision on the route today. It is noting the work to date following the pause requested by the CA and agreeing to undertake further work, including a consultation, on the section out to Cambourne.</p> <p>The Cambourne to Cambridge paper, together with the City Access paper later in the agenda, outline proposals for an integrated public transport strategy for Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership Board will not agree a final route until autumn 2019. Until then, the GCP will continue to work with stakeholders as plans develop.</p>
-----------	-------------------------	--	--

		<p><b>to create a public transport scheme directly linking Greater Cambridge’s new satellite settlements to their places of employment via a four-ways Girton interchange?</b></p>	
6c	Sara Godward	<p>The Matt McDonald report says that the proposed route is no nearer to properties than the existing bus route, which is factually incorrect, but it is anyway disingenuous to compare the impact of a slow-moving bus entering the village 3 times a day with a bus at high speed 9 times an hour. My young daughter wanted to come along today with her school friends but I have dissuaded her because I thought it would add to her distress. She has asked me to ask you why you are proposing a route so close to her bedroom that she will be able to touch the fence from her window. She is worried about the noise and the safety of buses travelling at high speed so close to her bedroom and wants to know if this is something you would be happy to inflict on your own children or other children you care about. The public has lost trust in the GCP because of the repeated gross misrepresentation of factual information, which includes a claim in a presentation last week that the off-road route is less detrimental to residential property than the on-road route. <b>Why is the negative impact of potential routes on businesses considered in the report, and not the negative impact on residents?</b></p>	<p>The Executive Board is not taking a decision on the route today. It is noting the work to date following the pause requested by the CA and agreeing to undertake further work, including a consultation, on the section out to Cambourne.</p> <p>Each option has been assessed using a standard national transport appraisal approach. This approach considers both transport effectiveness, engineering and implementation costs, potential environmental effects and the overall economic/public benefits.</p> <p>Detailed plans for environmental design measures will be developed and taken forward with input from the local community.</p> <p>Any final route will need to undergo a full Environmental Impact Assessment which will need to demonstrate the overall impact of any scheme on the environment.</p> <p>Our project team continues to welcome views and contributions from stakeholders throughout development of plans for Phase 1 of the route.</p>
6d	Jane Renwick	The off-road route from Madingley	Significant existing unreliability exists for buses and general

		<p>Roundabout to Grange Road is predicted to take 12 minutes. For passengers travelling onwards to the biomedical campus, the officers are suggesting a change to the U bus from Grange Road onwards to the biomedical campus. The U bus takes no less than 30 minutes (as per timetable) in peak hours from Grange Road to the biomedical campus, but, in reality it takes 35 to 40 minutes. Passengers disembarking from the off-road C2C bus will have to change buses and may be waiting up to 12 minutes. This mode of transport can therefore be expected to take an average of 12+30+6 =48 minutes, just from Madingley roundabout to the biomedical campus. This falls woefully short of the 30 minutes discussed in the joint assembly as the journey time needed to encourage a modal shift.</p> <p><b>Given that the GCP is aiming for a journey time of 30 minutes from Cambourne to the biomedical campus, can the GCP explain how the off road solution from Madingley roundabout to Grange Road is going to achieve this?</b></p>	<p>traffic using Madingley Hill. The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme seeks to address this by providing quicker, more reliable journeys through enhanced infrastructure.</p> <p>As well as schemes designed to improve travel into and out of Cambridge, the GCP is looking to significantly improve travel within the city. The GCP's City Access project is designed to reduce congestion in the city centre, improve public transport, cycling and walking, and significantly improve air quality in Cambridge.</p> <p>The Executive Board is today reviewing options for improving public transport and managing demand for road space. In our Big Conversation, held last year, congestion on the road and the cost, reliability and access to public transport were identified as the biggest challenges people faced</p> <p>Together, infrastructure schemes like Cambourne to Cambridge and development of the City Access package will deliver the improvements necessary to significantly enhance local public transport services, including better journey times and greater reliability.</p>
6e	Marilyn Treacy	<p>The Historic England reports states "To conclude, we consider that all three potential routes and their sub-options are likely to cause harm to heritage significance, either to the American Military Cemetery or to the significance of the village of Coton." These conclusions have been misrepresented in the item 6 papers for this meeting and in recent GCP presentations, implying in many places that</p>	<p>A summary Arup report, as commissioned by the Combined Authority was published and presented to the CA Board in October. Since its publication, the GCP has pursued an extended position paper, included as Appendix 2 to the Executive Board report, in order to share more detail with stakeholders.</p>

