# GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on
Wednesday, 20 March 2019 at 4.00 p.m.

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Cllr Lewis Herbert | Cambridge City Council |
| 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:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Councillor Tim Wotherspoon | GCP Joint Assembly Chairperson |

**Officers/advisors:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Peter Blake | Transport Director, GCP |
| Daniel Clarke | Smart Cambridge |
| Sarah Heywood | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Kathrin John | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Niamh Matthews | Head of Strategy and Programme, GCP |
| Rachel Stopard | Chief Executive, GCP |
| Isobel Wade | Head of Transport Strategy, GCP |
| Victoria Wallace | Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council |

## 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Phil Allmendinger.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

## 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Executive Board **APPROVED** the minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 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 8 and 10. Details of the questions and a summary of the responses are provided in Appendix A of the minutes.

## 5. FEEDBACK FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** an overview report from Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly, on the

discussions from the GCP Joint Assembly meeting held on 15 November 2018.

## 6. BUDGET SETTING 2019/20 AND QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which updated the Joint Assembly on progress across the GCP programme.

Councillor Bates:

- Thought that South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City needed to be more ambitious regarding affordable housing, whilst linking this to the revised Local Plan.
- Queried where electric buses would be charged.
- Pointed out that the biggest call for S106 funding was for schools, health and transport infrastructure.
- Pointed out that if the GCP was successful in securing the next £200 million of funding following the second Gateway Review, due to the £50 million funding shortfall referred to in the report, this would actually be £150 million.
- Informed the Executive Board that the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee had been looking at grid capacity and initial proposals from the group were emerging. The agenda for this committee's 4 March 2019 meeting, at which a relevant report was discussed, could be viewed at https://bit.ly/2XGoOQB

Councillor Van de Weyer informed the Executive Board that now that the Local Plan was in place, rural exception sites for affordable housing were being focussed on.

Claire Ruskin:

- Expressed support for the work of the Economy and Environment Committee regarding grid capacity, as this would stop a lot of development if not addressed.
- Expressed support for the smart places work and in particular the work on fibre ducting.
- Thanked officers for bringing these issues to the attention of Board members. She queried whether the numbers regarding housing were high enough, as the region was growing faster than had been anticipated. It needed to be ensured that housing was connected adequately.

The Executive Board was informed that:

- The work Cambridge Regional College would be undertaking on skills, would link apprentices with businesses and vice versa.
- Regarding S106 funding, there were unknowns regarding some of the amounts but City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Councils were working on this.
- The budget assumed success in the first Gateway Review and the release of the next £200 million of funding.
- The GCP was working with Stagecoach on the charging arrangements for electric buses. The range of these buses was 150 miles. The new managing director of Stagecoach was interested in developing the bus network in the wider region.

The Joint Assembly Chairperson recognised the importance of education and transport in relation to S106 contributions and that affordability of affordable housing was essential in the planning process. He hoped that South Cambridgeshire District Council continued to balance affordable housing and S106 contributions wisely for new strategic developments.

The Executive Board:

a) **APPROVED** the GCP's 2019/20 budget, which included proposed changes to the previously agreed budgets as set out in section 21 of the report.

b) **NOTED** the proposal that Form the Future and Cambridge Regional College were to be contracted to start work on the Greater Cambridge Apprenticeship Service as soon as contracts had been finalised.

c) **NOTED** the progress across the GCP programme.

d) **ADOPTED** the County Council's new Fibre Ducting in Transport Schemes policy, tabled for consideration by the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee on 14th March, as detailed in section 16 of the report. This would support the deployment of fibre ducting in all GCP commissioned transport schemes going forward.

e) **APPROVED** the investment of up to £400k to support Stagecoach to purchase two low emission buses to operate on routes within the city centre.

## 7. GCP FUTURE INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Chief Executive and Head of Transport Strategy presented the report which set out an updated Future Investment Strategy to support preparations for the forthcoming first Gateway Review. This was presented alongside the proposed 2019-2020 budget.

Regarding the interaction of schemes, Councillor Bates suggested that how Highways England, Network Rail and sub-regional transport bodies fitted in needed to be considered.

The Executive Board Chairperson requested modal shift, cycling and walking be added into other policy impacts. He also suggested education be referenced as there were significant movements of 16 to 19 year olds over considerable distances.

