



# GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

**Report To: Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board**

**4 July 2018**

**Report From: Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Chairperson of Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly**

---

## **1. Overview**

- 1.1. This report is to inform the Executive Board on the discussions at the Joint Assembly held on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2018, which the Board may wish to take into account in its decision making.
- 1.2. Ten public questions were received, of which one was taken with the GCP Transport Strategy Item, six with the Milton Road item and two with the Greenways item. One question was refused under standing orders as it did not relate to a specific item on the agenda.
- 1.3. Six reports were considered; one was postponed and two were amended due to the Mayoral Transport Statement, which was considered by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018.

## **2. GCP Transport Strategy**

- 2.1. The Joint Assembly welcomed the paper and agreed with the overall approach being recommended to the Executive Board, and looked forward to a future version of the paper coming back to the Assembly.
- 2.2. Whilst Joint Assembly members were happy with the overall content of the report, they had some observations about whether all views had been taken into account and in particular, whether there had been any engagement with bus users groups. There was also discussion around the need for weekend traffic to be taken into account as well as commuter journeys.
- 2.3. There was concern amongst many Joint Assembly members about the high cost of public transport and the perceived benefits on the levels of traffic within the city if the costs were lowered. Overall, they welcomed the analysis of service provision, alongside infrastructure needs, and recognised that both needed addressing together

### **3. Milton Road Project**

- 3.1. The chair of the Local Liaison Forum was generally supportive of the proposals although fed back some specific points that were also made through the public questions. She fed back that the scheme in front of the Joint Assembly today was much better and well received than the original proposals, and thanked both residents and officers for working together to find better solutions.
- 3.2. Members of the Joint Assembly discussed the introduction of shared pedestrian and cyclist paths along Milton Road and members were worried about the potential impact on the safety of pedestrians that this could have.
- 3.3. Following a public question, there was a wider discussion about the potential of verge parking along Milton Road and how it would damage the verges after the works had been finished. Various members showed interest in this and it was therefore formally agreed to ask the Executive Board to agree the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order along Milton Road as an integral part of the scheme's final proposals

### **4. City Access**

- 4.1. The Joint Assembly was happy to see this report, although they commented on the amount of time that it had taken to reach them as a report. Members agreed with the general points that the paper was making and wanted to see it progressed quicker.
- 4.2. The Joint Assembly's main points of discussion were surrounding the potential impact that this policy could have on lower income families as they were most likely to be affected by any potential toxicity/intelligent charge. Members were also reluctant to fully commit to a measure as significant as this until the public transport network has improved drastically. The Joint Assembly was concerned that physically closing roads would simply displace the traffic to other roads.
- 4.3. Members also made the suggestion that officers should look at school traffic as it was felt that this adds a large amount of traffic during peak hours.

### **5. Greenways**

- 5.1. There was a positive reception to the Greenways paper and members supported the direction of travel. The main discussion topic was a desire to see the main greenways linked together by minor routes ("fishbone design") to connect smaller villages in rural areas.
- 5.2. Members raised the importance of sufficient consultation on the schemes, including issues, such as the width of the paths and whether they would be sufficient enough to accommodate shared use. Members discussed the potential issue of flooding on the St Ives Greenway and if this had been considered by officers when they were planning the potential route.

5.3. Members also raised issues around the maintenance of the Greenways. Members agreed that whilst the whole of the Joint Assembly supported the Greenways project, they would be short-lived and not used much if the paths are not properly maintained and have budgets for maintenance. They also commented specifically on Cherry Hinton and whether a safe crossing at Yarrow Road roundabout could be considered and integrated to the design. They also raised the point that Cherry Hinton North station should be included in design proposals.

## **6. Cambridge South East Transport Study**

6.1. The paper was well received by members of the Joint Assembly and they noted that the proposed recommendations being taken to the Executive Board had changed due to the Mayoral Interim Transport Strategy Statement. The Chair of the Local Liaison Forum fed back to members and commented that the forum was generally happy with the direction of travel.

6.2. There was a discussion between members on the proposal for an underpass at the junction near Wandlebury, as members were concerned that the underpass may not be used by pedestrians due to safety concerns and that the road would still be a dangerous options for pedestrians to cross.

## **7. Quarterly Progress Report**

7.1. Members showed great interest in the Quarterly Progress Report and the section that details the GCP's progress on skills and apprenticeships. There was a broad discussion on how the GCP is working with the Combined Authority to be able to deliver its skills commitment as one body. Members also questioned why they were viewing data from over 2 years ago and when they would be able to see the updated data.

7.2. Members also commented on the proposal for the GCP to look at viability studies in two projects within the GCP area and what principles we apply when looking at GCP investment. There was large interest in the autonomous vehicle pilot and members wanted to make sure that it was on track to meet its predicted timescales. Finally, the assembly wished to further understand 'smart panels' and asked if Cambridge North could be considered as a location for a smart panel.

*End of Chair report*