



# GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Thursday 18 January 2018 at 2.00pm

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Grenville Chamberlain	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

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

Councillor Ian Bates, GCP Transport Portfolio Holder      Cambridgeshire County Council

### Officers/advisors:

Peter Blake	Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Beth Durham	Head of Communications, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Mike Soper	Cambridgeshire County Council
Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Tunstall	Interim Transport Director, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In relation to agenda item 8 Ely to Cambridge A10 Transport Study, and agenda item 10 Rural Travel Hubs, Councillor Tim Wotherspoon declared a non-pecuniary interest as the County Councillor for Cottenham and Willingham. Also in relation to agenda item 10, Councillor Kevin Cuffley declared a non-pecuniary interest as the County Councillor for Sawston.

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

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2017 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the word 'advised' being replaced with the word 'commented' in relation to Claire Ruskin's comments on page 3 of the minutes.

The Joint Assembly was informed that this would be the Interim Transport Director's last Joint Assembly meeting. Peter Blake was introduced as the new Greater Cambridge Partnership Transport Director.

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

Two public questions had been received and these were addressed at agenda item 10.

## **5. PETITIONS**

The Chairman notified the Joint Assembly of a petition received at the end of 2017 to "Progress the Comberton Greenway for walking/cycling/horses, but make it busway free.". The petition contained more than 50 signatures but had not reached the required 500 signatures to formally present it to the Joint Assembly.

## **6. RAPID MASS TRANSIT OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Chairman welcomed consultants from Steer Davies Gleave who presented the Rapid Mass Transit Options Appraisal. The Joint Assembly members thanked the consultants for their work and were generally enthusiastic about this and the study's findings, which were welcomed. The following comments and queries were expressed by the Joint Assembly members:

- The reasons for the presentation not being made available to the public in advance of the Joint Assembly meeting were queried. It was felt that the detailed press releases issued by the Greater Cambridge Partnership the day before the meeting, had pre-empted discussions. In response to this the GCP Interim Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that the consultants' report was still being finalised and would be presented to the Combined Authority on 31 January 2018. This report would be made available in the public domain a week before the meeting and would also be presented to the GCP Executive Board. The intention of this presentation was to give the Joint Assembly the opportunity to ask questions of the consultants before the final report was presented to the Combined Authority.
- In response to a query regarding projected demand figures, the Joint Assembly was informed that a detailed demand study would be carried out. The initial assessment took account of double the level of Local Plan growth beyond 2031. The balance of demand and service provision would need to be worked out around each of the corridors.
- In response to a comment regarding ambitious delivery timescales for assessment modelling, the Joint Assembly was informed that the timescale given was for the assessment period of the design work, which would build on initial work that had

already been carried out.

- Some members commented that this work had been commissioned and carried out well and were pleased to see progress, which it was thought residents would welcome.
- The length of tunnelling for the autonomous metro was queried. In response to this the consultant clarified that the detailed design of where the tunnel would come in and out of the city, had not yet been carried out. The costings allowed for tunnelling of up to 6km. It was not envisaged that the entry/exit point of the tunnel would be in the city centre and suitable locations would need to be considered.
- It was commented that proper scrutiny of the ongoing financial sustainability of the metro would be needed, to ensure it would be affordable for users.
- It was observed that the map shown in the presentation left many residents a long way from being able to access the service.
- The city centre stop illustrated on the map was queried. A Joint Assembly member commented that there were two city centres in Cambridge, which were a distance apart and that it was important that the metro did not commercially disadvantage one part of the city over the other.
- Concern was expressed regarding the potential effect of the autonomous metro on the economic viability of other public transport services. A coordinated approach would be needed which bore in mind these other services, so as not to remove their viability with the introduction of the metro. In response to these concerns, the consultant assured the Joint Assembly that the autonomous metro scheme would not be designed in isolation and would be part of an integrated network, designed to complement other transport schemes.
- In response to a query, the Joint Assembly was informed that it was a realistic expectation that an autonomous metro service could coexist with other autonomous transport services and driven vehicles.
- It was urged that the metro should not be developed at the expense of other road improvements that were needed.
- It was pointed out that parking for those accessing the metro would need to be provided.
- In response to anxiety expressed regarding financial sustainability of the scheme and potential sources of revenue to subsidise it in its early stages, the consultant clarified that the scheme would be commercially viable before its completion. The next stage of work would look at this in more depth.
- The Joint Assembly members felt that there was a key role for the Greater Cambridge Partnership to be involved in the development and delivery of the elements of the network situated within greater Cambridge.