		<p>the on road solutions are more damaging than the off-road solution when in fact all three are harmful to the environment. It seems that no segregated route via Madingley Mulch will be acceptable.</p> <p>We therefore have to ask "What evidence is there that a "northern" alignment (via the Girton Interchange) for an off-road route is not feasible?" We are told that this evidence is in the full Arup report.</p> <p><b>Could the GCP please tell us the date when this Arup report was completed and published and provide us with a copy?</b></p>	
6f	Allan Treacy	<p>I refer to the Mott Macdonald Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project Interim Report dated November 2018. Figure 12 on page 45 shows the "monetised benefit for full segregated option Cambourne to Cambridge versus full on-road option."</p> <p>The benefit for the off-road option is shown to be £680 million compared to £140 million for the on-road option. <b>Will the GCP please instruct Mott Macdonald to publish, in full, the assumptions and data underlying these calculations?</b></p>	<p>Yes. This information is available online at Cambourne to Cambridge section of the GCP website; <a href="http://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/cambournetocambridge">http://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/cambournetocambridge</a></p>
6g	Roger Tomlinson	<p>As I understand it, there is a legal requirement that when the scheme for a Cambourne to Cambridge Busway is put out to statutory consultation under government regulations, it is necessary for there to be an alternative low cost option</p>	<p>There is no 'legal requirement' to consult on a 'low cost option' as part of the statutory consents process</p> <p>The business case assessment is based on guidance issued by the DfT. Guidance recommends that in reaching a final option, a lower cost alternative is also assessed.</p>



		<p>that meets the objectives. This was confirmed to the Local Liaison Forum by the previous Transport Director Chris Tunstall in December 2017, who also confirmed that the LLF Technical Group would be involved in developing the low cost option, then presumed to be on-road.</p> <p>It appears that to meet the Mayor of the Combined Authority's requirement for a segregated scheme that is capable of operating as, or converting to, the "Metro", that it is necessary for the low cost option also to be segregated, and therefore also off-road. The report from Transport Director Peter Blake appears to be exclusively about the officers' preferred off-road high-cost route. Note that the LLF has not been involved in the so-called "optimised" on-road option, for which many of the proposals were rejected at the public workshops.</p> <p><b>Please explain what route the officers are working on as the low cost option for the statutory consultation?</b></p>	<p>The project group is working on the optimised on-road option as the low cost option.</p> <p>The LLF technical group was involved in workshops on the optimised and on road options held in February/March. The project group would be happy to continue those discussions with the technical group.</p>
6h	Stephen Coates	<p>Why has the GCP chosen a route through the West Fields when</p> <p>(a) there were better alternatives that did not harm this very sensitive area of greenbelt</p> <p>(b) when the main route is through the West Cambridge Site</p> <p>(c) when James Palmer's metro scheme will involve a tunnel from the West Cambridge Site making this route</p>	<p>The Executive Board is not taking a decision on the route today. It is noting the work to date following the pause requested by the CA and agreeing to undertake further work, including a consultation, on the section out to Cambourne.</p> <p>Each option has been assessed using a standard national transport appraisal approach. This approach considers both transport effectiveness, engineering and implementation costs, potential environmental effects and the overall economic/public benefits.</p>

		<p>redundant                  (d) when both the High Court in 2008 and LDA Design have said this area of greenbelt is critical for the historic city                  (e) when this route does not as you claim “go around the West Fields” but causes significant damage to its most important and sensitive section - the fields either side of Bin Brook behind the Rugby Club                  (f) when this route creates potential flood risk for Gough Way which has already flooded numerous times with existing arrangements?</p>	<p>Detailed plans for environmental design measures will be developed and taken forward with input from the local community.</p> <p>Any final route will need to undergo a full Environmental Impact Assessment which will need to demonstrate the overall impact of any scheme on the environment.</p> <p>A Strategic Business Case for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro will be presented to the CPCA Board in early 2019. As proposals are developed, the GCP will continue to collaborate with CPCA to align plans and routing proposals.</p> <p>The reasons for the Specific Route Alignment (SRA) are set out in the report. These reasons are based on a range of transport and environmental criteria.</p> <p>Early design work has been carried out looking at the flood levels and issues. Work to date indicates that this would not require a significant engineering requirement, and can be achieved with relatively moderate design and mitigation measures.</p> <p>As part of the consent process undertaken, and subject to a GCP Executive Board decision in Oct 2019, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required to support the planning process and to be considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment, which is scrutinised for consent by the Environment Agency and the Local Authority responsible for drainage.</p>
<p>6i</p>	<p>James Littlewood, Cambridge Past, Present and Future</p>	<p>1. Following a presentation by officers and their consultant at the recent LLF it seems that has been a significant breakdown in trust between the community and GCP officers (as represented by most of the LLF</p>	<p>1) The work undertaken as part of the project planning will continue to be compliant with standards set out in the governments Transport Assessment Guidance and the GCP uses specialist consultants to provide objective professional advice using these accepted standards and</p>