The Executive Board:

a) **NOTED** that the updated evidence base continued to demonstrate that a transformational solution was required to address the issues that posed a risk to continued economic growth and prosperity.

b) **AGREED** the principles and criteria for prioritisation of future investment, which were based on the City Deal Assurance Framework.

c) **AGREED** the initial prioritisation for future investment at paragraphs 5.4-5.8 of the report, and noted that together with existing commitments, this would take overall allocated spend to c£627m.

d) **NOTED** the updated long list of projects at paragraph 5.10 of the report, and agreed to keep these under consideration while additional work to develop projects and identify match funding was undertaken.

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

Councillor Jocelynne Scutt, Chairperson of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) was invited to address the Executive Board and made the following points:

- LLF members and Milton Road residents asked to be kept informed of the progress and timescale of both the Milton Road and Histon Road projects. The Milton Road LLF

wanted to be kept informed of what was happening on Histon Road and vice versa as both schemes impacted on one another.
- Councillor Scutt highlighted the importance of biodiversity and requested a biodiversity strategy be developed for both Milton Road and Histon Road.
- Concerns remained about parking being removed on Milton Road and the impacts of this on other areas.
- Concern regarding landscaping was raised; this should be implemented as proposed on Milton and Histon roads.
- She asked that the GCP be mindful of the impact of construction on air quality and stress caused to residents. It should be ensured that air quality was monitored and there needed to be a construction plan that limited the impact on residents.
- She thanked officers for getting in touch with Maureen Mace already, regarding public art.
- She requested that the trees and vegetation be retained on the Elizabeth Way roundabout.
- Councillor Scutt was appreciative of the work that had been put in by residents, residents associations, local councillors and officers, which had led to such a positive result with the development of this scheme. She also thanked the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for the positive ways in which LLF reports had been received.

Public questions were invited from Lilian Rundblad and Maureen Mace. The questions and a summary of the responses is provided at Appendix A of the minutes. Attention was also drawn to an email which had been received by the Executive Board, from Matthew Danish.

The Transport Director presented the report which set out the final design for Milton Road, which included modifications to the previously approved design following public consultation feedback.

The Executive Board discussed the report and made the following points:
- Councillor Van de Weyer expressed support for the scheme and commended the efforts in its development and the changes that had been made to it.
- The GCP needed to look further at Mitchams Corner.
- The northern end of Milton Road was a hostile environment for cyclists and pedestrians, which needed to be addressed as part of work on north east Cambridge.
- The construction phase of the Milton Road scheme, the disruption that this would cause and the implications of this, needed to be discussed with the residents and LLF.
- The Milton Road scheme limited the capacity of cars and improved the opportunities for cycling; officers and residents involved in developing this scheme were thanked.

The Executive Board:

a) **SUPPORTED** the final design for Milton Road outlined in Appendix A of the report, as a basis for moving to the detailed design stage, including preparation of the final business case and contractor procurement.

b) **SUPPORTED** the Landscaping Strategy as set out in Appendix B of the report.

## 9. A10 FOXTON LEVEL CROSSING BYPASS AND PARKING AT FOXTON RAIL STATION

The Transport Director presented the report which set out the review of work undertaken on the Foxton Level Crossing and rail parking options in the vicinity of Foxton station. More work needed to be done with the parish councils and local residents. It needed to be ensured that benefits were delivered for Foxton, not just for those who wanted to use Foxton station.

The Executive Board discussed the report:

- Councillor Van de Weyer suggested that increasing road capacity on the A10 would have a detrimental impact on Harston. There was an opportunity to make it more attractive for nearby residents to use Foxton station, which was currently unpleasant to use and people avoided using it. Councillor Van de Weyer emphasised the need for this project to be about more than parking provision.
- Councillor Bates indicated his support for the recommendations and queried the down time of the crossing compared to other places; he requested information regarding the down time of all level crossings in the GCP area be collected.
- Claire Ruskin indicated her support for the recommendations. She suggested the anticipated down time of the crossing in the future be included in the analysis, pointing out that if there were more frequent trains in future, this would increase significantly and would need to be planned for. She also pointed out that currently, the crossing displaced traffic through Orwell and to the A603.