## **7. A10 FOXTON LEVEL CROSSING BYPASS AND TRAVEL HUB**

The Joint Assembly considered the report which recommended the A10 Foxton level crossing bypass for further development as part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Future Investment Strategy. The revised proposals would also consider a 'travel hub' with the provision of additional parking facilities to complement the existing Park and Ride and Rural Travel Hub proposals.

The Joint Assembly was informed that there were currently four trains per hour which resulted in the level crossing being down for up to 30 minutes in every hour. There would soon be six trains every hour and traffic was growing on the A10. The Joint Assembly was informed that Network Rail did not consider this crossing to be a priority and did not consider that anything needed to be done with it.

The Joint Assembly members discussed the report and made the following comments:

- The Joint Assembly members welcomed this being put back on the agenda and felt that Network Rail should contribute financially to the scheme. Members were informed that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was in discussions with Heidi Allen MP regarding this and would be pursuing the issue with the Department of Transport. The Executive Board's Transport Portfolio Holder pointed out that the Greater Cambridge Partnership had secured money in the past from Network Rail for other similar projects.
- It was queried whether any of the options impacted on the option of a car park at the station and it was confirmed that it would not.
- Officers and members were informed that Foxton Parish Council's preference was for an underpass at the crossing as it was concerned that a bypass would land lock areas of greenfield land for development. The Interim Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that officers would be attending Foxton Parish Council's March meeting and that they were tying this in closely with Foxton's neighbourhood planning exercise.
- The planning permission that had been granted for 200 houses at the quarry site in Barrington was queried, as a requirement of this was that the cycle link along the old Barrington train line to the A10 be completed. Officers confirmed that this would be incorporated into the scheme.
- It was requested that the comment in the consultant report regarding the Victorian signal box be removed, as the signal box was valued by the local community. The Interim Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that Network Rail had informed the Greater Cambridge Partnership that there was no benefit to removing the signal box and Foxton Parish Council had already made it clear to the GCP that they did not want this to be demolished. The Joint Director of Transport clarified that the removal of the signal box was not being proposed.
- A member commented on the high value of this scheme and thought that a bigger park and ride with 500-1000 parking spaces with a train link, should be considered. It was pointed out that within nine months, 2000 Papworth Hospital staff would be travelling along the A428 to the Addenbrooke's Hospital site and that they would need somewhere to park. The Interim Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that parking would be integral to the options being developed for bypassing the level crossing and creating a travel hub. He also informed the Joint Assembly that the Greater Cambridge Partnership had had a proposal for a travel hub at Papworth and advised that the Joint Assembly may want to consider further work on this being done. The Joint Assembly was informed that the partners on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site had commissioned this study and the proposal had been for 200 parking spaces to be retained at Papworth Everard, with buses provided to Addenbrooke's.
- As an almost daily user of the Foxton level crossing, a member expressed support for this being put back on the agenda provided it was looked at in conjunction with East/West rail and travel hubs.
- A member commented that the level crossing was not safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It would be beneficial to have more cycle parking at the station. The integrity of the Cambridge to Royston cycleway needed to be maintained whatever was decided with the Foxton level crossing. In response to this, the Joint Assembly was informed that cycle parking would be built into proposals.

The Joint Assembly welcomed this scheme being put back on the agenda and supported the overall approach being recommended to the Executive Board, to review the options and develop a full business case for a preferred option.

