

**4 January 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p>Edward Leigh Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>South Petersfield Residents Association (SoPRA) notes that a new proposal for the Hills Road Catholic church junction has emerged post-consultation, which will have significant impacts on traffic flows on Brooklands Avenue and through South Petersfield (between Hills Road and Mill Road). As part of developing the "final preliminary designs" (paragraph 10.2), we ask GCP to engage directly with local residents' associations, including SoPRA, New Town RA, Accordia RA and any others that are active in the vicinity of Hills Rd and Brooklands Avenue to explore the trade-offs, potential alternatives and mitigations. Will the Board support this request?</p> <p>We draw Board members' attention to the fact that the draft New Road Classification for Cambridge omitted Station Road and Tenison Road, even though these are heavily used routes for travel to/from Cambridge station. They are also used, along with other roads in South Petersfield, as 'rat runs' between Hills Road and Mill Road. These traffic flows need to be taken into account when considering banning turns at the Catholic Church junction.</p>
<p>Lesley Sherratt Chair, Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>We, Grantchester Parish Council (GPC), ask the Executive Board not to move forward with the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway (the 'Through Village Route') due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Its detrimental aesthetic impact on a heritage village; (ii) The low projected use, especially coming from Haslingfield into Grantchester; (iii) The existence of an alternative route, the "Baulk path" on the Barton Greenway; (iv) The high additional cost of the Through Village Route (v) The democratic deficit in distinguishing the local response from the overall response, then discounting that (very negative) response; (vi) Misleading answers having been given to the Joint Assembly, making its recommendation to the Executive Board flawed. <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The poor benefit:cost ratio of 0.4:1 of this section was buried by claiming a cross network benefit. (This benefit is unaffected if using the Baulk instead.) (ii) The question: 'How much longer would it take a twelve year old child to cycle the Baulk path?' was answered by giving the approximate distance, not time taken. After accounting for the reduced speeds on the Through Village Route, there is no obvious time advantage.

**4 January 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>(iii) A specific commitment given to GPC by Councillor Smith (not the project team) that the Grantchester vote would be accepted, resulting in a mutual agreement, was described simply as GPC's misunderstanding and overridden. It is not appropriate for GPC to decide what was agreed between Councillor Smith and GPC. If our factual account of this agreement is correct, there is a breach of a legitimate expectation.</p> <p>- and instead investigate shortening the Barton Greenway connection.</p> <p>Accordingly, we ask whether the Executive Board will decline to approve the proposed Through Village Route on grounds of (i) – (vi) above and the fact that to do so may be unlawful; but to investigate shortening the Barton Greenway connection instead.</p>
Peter Scrase Grantchester resident	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>The Executive Board is being asked to ratify the recommendation of the Joint Assembly to continue to develop the proposed route through Grantchester village rather than the route via the Baulk. No comparison of the relative cost of these two alternatives was made in the report to the Assembly nor was any mention of this made in the recommendation to the Executive Board.</p> <p>Given that the Baulk route is going to be built in any event as part of the Barton Greenway, almost the entire cost of the proposed route through the village would be saved if it is abandoned in favour of the Baulk route. An estimate from documents which I have seen would indicate a saving well in excess of £2m if the Baulk route is chosen.</p> <p>My question to the Board is whether it accepts that expense is a serious relevant factor in deciding which route to select and that no decision should be taken until the figures for each alternative are made known.</p>