The Executive Board:

a) **SUPPORTED** the concept of additional station parking and the promotion of sustainable travel options at Foxton Station, and agreed to consult the public on proposals and as part of that process, to develop an Outline Business Case.

b) **NOTED** the report on removing the Foxton Level crossing, but recognising the wider traffic issues along the A10 corridor, referred the matter to the Combined Authority for its consideration as the Strategic Transport Authority for the area.

## 10. CAMBRIDGE BIOMEDICAL CAMPUS TRANSPORT NEEDS REVIEW

Public questions were invited from Jim Chisholm and Sam Davies. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the emerging outputs and proposals from the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) Transport Needs Review, highlighting that this made the case for Cambridge South Station and that a package of proposals was needed. He highlighted that the deregulated environment regarding buses was challenging.

The Executive Board discussed the report and made the following points:

- Claire Ruskin indicated her support for the proposals and queried whether there were other sites that should be looked at in the same way as CBC had been, such as the Cambridge Science Park for example.
- Councillor Bates expressed his full support for Cambridge South Station. He suggested the long term interventions needed at CBC also needed to be looked at. He pointed out that there was no ‘A’ bus service from Trumpington park and ride on a Sunday to get visitors to Addenbrooke’s Hospital; the only option was to drive. He suggested there was a need to do more outreach work for patients in the community, to avoid the need to travel to Addenbrooke’s. He also suggested outpatient appointments would be better offered at the weekends when there was less traffic. The CBC partners needed to be worked with closely on what could be done.

- Councillor Van de Weyer pointed out that the GCP did not have the power to solve all the problems identified.
- The Chairperson agreed that basic analysis needed to be undertaken of other sites around Cambridge, such as the Science Park, as suggested by Claire Ruskin. He suggested Addenbrooke's and other partners on the CBC site, needed to take greater ownership of the challenge faced. He also suggested that residents of the communities adjacent to the CBC needed to be worked with. He pointed out that Cambridge South Station was vital, as was expanding the capacity of park and ride. The bus network needed to be improved; he suggested a bus service between Babraham and Trumington park and ride was needed. He thought that the CBC site was overly car dominated and pointed out that it was difficult to walk and cycle through the site; this was due to lack of joined up planning. It was suggested that CBC needed a full time transport officer.

The Joint Assembly Chairperson commented that one of the reasons the CBC site was so car dominant was because it was difficult to access by public transport and you could not reach CBC directly by public transport from any of the northern South Cambridgeshire villages. He pointed out that people needed to be able to rely upon being able to get to their appointments on time if they used public transport. Alternatives needed to be in place before access by car was made more difficult, so that people were not disadvantaged and could still easily access health services at CBC. He pointed out that people needed to be able to drop-in to health services and the ability to do so improved health. It was suggested that not all health services should be located at Addenbrooke's Hospital.

Councillor Herbert proposed an amendment to recommendation b) with the addition of 'working with residents of adjacent communities', which was seconded by Councillor Bates. The amendment on being put to the vote, was agreed.

Councillor Bates proposed a further amendment adding the words 'long-term' to recommendation b), which was seconded and supported.

The Executive Board:

a) **NOTED** the findings of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review study, and recognised the urgent need for action in the short to medium term.

b) **REQUESTED** officers to work with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus partnership at a senior level, and with residents of the adjacent communities, to develop an action plan for short, medium and long term interventions based upon the recommendations of the Transport Needs Review study.

c) **AGREED** to receive a further report on an agreed prioritised delivery programme following discussions with the Biomedical Campus partners.

## 11. THE CHISHOLM TRAIL

The Transport Director presented a report on progress on the delivery of Phase One of the Chisholm Trail scheme, and looked ahead to how Phase Two would be delivered to complete the scheme.

The Executive Board:

a) **NOTED** the progress being made on Phase One, details of construction works commencing and the work to date on developing Phase Two.

b) **APPROVED** an increased budget in line with final estimates.

c) **APPROVED** the delivery of the Romsey section of Phase Two by Govia Thameslink/Network Rail's contractor, as part of the Thameslink work.