## **8. ELY TO CAMBRIDGE A10 TRANSPORT STUDY**

The Joint Assembly considered the report which presented the findings of the Ely to

Cambridge A10 Transport Study and proposed next steps. In discussing and debating the report, the Joint Assembly members made the following comments:

- Concern was expressed regarding the dualling of the A10 on its existing alignment and it was queried whether the assessment took into account the cost of potentially having to divert the road from this alignment.
- It was felt that proposals were only achievable if Planning colleagues imposed strict parking constraints on developments such as the Cambridge Northern Fringe and the Science Park, where approximately 60% of employees used their cars to travel to work. Page 176 of the Mott MacDonald report was referred to, which highlighted the need for development related transport planning. The Interim Director of Transport informed the Joint Assembly that the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, was actively looking at planning issues and applying restraint on parking in relation to planning.
- Disappointment was expressed by a Joint Assembly member who thought that the approach being considered was road centric. It was suggested that all options for making better use of the existing railway to help eliminate commuter traffic, should be exhausted before road options were pursued. This was acknowledged by the Interim Director of Transport.
- Members welcomed proposed improvements to the north of the county and were pleased to see the proposed cycleway all along the railway line between Ely and Cambridge. Members commented that there was a need for people to be able to easily and safely access the cycleway via branches connecting villages to it.
- Some members thought that a network of Greenways should be centred on Ely, joining up places such as Sutton, Little Downham and Queen Adelaide for example.
- There was a need for suitable entry points from villages and existing side roads onto a dualled A10. In response to this the Interim Director of Transport advised that officers were aware of this.
- The moving of the railway station at Waterbeach was queried by some members.
- One member suggested that the park and ride and railway station needed to be brought closer together. It was commented that a reasonable alternative was needed for car drivers to enable them to get out of their cars earlier on and providing a reasonable alternative was the only way to achieve modal shift.

The Joint Assembly supported the recommendations to the Executive Board that the Combined Authority should have the responsibility for approving the study's recommendations and taking these forward for consultation. The Joint Assembly members felt that the Greater Cambridge Partnership should take forward the proposals identified in Option 1, specifically walking, cycling and public transport improvements and aligning the public transport improvements with the Cambridge Mass Rapid Transit Options Appraisal findings.

## **9. OUR BIG CONVERSATION**

The Chairman welcomed consultants from Systra who presented the findings of the telephone travel survey which had been carried out as part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's public awareness and engagement exercise called 'Our Big Conversation'. Following this the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Head of Communications presented the interim findings of 'Our Big Conversation' (OBC). The aim of this had been to strengthen the evidence base needed to inform the GCP's Future Investment Strategy by generating public dialogue on Greater Cambridge growth, testing emerging GCP proposals with the public and undertaking a comprehensive travel survey to refresh 2011 census data.

The Joint Assembly members discussed the findings and made the following comments:

- It was observed that the top things identified by the survey that would encourage modal shift; speed, fares and reliability of public transport, were things that the Greater Cambridge Partnership did not have the power to control. This was due to buses in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire being operated on a commercial basis by Whippet and Stagecoach. Joint Assembly members pointed out that the Mayor had the power to do something about bus services and hoped that he took this evidence into account when reviewing them. Some members hoped that he would introduce bus franchising as it was felt that modal shift could not be achieved without this.
- The County Councillor for Fulbourn informed the Joint Assembly that his village's bus service was being halved; it had a 15 minute service but this would be reduced to a 30 minute service in February 2018. He commented that commercial bus operators were not encouraging people to use public transport while the GCP was trying to encourage modal shift.
- In response to this, the GCP Interim Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that the Combined Authority was commissioning a review of bus services. She advised that new public transport routes were a strong way of encouraging modal shift and the Greater Cambridge Partnership did have control of this. The Joint Assembly was advised that public transport needed to be made attractive through reliability, which was within the GCP's gift.
- The statistical significance of the sample size of the telephone survey was queried. In response to this, the consultants assured the Joint Assembly that the sample was statistically relevant and that the target sample provided robust results.
- Scepticism was expressed regarding the answers given in relation to disincentives that would encourage modal shift. There was concern from some members that survey respondents may not have answered these questions honestly. In response to this the consultants acknowledged that some questions were subject to policy bias, however the consultants explained that evidence suggested that participants had answered these questions honestly. The Joint Assembly was informed that qualitative survey responses would be published online.
- A member highlighted that the survey evidence showed that there was a high level of support for improvements to public transport and that there was a willingness for people to consider road charging amongst other options, to encourage modal shift.
- It was pointed out that the vast majority of consultation respondents had identified the supply of affordable housing as the critical issue for the sub-region. The evidence also identified an appetite for technologically advanced solutions; it was suggested that the Greater Cambridge Partnership should see how it could help to realise these solutions.
- The Executive Board's Transport Portfolio Holder commented that the evidence gathered was not only useful to the Greater Cambridge Partnership but also to other local authorities, parish councils, the Combined Authority, large employers, planners, MPs and bus operators. He proposed that once the data was complete, this should be distributed to a much wider audience.
- In response to a query regarding whether improvements to the safety of walking or cycling would encourage more people to change to these forms of transport, the consultants advised that the majority of safety issues identified during the survey regarding walking and cycling, were from parents referring to the school run. The GCP Interim Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that there was some qualitative evidence from the 'Big Conversation' recently which suggested that the quality of cycleways did put people off cycling.

