



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

**FEEDBACK FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY MEETING  
20<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2018**

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

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

**1. Overview**

- 1.1. This report is to inform the Executive Board of the discussions at the Joint Assembly held on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2018, which the Board may wish to take into account in its decision making.
- 1.2. One public question was received, which related to item 11 on the agenda; Place Based Engagement Strategy.
- 1.3. Five reports were considered and a summary of the Joint Assembly discussion is set out below. An item on the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge had been deferred to allow completion of the detailed technical work by the Combined Authority's consultants. This work is aimed at ensuring the scheme meets alignment requirements with the Cambridge Area Metro (CAM) network proposals and other criteria such as cost, deliverability and timing.

**2. Cambridge South East Transport Strategy**

- 2.1 The Joint Assembly noted that the Cambridge South East Transport Study Local Liaison Forum (LLF) had met on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2018 and had been given a presentation on the paper going to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. The LLF had:
  - Noted the outcomes of the consultation held early in 2018; and
  - Broadly supported the further work proposed in relation to Strategy 1, but there had been some support for continuing to consider light rail and it had been noted that if Strategy 1 proved to be impractical, Strategies 2 and 3 remained on the table.
- 2.2 The Joint Assembly broadly welcomed plans to progress this project, in particular it highlighted the opportunities for environmental enhancement that this scheme may be able to offer. Comments included:
  - Concern about the reach of Strategy One to the three campuses [Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park and Cambridge Biomedical Campus] and to villages in the vicinity [Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford in particular].

- The need for the Strategy to serve the needs of residential centres as well as serving key employment centres; although it was noted this was an infrastructure scheme and a separate piece of work was being done on services.
- Concern about the implications of the park and ride proposals given current discussions and queries about the extent to which the existence of the Babraham Park and Ride site would impact on the business case for a transport scheme further out of the City.
- A strong desire that Cambridge South Station should rise up the agenda and secure 'committed' status, so it could be incorporated into the business case as soon as possible.

### **3. West of Cambridge Package (M11 / Junction 11 Park and Ride)**

3.1 There was a mixed reaction by the Joint Assembly to this item. Comments included the following:

- Strong need for progress, as the problem was already urgent and Trumpington Road Park and Ride site was now at capacity most days. This would get worse with the further expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which was likely to involve an additional 4,000 staff. Pressure on the existing park and ride site could also increase as a result of an extension of residents' parking and plans to reduce hospital staff parking.
- A need for more detail of proposed interventions along Trumpington Road.
- Considerable concern about what was meant by 'temporary' park and ride; especially if it was going to involve a segregated bridge over the M11. People could be discouraged from using the sites if basic facilities were not provided.
- The need to articulate how this scheme would contribute to delivering overall modal shift.
- A need to tell a more compelling story focussed on a ten year evolving strategy to create a strategic interchange network.
- Questions about the absence of data on origin and destination for the use of the current park and ride facility. This was key to support the assumptions being made.
- Concern that the proposals did not provide sufficient benefit to the villages of South Cambridgeshire. Harston Parish Council had expressed concern regarding the growth of employment centres and the potential increase in rat running through villages.
- The scope for Whittlesford station to be attractive to people using Stansted Airport, especially if parking at the park and ride site was cheaper than airport parking. It was noted that the West Anglia Taskforce was looking at four tracking a short section of the Liverpool Street line to enhance capacity, which would make this a more attractive route to London.

### **4. Better Public Transport Project – Waterbeach to Science Park and East Cambridge Corridors**

4.1 The Joint Assembly was supportive of this proposal but commented on the need to look at wider catchment area, taking into account cross boundary issues and journeys into Cambridge from a wider area; including broadening the area covered by the green shaded sectors in figures 1 and 2 of the report [page 70]. This highlighted the need for close collaboration with neighbouring/partner authorities, including those outside the Greater Cambridge Partnership area to develop a joined up transport strategy.

4.2 It was considered important to engage with communities along the A10, in particular Cottenham, Willingham and Rampton, as they would be contributing to the congestion in

the absence of any improvements to local public transport in this area. It was pointed out that along this route many people had no alternatives than to use cars.

## **5. Place Based Public Engagement Strategy**

- 5.1 The Joint Assembly was supportive of the proposals, but stressed the need to exercise some caution to ensure the positive aspects of current practice were not lost. Members valued input from communities which was essential to informing discussions and formulating proposals.
- 5.2 With reference to plans to submit community feedback to the Executive Board alongside Joint Assembly feedback, members of the Joint Assembly commented that they valued the input from Local Liaison Forum Chairs and others and hoped this would continue; although the timetabling difficulties were acknowledged.

## **6. Quarterly Monitoring Report**

- 6.1 The Joint Assembly noted progress on the Greater Cambridge Partnership programme, as detailed in the report. Members provided feedback on digital wayfinding, including problems with the map at Cambridge Station. This information would be fed back to the team. Members also commented on the way data was presented, in particular details of the Transport Delivery Overview. It was suggested that it would be useful to see the projected design, construction and completion periods of the projects. It was also asked that more information be provided on more immediate projects and less on longer term plans. Referring to project costs, it was suggested that it would be useful to outline the forecast total cost of projects and forecast cash flow.
- 6.2 The Joint Assembly noted progress with the A10 Melbourn to Royston Cycle Link and the Arbury Road Cross City Cycle Scheme. Councillor Susan van de Ven addressed the Joint Assembly as local Member for Melbourn and Bassingbourn and spoke in support of the A10 Melbourn to Royston Cycle Link proposals. It was noted that the Executive Board would be asked to agree that officers should formally explore a range of funding options for the scheme with neighbouring authorities.