		<p>and community groups such as Cambridge PPF and the National Trust). This relationship seems to be becoming increasingly acrimonious and could potentially last for several years with likely legal challenges and fights through the planning system. The breakdown is due to officer's preference for the off-road route leading to some bias in their reports, to the extent that the community no longer believes much of what they are being told. This is not healthy for the community and I would also be concerned, as politicians, as to the information you are receiving. At the last LLF it was recommended to establish an expert panel that is independent of the community, officers and politicians in order to restore trust in the system. The community could have faith that what they are being told is correct – and if it is not correct, then as politicians you can act accordingly. A panel might only need to consist of 2-3 people (transport economist/transport planner/environment&amp;heritage) and need only review the evidence and reports produced by officers and their consultants. In other words, they need not attend meetings and get involved in any discussions, although that might also be helpful. <b>Will the Exec Board consider establishing an independent expert panel for this scheme?</b></p> <p>2. At the LLF, Mott Macdonald made much of the response of Historic England to the two options. However, now having now seen the responses of both Historic and</p>	<p>criteria. All information collected by the project on the range of impacts will continue to be published and made available for independent scrutiny.</p> <p>Consultants appointed by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority have reviewed the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and considered the work to date robust.</p> <p>The Executive Board takes advice from the GCP Assembly which offers robust overview and scrutiny of the work undertaken.</p> <p>The business case itself would, if agreed, form part of the background to any statutory consents procedure, which would require examination in public and determination by an independent inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State of Transport.</p> <p>2) Work by both the GCP and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has identified that a route via Girton would be less direct, have high environmental impacts and would have a strong dependency on external factors around an upgrade of the Girton interchange by Highways England. The GCP has written to Highways England and had a number of meetings regarding the future of Girton Interchange. We understand that improvements to this junction are unlikely to be a priority for the National Network over their next strategy period.</p> <p>Following the LLF and GCP Joint Assembly on 15, we have asked our consultants to revisit the previous review of the Girton interchange routing and we will provide that information in due course.</p>
--	--	---	--

		Natural England it is clear that the landscape between Coton and Madingley Hill is significantly important and that any scheme through it will be damaging. These responses add further weight to the argument that an alternative scheme via the Girton Interchange could avoid this harm. At the LLF we requested to see the evidence base showing why such an alternative had been ruled out and we are still waiting to see this. <b>Please will the GCP Board keep the option of this alternative on the table at this stage in order to avoid harm to one of Cambridge's most important landscape areas?</b>	
Questions for Agenda Item 8: Histon Road			
	Questioner	Question	Answer
8a	Lilian Rundblad, Vice Chair Histon Road Local Liaison Forum, Chair HRARA	The Histon Road Area Resident's Association requests the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board to ask the GCP project team to prepare a revised road scheme based on a two-lane carriageway with bypass Bus Stops and enlarged space for walking and cycling between Kings Hedges Road and Carisbrooke Road to be presented to the GCP Executive Board on 6 December 2018.	The project objectives set out the requirement to provide bus priority measures on Histon Road which are achieved by including the proposed length of bus lane.  The inclusion of this bus lane was supported in the last consultation.
8b	Lilian Rundblad, Vice Chair Histon Road Local Liaison Forum, Chair HRARA	<b>Warwick Road / Histon Road Junction – Cycling Safety for Schoolchildren</b>  The new design for Gilbert Road/Histon Road/Warwick Road Junction was well received at the HRLLF meeting and the work of the Officers agreed. However, on	The request is beyond the scope of the Histon Road project.  Officers will explore other possible avenues of delivery and report back to the Residents' Association.