The Joint Assembly noted the interim findings of 'Our Big Conversation' and commended the officers involved in this.

## 10. RURAL TRAVEL HUBS

The Chairman invited Councillors Philippa Hart and Janet Lockwood to ask their questions which related to this item and had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. Details of the questions and a summary of the answers given are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Joint Assembly considered the report which presented a feasibility report on the development of Rural Travel Hubs in South Cambridgeshire and sought approval to proceed to phase two of the project. This would involve the preparation of full business cases for the proposed pilot sites of Oakington, Whittlesford and Sawston, a detailed analysis of planning considerations, refined costings of construction and an outline of the evaluation of methods to review the success of the pilots.

In considering the report the Joint Assembly members expressed differing views:

- Some members felt that the case had not been made for Rural Travel Hubs while others were supportive and felt that these could provide a significant contribution towards modal shift.
- It was felt that public transport from Rural Travel Hubs had to be frequent and reliable and that reference to 'relative frequency' in the consultant report was not good enough.
- Referring to the travel hub at Swavesey, it was commented that this was not a travel hub but was a bus stop with one bus every two hours and from which bicycles were stolen on a weekly basis.
- Concern was raised about conflicting priorities between what parishes wanted in terms of doing something to benefit their local community, and what the Greater Cambridge Partnership wanted to achieve in terms of modal shift. There was concern regarding transparency and whether parishes fully understood the implications with regard to Rural Travel Hubs. It was suggested that parishes needed to be revisited and objectives needed to be aligned.
- The Rural Travel Hub at Whittlesford was referred to, which some members thought was no more than an extension to the railway car park rather than a travel hub for Whittlesford village. Some members felt that travel hubs would be extended car parks for the nearby railway stations, which would not benefit the villages and would not deliver better and more sustainable public transport.
- Some members expressed their support for Rural Travel Hubs and thought that these were steps towards making things better.
- The local member for Sawston, who was also a resident of Sawston, informed the Joint Assembly that having a travel hub in Sawston would be a great improvement for the village, taking traffic off the A1301. The local member commented that Sawston was looking at this holistically and was supportive of the Rural Travel Hub. He felt that Rural Travel Hubs would take cars off the roads, thereby making roads and cycleways safer.
- The local member for Oakington spoke in support of trying things out in a more temporary way regarding Rural Travel Hubs. As the local member for Oakington he informed Joint Assembly members that there had been extensive discussion with the wider local community as well as with the parish council, which was aware of the conflicting priorities. The local community was supportive of the Rural Travel Hub, which offered the chance for the Oakington bus service to service the Oakington busway stop. This would open up access to Cottenham, which was pushing for a cycleway in conjunction with Oakington. The Joint Assembly was informed that Oakington had opted for a modest amount of car parking, which was more than was needed to take cars off Station Road. If this was successful then the amount of parking could be extended.

In response to the concerns raised, the Interim Director of Transport informed members that:

- This stage of the work was about concept and a full business case would be developed, worked up with Parish Councils and presented to the Joint Assembly for consideration at a future meeting.
- In the case of Whittlesford, it was confirmed that a Transport Master Planning Exercise was to be undertaken which would look to incorporate any proposals in respect of potential Rural Travel Hub facilities.
- In response to comments made regarding temporary work, this allowed for things to be tested and Joint Assembly members were informed that there was support for carrying out temporary work.
- The GCP was trying to get groundswell back so that people used the services that were available to them.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018 at 2pm in the Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.

