

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

From	Question
<p align="center">Al Hanagan Resident and member of Riverside Area Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</p> <p><i>Shared Use</i></p> <p>Riverside is a busy, often narrow and often contested space. Most conflict is between cyclists/ e-scooters and pedestrians as very few vehicles use Riverside. Pedestrians mainly walk along the riverfront and in the road as footpaths are narrow or non-existent. Three Greenways (Horningsea, Bottisham and Swaffhams) are projected to converge on Riverside. P5 of the report states that the DoT seeks a minimum 20% uplift in user numbers and the GCP may set itself a higher target. However, the proposed traffic count will only identify <u>existing</u> levels of conflict.</p> <p>Can the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State the GCP target figure for future volumes of (i) cyclists (ii) pedestrians (iii) other users such as e-scooters, powered bikes and mopeds, per Greenway? • Guarantee that the Feasibility stage will comprehensively model the impact of <u>all three</u> Greenways on cyclist, pedestrian and other user volumes along Riverside and at the Stourbridge Common entrance, based on the DoT minimum increase of 20% or the GCP target figure, whichever is higher? • Confirm that the Greenway website promise that "<i>In all places there will be improved safety measures, and the path will be separate from road traffic</i>" will apply to Riverside, and that if new and/or expanded footpaths are needed to protect pedestrians, these will be provided? • Confirm that where Riverside is too narrow to accommodate both a cycle path and a footpath, pedestrian safety will be given <u>absolute priority</u> in layout design decisions?
<p align="center">Professor Sir David Spiegelhalter Resident and member of Riverside Area Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</p> <p><i>Red Asphalt Surfacing</i></p> <p>Because of the shared use and space constraints in many sections of Riverside, we are concerned that a dedicated red asphalt cycle path will increase conflict and danger by creating a sense of entitlement among cyclists and powered scooters that they can travel at speed with impunity. It will be like putting a motorway down a high street. The core issue is Greenway user behaviour.</p> <p>Can the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee that the Preliminary design stage review will seek out and consider all available research on the respective effects of (i) dedicated cycle paths, and (ii) shared space approaches, on cyclist and e-scooter user behaviour? • Guarantee that all such research will be made publicly available?

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee that appropriate speed-reducing measures will be incorporated?? • Guarantee design decisions on surfacing along Riverside will be informed by such research, and the issue of managing Greenway user behaviour to maximise pedestrian safety given <u>absolute priority</u> in design decisions?
<p align="center">Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Greater Cambridge Greenways</p> <p>It has been clear throughout this stage of the Greenways consultation, that the previous work done has not been fully understood, considered and acted upon. For example, where challenges were previously highlighted, little has been done to resolve the concerns. Furthermore many of the major infrastructure elements have been removed any decision making process behind their removal apparently arbitrary.</p> <p>For example: members of Camcycle recently submitted a FOI request to understand the reasoning behind the proposal for an unsatisfactory and dangerous section of route along Green Bank Road in Swaffham Bulbeck. The GCP stated that the "issues log" which they released earlier is the only documentation they have. The issues log mentions some potential downsides to that route, things like "the Ramblers might object" but they are both speculative and hardly decisive. This strongly implies that no serious work was done on progressing the proposal since the 2019 consultation for a route along the existing footpath.</p> <p>We have also heard in the response that an underpass on Ditton Lane would 'represent poor value for money' with the feasibility work identifying issues such as utilities, flood risk and land acquisition and safety of underpasses. These are typical constraints for infrastructure like this and are very similar to those of the Chisholm Trail underpass on Newmarket Road, a piece of infrastructure that has transformed cycling in the local area. Where is the detailed review of alternatives (including those previously suggested) to the underpass.</p> <p>It is clear that the design teams employed by the GCP to do this work are not being held to a high enough standard. We therefore ask the GCP to create a scrutiny panel to review the design work at a much more regular interval. The current level of engagement with key stakeholders is simply not enough.</p>
<p align="center">Martin Lucas-Smith Petersfield Resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>One of the interesting outcomes of the last nine months of public debate on how to reduce traffic and fund public transport has been the emergence of an option which both sides of seem to agree on: a Workplace Parking Levy. Both those campaigning for sustainable transport as well as even the South Cambs Conservative MP seem in favour.</p>