		<p>my question regarding off-road cycle lane for the schoolchildren on Warwick Road from Histon Road to the Mayfield School reception area, the answer was “it is outside the scope”.</p> <p>The representatives for Mayfield School are positive to the off-road cycle lane. There are already designs in the present Histon Road Final Scheme which are “outside the scope”.</p> <p><b>Histon Road Area Residents’ Association HRARA requests the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board to direct the officers to incorporate into the present scheme for the Gilbert Road/Histon Road/Warwick Road Junction, an extension of the off-road cycle lanes on Warwick Road to the Mayfield School reception area on Carisbrooke Road.</b></p>	
8c	Lilian Rundblad, Vice Chair Histon Road Local Liaison Forum, Chair HRARA	<p><b>Carisbrooke Road Junction and Signalized Pedestrian Crossing</b></p> <p>The design for the above area was shortly discussed at the HRLLF on November 26<sup>th</sup> and raised safety questions from the forum as details were difficult to envisage from the drawings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inbound Bus-lane and car-lane ends in the middle of the road junction, just in front of the new signalized pedestrian crossing;</li> <li>2. No landscaping has been designed for the outbound floating bus stop in the same area as the pedestrian</li> </ol>	<p>The termination point of the bus lane has been designed to allow the merging point to take place in advance of the pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>This arrangement is subject to full safety audit, comments from this audit will be considered by the design team.</p> <p>The landscape proposals for Histon Road were well received at the LLF workshop on 8<sup>th</sup> October. Following approval of these concepts the project team would look to develop the landscape designs. This will include landscaping along the length of Histon Road as well as the specific landscaping areas that are identified in the appendix to the Board Report.</p>

		<p>crossing, although it includes loss of trees and greenery;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The new road to the planned residential housing area “Squash Court Road” and the cycle and pedestrian lanes from the Darwin Green development were not included in the design, the road connects to Histon Road just north of the Carisbrooke Road junction.</li> <li>4. In the supplement to the GCP Executive Board meeting 6th December, point 5.15 is stated: “length of inbound bus lane extending from Blackhall Road to a point 40m south of Carisbrooke Road” thus the bus lane will run through the new pedestrian crossing towards Borrowdale bus stop. In 5.11“ requires the proposed bus lane to be shortened slightly”.</li> <li>5. Consider mitigation at the Roseford Road Junction to reduce rat runs.</li> </ol> <p><b>The Histon Road Area Residents’ Association HRRA requests The Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board to direct the officers</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>to shorten the length of the bus lane and the car lane to be merged well before the new pedestrian crossing and the Carisbrooke Road Junction/Squash Court Road exit,</b></li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>b. in cooperation with the landscape designer, prepare a design for the floating bus stop area and the new pedestrian crossing by Carisbrooke Road in consultation with the residents as replacement for the loss of trees and greens.</b></p>	
<p>8d</p>	<p>Anna Crutchley from Benson Area Residents Association (BenRA)</p>	<p><b>Parking on Histon Road</b>                  The south end of Histon Road is a residential area where c. 100 houses front onto the street. The proposed removal of parking will create <i>significant</i> problems for local residents, who will be required to compete for spaces on Canterbury and its neighbouring streets. So far, BenRA has not been given any answers, as to how the logistical problems the removal of parking will be solved. For example:</p> <p><b>a Carers</b>                  Some residents on Histon Road have twice daily visits from carers. For example, one elderly resident lives alone and suffers from dementia. Time spent with her by her carer is vital, and very limited. This will be curtailed as the carer spends time looking for a parking space and then having to walk back and forth from the space to her house. This could take up to 14 minutes both at the beginning and the end of her visit, significantly reducing the time spent with her client.</p> <p><b>b Deliveries/passenger loading and unloading</b>                  Residents and businesses will need</p>	<p>Given the proposed removal of Residents Parking and Pay and Display parking along the southern end of Histon Road, the project team have considered the issue of short term parking along this section. The feedback gathered from consultation has informed the proposal.</p> <p><b>Q1</b> It is proposed to retain pay and display parking bays near to Cranwell Court. The parking bay opposite the ATS garage will be converted to pay and display, and pay and display bays will be created in Lindon Close. This provision should provide the ability for short term parking within an approximate 2-3 minute walk from all properties located in this section of Histon Road.</p> <p><b>Q2</b> The advisory cycle lanes in this southern section of Histon Road will have double yellow lines with additional loading/unloading restrictions for peak times. Outside peak time is legal to stop on double yellow lines for the purpose of dropping off, loading and unloading.</p> <p><b>Q3</b> Traversing of the advisory cycle lanes will only occur when HGV or Buses are passing each other. When this occurs bus/HGV drivers will need to give way to the cyclists in the cycle lane at the point of passing. In comparison the Pay and Display bays along Histon Road would cause permanent disruption to the cycle lane.</p> <p>It is therefore considered a safer and more appropriate option to provide the more permanent pay and display bays</p>