**12. APPENDIX A TO THE MINUTES OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP MEETING - 18 JANUARY 2018 - PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.15 p.m.**

---

This page is left blank intentionally.

# Minute Item 12

18 January 2018 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – public questions

No	Questioner	Question	Response
10a	District Cllr Philippa Hart	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership published its feasibility study on Rural Travel Hubs on 4th January. While neither Meldreth nor Shepreth were selected for the initial pilot scheme, nevertheless plans were published for additional car parking adjacent to their railway stations. The lack of local consultation is well known and unacceptable, but it does not appear that any cross-referencing has taken place within GCP as both sites have planning applications for housing live or pending on them. Please can the Assembly explain how much more compulsorily purchasing these sites will be if planning permission is granted on them?</p>	<p>The plans published within the feasibility report are only proposals which require more public consultation before being finalised. We are currently drafting a full engagement programme (as part of phase two) for the three pilot sites which will be put in place subject to the Board's decision on 8th February.</p> <p>In terms of the consultation conducted to date, during phase one we;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wrote to all 105 parishes in South Cambs asking them for suggested sites for rural travel hubs.</li> <li>- Officers visited in person all the parishes who showed an interest</li> <li>- Officers met with Richard Goddin of Meldreth Parish Council on 6th September and attended a meeting of Shepreth Parish Council on 12th October</li> <li>- An officer met with Cllr Hart and Cllr van de Ven on 16th October</li> <li>- Held a stakeholder and engagement event on 6th September to which all parishes and local interest groups were invited</li> <li>- Parishes were sent notes of their meetings and agreed the text to be submitted into the final Feasibility report</li> </ul> <p>All these discussions have helped to inform the feasibility report.</p> <p>We are aware of pending planning applications on some sites and in the case of Meldreth this is referenced in the feasibility report at page 52. The proposed site at Shepreth is one of three put forward to the project by the Parish Council. For the purposes of the pilot we are not recommending sites be taken forward at Meldreth or Shepreth. Should these Parishes want to be part of the project at a later stage we would be happy to meet with them to see what options would be preferred locally and what the implications of any proposals would be.</p> <p>There has never been any suggestion that sites would be compulsory purchased and it is highly unlikely that in any future studies that we would consider sites that had planning approvals already in place.</p>
10b	District Cllr Janet Lockwood	<p>To what extent do you think travel hub parking can relieve pressure on the necklace Park and Rides? I am thinking particularly of the expected extra traffic travelling north along the A10 through Harston.</p>	<p>The Rural Travel Hubs project is proposing pilot hubs at Oakington, Whittlesford (as part of the master planning exercise) and Sawston. Once the success of these pilot sites has been evaluated, the project could look at implementing further travel hubs across South Cambridgeshire following further feasibility studies. These feasibility studies would inform the optimum number of parking spaces each future hub could have. In turn, this could be used as a proxy to determine the level of relief at the necklace P&amp;R sites.</p> <p>The aim of the Rural Travel Hubs project is to improve access to public transport into and out of Cambridge from Rural South Cambridgeshire and facilitating travel between locations in South Cambridgeshire, therefore reducing the need to travel by private car and so reducing congestion. We expect the RTH's to work alongside the necklace P&amp;R sites, and other schemes such as Greenways as part of coordinated approach to improve residents options for sustainable travel in to the city.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure that is either proposed or existing within the Western Orbital study area will be measured either through transport modelling or a sensitivity test to that transport modelling. If a Rural travel hub was proposed then this would be incorporated into the transport assessment of any further work undertaken on this project.</p> <p>We are also looking at Foxton with a view to providing additional car parking at the station which might reduce traffic on the A10, although it is anticipated that this will only be marginal. The implications of the additional parking will be factored into the deliberations regarding the proposal for a travel hub at Hauxton.</p>

This page is left blank intentionally.