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<p>A Workplace Parking Levy (a charge on employers who provide workplace parking) would answer a common complaint: Namely, that larger employers, who benefit most from growth and are most responsible for the congestion problems it creates, currently do not contribute to solving it. The current GCP proposals put all the onus on citizens, omitting companies.</p> <p>A WPL would quickly bring in £5-10m of annual bus subsidy, reducing pressure on city-wide congestion charging. It would be straightforward to implement. It taxes employers not employees. It has no regressive impacts. It would not see employers would move away just because of parking taxation. It doesn't need camera infrastructure, nor a complex exemption system. It encourages workplaces to help employees by subsidising cycling and public transport. And it nudges employers to replace inefficiently-used land with things like much-needed housing instead.</p> <p>Page 84 says "a Workplace Parking Levy scheme would perform significantly less well than a sustainable travel zone in terms of overall traffic reduction."</p> <p>Whilst this is obviously true, no proposal is ever a complete solution. It's not a reason not to include it, balancing other measures.</p> <p>Can the Assembly please commit to keep a WPL on the agenda and consider its introduction alongside other measures? Speaking as a sustainable transport advocate frustrated with various aspects of the STZ, I can tell you that taxing larger businesses would give the GCP much-needed credibility by people on all sides of the debate.</p>
<p align="center">William Bannell</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>My question relates to the GCP making connections report, and the issue of public trust which has been destroyed in recent months by the manner and behaviour of Councillors with regard to the GCP plans for the city. This report is widely regarded as not credible, and not a genuine representation of what the public really thinks and feels.</p> <p>I'll give you 6 examples why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GCP data and stats in the 2022 presentation were debunked at an early stage by residents, calling into question the overall validity of the presentation itself (debunked figures which are still on the website I would like to add). - In December the County Council voted against having the consultation independently verified. - In March the County Council voted against holding a proper referendum which would have provided us with an authentic survey of

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<p>opinion using the same strict rules as an election, which would have been credible and legitimate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There were public meetings and engagements which took place over the consultation period which were not listed among the public engagements. - There was a meeting held with the GCP board at a local business which remained private and undisclosed to the public, not mentioned in the report. Maybe there were more secret undisclosed meetings. - And during the election, no candidate spoke in favour of the proposals, but did everything they could to avoid the issue and distance themselves from them. <p>All this creates a very suspect picture, and Councillor's appear disingenuous. It is easy to understand why the people of Cambridge don't believe a word anyone here says.</p> <p>Can this Assembly carry on like everything is okay, or are they going to need to attempt to restore public confidence? How do Assembly members intend to address this issue of trust?</p>
<p align="center">David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>Cambridge Living Streets welcomes the GCP report on the Making Connections consultation and calls on the Joint Assembly to endorse the call to action for active travel investment that it reveals. .</p> <p>70% of respondents support the bus improvement strategy. An even higher 75% of respondents call for measures to improve walking and cycling. This overwhelming mandate for a shift in priorities towards more active travel must be converted into actions or politicians and officers risk losing public confidence and trust.</p> <p>As yet more evidence demonstrates that walking is the most used active travel mode, we question why it has been for so long the ‘Cinderella’ in transport investment? 65% of consultation respondents use it as their 'most common transport', reinforcing the point that walking - to work, to school and college, for shopping, leisure and access to amenities - is a key type of economic activity.</p> <p>Why haven't the GCP and politicians changed their mindset on walking and moved beyond fine words and dribbles of investment to deliver a comprehensive strategy for the whole city and beyond? Why is so little attention paid to pavement quality and amenities when the evidence shows these are the greatest determinants of the choice to walk? And why haven't they 'joined the dots' and recognised that investment that transforms our</p>

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<p>streets into safer and pleasanter environments also supports our health and wellbeing, cuts costs for the NHS and helps to save the planet?</p>
<p align="center">Jethro Gauld Chair East Cambs Climate Action Network</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>Transport policy in Cambridgeshire has been hampered by decades of short termism. Transport is a significant source of pollution and the single largest source of climate warming green house gases in our region. While electrification has an important role, the Cambridgeshire Climate Commission makes it clear that a reduction in private use will be central to meeting our climate targets and making transport more equitable because many can't afford to own a car.</p> <p>The consultation is clear, people want better buses and better cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Our group strongly supports the proposals set out in the making connections plan including the principal of some kind of congestion or ULEZ charge to help fund improvements for cycling and public transport. In the wake of the consultation it is clear that further exemptions may be needed for specific groups and businesses. We urge the GCP and councillors to hold their nerve and not abandon yet another plan to reduce congestion and pollution in the city.</p> <p>Our question is this, what next for the making connections plan and for those opposing it, what is your alternative proposal to reduce congestion and pollution in Cambridge and surrounding areas?"</p>
<p align="center">Sarah Hughes Cambs Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>The Making Connections report clearly shows that the public would like better sustainable transport options: 70% are in favour of the proposed bus improvements and 75% of measures to improve walking, cycling and public spaces.</p> <p>Overall, only 17% of those polled by the GCP were against road charging in any form; many who opposed or were unsure about the STZ reported there were changes that would encourage them to support it.</p> <p>People will never be able to get to where they want to be safely, easily and affordably by bus, walking, wheeling or cycling while central government funding lacks a sustainable, long-term plan, and while bus services aren't under local control.</p> <p>Last October's bus service withdrawals would have left many villages without any service whatsoever, had the Combined Authority not funded tendered replacements. In February, the Government's three month</p>