		<p>facilities for deliveries, loading and unloading passengers, goods, visitors, taxis, builders, and so on.</p> <p>New pay and display spaces (at this stage we do not know how many) will be made available on Linden Close. These are likely to be filled by customers at Domino's Pizza. However, there is no guarantee of enough spaces for other local businesses such as Headlines, the Beauty Den, Sam's Nail Parlour and the curry restaurant.</p> <p><b>Q1. Is the Executive Board going to consider part-time parking out of peak hours?</b></p> <p><b>Q2. What provision will be made for residents' deliveries, loading/unloading/carers/ taxis/ on Histon Road?</b></p> <p><b>Q3. Taking into consideration that the cycle lanes will be advisory, and that 2 buses or HGVs passing each other in opposite directions will have to traverse the cycle lanes in order to pass, that vehicles will traverse the cycle lanes to load/unload/drop off, and thereby already compromise cyclists' safety, what is the safety argument against having several well-separated pay and display bays with 2 hour parking restrictions along Histon Road?</b></p>	<p>in the locations detailed above.</p>
8e	Matthew Danish of Camcycle	The LLF has passed a resolution for pedestrian priority at side roads. We believe this is best provided by continuous	It is proposed that all but one of the minor side roads (Linden Close) along the length of Histon Road will include raised table treatments in order to provide improved priority



		<p>footways that send an unambiguous reminder of Highway Code rules 170 and 206 to all road users. A generously-sized raised table crossing at the level of the pavement is especially important for slowing down turning motorists and cyclists, just to give pedestrians a chance. But in the proposals before you, only 1 of the 16 uncontrolled junctions will provide true pedestrian priority. The project team has offered some explanations for not providing these features at every side road. But we still believe that it is possible because we can find examples of pedestrian priority side road junction treatments in all kinds of cases around the country (and the world). Narrow and busy junctions are precisely where you need speed-reducing measures to slow down turning traffic. <b>Would you direct the officers to include pedestrian priority measures at all uncontrolled side road junctions as they take the scheme into detailed design?</b></p> <p>The Victoria Road junction remains an unsatisfactory design. The popular protected cycleways are all gone. The floating bus stop has been replaced by car parking. The Histon Road crossing is pushed too far north. A loading bay will block a cycle lane even though the shop in question has a rear loading access they could use instead. Some of these issues are more easily fixed than others, like removing the loading bay from the cycle lane, but we would like to see all these issues resolved.</p>	<p>for pedestrians.</p> <p><b>Q1</b> It is not recommended that raised tables or continuous footway are used at the larger side roads (Windsor Road and the Entrance to Aldi/Iceland). These roads experience a wide range of users including large delivery trucks, which make the use of raised tables less suitable.</p> <p><b>Q2</b> The scheme provides improvements for pedestrians, cyclist, and public transport users while also balancing such requirements.</p> <p>The aim is to provide 1.8m footways where possible and only deviate below this for very short lengths at pinch points.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Draft work on business cases for recent road schemes has shown that the vast majority of the benefits come from walking and cycling improvements alone. Along Histon Road, the southernmost 160 metres of the proposed bus lane pinches the footway down to an intolerable 1.4m near Roseford Road. This is obviously dangerous for pedestrians. It is also dangerous for people cycling because drivers must emerge from nearly-blind driveways into the cycle lane. <b>Would you direct the officers to ensure that the footways and cycle lanes are of safe and ample width, in this case by replacing the problematic southernmost third of the proposed bus lane, in order to increase the overall benefits of the scheme and fix dangerous conditions for walking and cycling?</b></p>	
--	--	---	--