## 12. RURAL TRAVEL HUBS

The Chairperson of Oakington and Westwick Parish Council and Councillor Peter Hudson, County Councillor for Oakington and Westwick, were invited to address the Executive Board. They both raised concern about the project and in particular regarding the potential provision of parking at the rural travel hub. The following points were raised:

- There was concern about the impact the provision of parking would have on the residents of Oakington and Westwick. It was felt this would increase the level of traffic passing through the village from the surrounding area.
- It was felt that a travel hub with parking would benefit Cottenham residents, to the detriment of Oakington and Westwick.
- The rural travel hub project had set village against village.
- The preferred option for the majority of Oakington residents was for a rural travel hub with provision of secure cycle parking, rather than car parking. Cottenham residents had also indicated a willingness to cycle if parking was not provided at the rural travel hub.
- A primary school was located on the same lane as the proposed hub; there were already safety issues due to the volume of traffic passing the school, which would increase if parking was provided at the travel hub.
- The new Oakington to Cottenham cycle path should connect with the rural travel hub.
- It was felt that it may be too early for a travel hub to be located in Oakington and it would be better to revisit this when an extended transport network was in place. There were other communities with greater need for a travel hub, such as Cambourne.
- The rural travel hub should have bike storage facilities and a bus turning circle.
- The C6 bus service from Cambridge to Oakington needed to be extended to the rural travel hub as the existing service stopped about 400 metres short of it.

The Transport Director presented a report which provided an update on progress and emerging issues regarding rural travel hubs.

The Executive Board discussed the proposals:

- Executive Board members acknowledged and understood the views that had been expressed by the representatives of Oakington and Westwick.
- Councillor Van de Weyer pointed out that there was neither a compelling strategic business case nor the local support for the Oakington Rural Travel Hub. However careful thought would need to be given to stopping this travel hub.
- Whilst recognising that the GCP was trying to reduce traffic, it was also recognised that people still needed to use cars. Executive Board members agreed that to make this rural travel Hub successful and well used, it needed to have car parking.
- It was suggested that further engagement with residents was needed before a decision was taken and that a further report was considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board following this.
- Councillor Bates indicated his support for rural travel hubs as a means of getting people out of their cars, however these had to be in the right places and link into bus services. Whilst it was regrettable one village had been set against the other, the recommendation was only for a pilot rural travel hub, for which Councillor Bates indicated his support. He did not want to see this as the only rural travel hub that was

built, as they were needed at many other locations; he wanted commitment from the GCP that more travel hubs would be built. South Cambridgeshire District Council needed to be engaged with regarding the potential locations for other travel hubs. Councillor Bates indicated his support for the recommendation as originally set out.

- Claire Ruskin suggested the rural travel hub could be situated closer to Cottenham, where it would be closer to the majority of people who would be using it. She pointed out that a travel hub without car parking, was merely a bus stop.
- The Joint Assembly Chairperson, pointing out that he was a resident of Cottenham, highlighted the views of the Joint Assembly which had expressed little support for the development of a rural travel hub at Oakington, pointing out that the GCP should be concentrating resources on projects that would achieve a step change. A lack of feeder services along the current busway had led to the rural travel hubs proposal. He suggested the Executive Board either go ahead with the recommendation as submitted in the report, or drop the proposal of having a rural travel hub at Oakington.
- The Executive Board agreed that further work and engagement should take place before a decision was made, with a further report to be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. In response to this, Councillor Bates proposed an amendment to recommendation (b) reflecting this, which was seconded.
- The Executive Board suggested that Cambourne be looked at as a potential location for a rural travel hub and was informed that officers were already looking at this.

The Executive Board **AGREED:**

a) To note the outcome of the Oakington and Sawston Rural Travel Hub public consultation and engagement.

b) With regard to the detailed design for the pilot Rural Travel Hub at Oakington, option 1 (with parking) be considered, together with options for potential alternative locations and a further report be brought back to a future meeting of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

c) To explore the opportunities for alignment of a Rural Travel Hub site at Sawston with the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme.

d) To note the conclusions of the Whittlesford Station Masterplan study and initial stakeholder feedback.

e) To undertake public consultation on the Whittlesford Parkway Station Masterplan and develop a draft delivery plan, with a report to come back to a future Executive Board meeting.

f) To acknowledge that the location of other potential locations for Rural Travel Hubs, including at Cambourne, will be subject to further review.

## 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 27th June 2019, at 4pm in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall in Cambridge.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.30 p.m.**

---