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<p>extension to the Bus Recovery Grant was announced so late that some services had already been registered for withdrawal (again).</p> <p>In March, the Secretary of State for Transport announced cuts to active travel schemes in England outside London, including a two-thirds cut to promised capital investment in infrastructure for walking, wheeling, and cycling.</p> <p>A decision not to progress Making Connections would be a decision to perpetuate the sporadic, precarious funding situation, and a decision to tolerate aggravated traffic congestion, unreliable bus services and unsatisfactory conditions for walking, wheeling and cycling. It would also be a decision to ignore the clear public message of support for sustainable transport.</p> <p>Given the precarious and short-term nature of central government funding for sustainable transport, does the Joint Assembly agree that, alongside bringing buses under contract to the local transport authority, they have a duty to work together to find a reliable funding source that is under local control?</p>
<p align="center">Neil Mackay Managing director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>During public questions in Cambridge City Council on May 25th I addressed the City Council. In doing so I had assumed that they had conducted a detailed impact analysis on the true cost of the £50 per lorry per day tax proposed and devised a means to scrutinise that data. I asked "What is that total figure and how was it derived?" I also asked "What will the total additional cost burden be for all Cambridge businesses that will fall within the currently proposed Congestion Charge zone?" Why do I need to know? Because my business receives between 6 and 10 deliveries by lorry per day. Which I estimate is equivalent to £104,000 pounds per year out of pocket.</p> <p>Sadly I failed to receive an adequate reply to either question Councillor Davey the newly elected leader of the City council stated that "The work that has been done to date on small business is not as we would like it!!" I would therefore like to address the same questions to the GCP Assembly in the hope that the organisation that has put forward the proposals for consultation, will themselves, have done some really rigorous work on this crucially important area, which is of great interest to not just the business operators within the area, but also their employees and customers.</p>
<p align="center">Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that bus users in the Greater Cambridge area will remain unable to make convenient, affordable bus journeys, unless services are under local control and funding is sustainable, long-term and also under local control?</p>

**8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

	<p>October 2022's bus service withdrawals left many rural residents fearful of being unable to get to work, school/college, medical appointments or recreational activities, until the Combined Authority funded tendered replacements. Fears returned early this year, as the Government's three month extension to the Bus Recovery Grant was announced so late that some services had already been registered for withdrawal.</p> <p>Bus service provision in the Greater Cambridge area is over-ripe for reform – and has clear public support. The Making Connections report recorded 70% in favour of proposed bus improvements. Even those opposed to the Sustainable Travel Zone recognised – and in large measure supported – the need for better bus services.</p> <p>Whilst the commitment of the Greater Cambridge Partnership to collaborate with the Combined Authority to stabilise the network by bringing bus provision under local control is welcome, this is not enough.</p> <p>Bus service funding can neither rely solely on farebox revenue nor upon the vagaries of sporadic, precarious, central government grants.</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that, alongside bringing buses under contract to the local transport authority, they have a duty to work together to find reliable, sustainable funding sources which are under local control?</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members further agree that any decision to abandon (rather than modify) the Making Connections proposals would be a decision to ignore the clear public message of support for sustainable transport, a decision to tolerate aggravated traffic congestion, and a perpetuation of unreliable, declining, bus services?</p>
<p align="center">Sara Lightowlers on behalf of the group Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone'</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>The Making Connections Report shows that there is significant concern amongst local residents and groups that the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone could disadvantage low-income groups. However, data suggests that these groups also disproportionately bear the serious harms of the status quo: air and noise pollution, and congested, unsafe roads. This is despite the fact that households in the lowest income areas contribute less to these problems due to lower rates of car ownership, fewer diesel vehicles, and fewer miles driven. In 2021, 38% of households in the lowest income quintile nationwide (compared with 16% in the highest quintile) did not own a car; infrequent and unreliable public transport provision is likely to be a major problem for this group, particularly for families who may be making multistep journeys.</p> <p>What assessment has the GCP made of the impacts, both economic and on health outcomes, on low income families, of the current proposals versus the status quo?</p>

8th June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation

<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</p> <p>The consultation shows strong support for active travel and public transport improvements and Camcycle believes that by making the scheme better and fairer we can achieve a high quality transport system for everyone.</p> <p>BETTER</p> <p>As noted in 3.12, many people have reminded the GCP that Making Connections must not be allowed to become solely about the bus network. 75% of consultation respondents cycled, with strong support for improved cycleways and secure cycle parking, including among those who opposed a road charge. The most popular sustainable travel measure was making the city more accessible for disabled people. The GCP should start delivering more active travel improvements that people want now on top of already scheduled projects.</p> <p>This must include links between towns and villages, not just into and within Cambridge. The GCP should also fast-track progress on the road network hierarchy and residents’ parking schemes to free up road space for active travel.</p> <p>FAIRER</p> <p>Motor traffic reduction and a reliable source of funding are essential for better active travel, so it is vital that the GCP delivers a plan that will work. To address concerns, progress is needed on an appropriate scheme of exemptions. For example, a Workplace Parking Levy for the Biomedical Campus could ensure larger employers contribute while providing the necessary exclusions for those visiting the hospitals. Extending the zone to weekends but adding a system of free passes could provide more flexibility for people’s different circumstances while still tackling traffic issues.</p> <p>People in Cambridgeshire need better walking, cycling and wheeling infrastructure now and the guarantee of a scheme that will prioritise sustainable transport for the future. Will the GCP commit to strengthen its commitment to active travel by ring fencing funding and bringing forward new schemes and ensure the effectiveness of a revised STZ for funding and traffic reduction?</p>
--	---