

**7 March 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p>David Stoughton on behalf of Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal</b></p> <p>Living Streets notes the evidence of the GCP's focus on 'themes and opportunities', such as 'behaviour change' (item 7, 10.24) and improving walking and cycling, air quality, natural capital and partnerships (item 8, 6.11).</p> <p>The GCP Board is asked to approve a City Access revised focus on making it 'safe and attractive to walk and cycle for everyday journeys' (item 9, 11.6), with quick wins that include 'safety improvements', 'micro-interventions' and 'working with communities on demonstrator projects' (12.4, p102).</p> <p>We welcome the greater status given to everyday walking - a hitherto neglected mode of local transport - and remind GCP of the positive economic, health and climate impact of the large numbers of people walking daily to work, to shops, to educational institutions. Almost all of us walk or wheel, most of us outside the city centre, so we need safe local streets and journeys.</p> <p>Living Streets has documented in surveys and through our website (<a href="http://camstreets4people.org">camstreets4people.org</a>) some of challenges everyday walkers and wheelers face: footway obstructions, cracked pavements, flooding, unsafe crossing points.</p> <p>What we need now is action by GCP to invest in tackling some of these difficult issues. In some cases it could provide funding so the county council can act, as is currently being proposed with the ETROs for pavement parking in the city.</p> <p>So in moving forward we need advice and guidance to enable community groups to propose well-founded initiatives, secure in the knowledge that they will meet established criteria. Otherwise work and time will be wasted, communities will be alienated and the commitment to promote walking will fail. Remember, walkers and wheelers will remain thin on the ground if footways remain too unsafe to use. Will the GCP commit to action and investment to make these much-needed changes?</p>
<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 - City Access Programme Update</b></p> <p>The papers for this meeting state that work on any revised proposals for the road network hierarchy review would be led by the Cambridgeshire County Council, rather than the GCP. This is despite the Joint Assembly wanting "to remain actively involved in this work and be given the opportunity to input to the same extent it would have if the work was being progressed by the GCP" (Agenda item 6, Feedback from the</p>

	<p>15 February Joint Assembly Meeting) and the GCP having a vastly larger budget for such projects than the County Council.</p> <p>In order to deliver for their residents on their stated objectives, we believe that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council should retain their voices on transport, including the network hierarchy review.</p> <p>Cambridge City's Corporate Plan states its number one priority is to lead Cambridge's response to the climate change and biodiversity emergencies; its second is to tackle poverty and inequality and help people in the greatest need. We do not see how it will achieve these objectives without taking action on transport poverty and emissions.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council's business plan states it will 'put the heart in South Cambridgeshire' by 'being green to its core' and 'growing local businesses'. We cannot discern how it can meet these aims without addressing transport issues.</p> <p>At February's Joint Assembly meeting, Cllr Thornburrow asked where people using the Greenways will go once they've reached the city; Cllr Shailer asked about making space for buses – two issues that make cheaper, greener transport less attractive or impossible to embrace. These are specific examples of problems you can address through a network hierarchy review.</p> <p>Will the GCP vote to retain the road network hierarchy project so its constituent Councils are better equipped to translate their commendable policies into effective action?</p>
<p>Mary Wheeler on behalf of the Windsor Road Residents' Association Committee</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 - City Access Programme Update - (c), objectives of the review of the Road Network Hierarchy</b></p> <p>A public consultation was held between 23rd May and 18th July 2022 by the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership on a proposed new road hierarchy. The subsequent decision not to proceed with congestion charging necessitates review of this road network hierarchy. The consultation of July 2022, of which some details are given in paras 7.17-7.19, will therefore be inapplicable. (As a passing comment, a link to the published report would be appreciated.)</p> <p>In many cases, several possible positions and/or methods of implementation would be equally effective in ensuring that the traffic is appropriate for the position of a road or street in the hierarchy, but the local view may favour a particular one.</p> <p>What plans has the GCP for further consultation of residents, whatever the position of their home in the hierarchy? This should include views on the revised hierarchy itself, and also</p>

	<p>give weight to local views on the details of siting and design wherever physical measures supporting road changes are proposed.</p>
<p>Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 - City Access Programme Update</b></p> <p>Time is running out to plan and implement City Access projects which are urgently needed to address transport issues in the city and beyond including reducing pollution and carbon emissions; improving safety and transport equality, and providing everyone with better transport choice.</p> <p>It's been 2 years since the GCP consulted on a revised road network hierarchy and there is still no clear analysis on the results.</p> <p>It's been 10 years since the county council last published a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and very few of the objectives have been achieved.</p> <p>We don't need another strategy, we need faster implementation based on the wealth of data already available.</p> <p>In addition to the GCP active corridor routes such as Histon Road, Milton Road and Hills Road, an integrated walking and cycling network requires more quickly implemented 'quiet routes' achieved using quick wins such as signal changes at crossings, modal filters and changes to parking. For example, during the Covid-19 pandemic, Camcycle designed several routes like this - including a low-cost 'Cambourne to Cambridge' option.</p> <p>While Camcycle welcomes proposals for quick wins and demonstrator projects, without a hierarchy which defines networks for walking, wheeling, cycling and bus journeys it will be difficult to prioritise these schemes and ensure maximum impact on sustainable transport journeys. In the absence of an overall vision, each implementation risks becoming an isolated scheme without community buy-in.</p> <p>Imagine if the hierarchy had been placed at the heart of planning and communication: the GCP could be carrying out trials of different priority measures already and the public would understand how this was part of a joined-up vision for the city.</p> <p>How will the GCP plan and prioritise its sustainable transport schemes while still waiting on a clear vision and hierarchy?</p>