

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>"2.8 The Greater Cambridge area is forecast to grow significantly. Successive development plans over the last 20 years have supported the economic success of the area and provided for housing and employment land to support that growth. The adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans plan for 44,000 more jobs and 33,500 homes by 2031.2 The 2021 Census showed that significant population growth has already taken place, with 35,000 more Greater Cambridge residents than in 2011.</p> <p>Greater Cambridge is a net 'importer' of workers, with a travel to work area stretching beyond Cambridgeshire into parts of Hertfordshire, Essex, and Suffolk."</p> <p>The CPCA Board met today (20th September 2023) Their Board Papers show a very different growth pattern. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan) for Greater Cambridge (Page 375. " A Connected Region") ("The Plan is closely aligned to the further aspirations for the region as outlined in England Economic Heartland Transport Strategy (EEH 2021)"</p> <p>The spatial context as described by the GCP and CPCA, are very different. The implications are serious. The issues where to build new homes and appropriate transport infrastructure are far from clear. It might also be the case that the CCC has other plans and expectations.</p> <p>Regardless, the TTWA for Cambridge (Fig 1 WSP Atkins Report Page 42 of 531) is certain to expand east/west as East West Rail connect Bedford and Tempsford with Cambourne and Cambridge South Station. In the absence of a clear sense of direction the likelihood of dependency upon the car as the essential mode for commuting remains high.</p> <p>Question.</p> <p>Joint (Shared) Local Plan to 2041 - How does the GCP intend to provide one shared strategic spatial context that delivers achievable and sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge, whilst preserving and enhancing the nature of our unique green corridors?</p>
David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Living Streets is committed to improving conditions for walking and deeply disappointed by the lack of funding to support it. The GCP proposed £5m annual funding at least signalled intent to take action and to recognise walking as top of the national transport hierarchy.</p> <p>So we ask: with the STZ in tatters how are the GCP and politicians now intending to meet the Department of Transport's requirements to put walking first?</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>There has been no dedicated funding stream for walking in any GCP strategy and some schemes may include impediments to walking - floating bus stops and shared-use cycle paths are examples. People won't walk more if it is risky or unpleasant.</p> <p>So we ask: what plans exist to create an infrastructure that cuts pollution, protects walkers and enables those 20 minute walks that will reduce health risks and cut NHS costs?</p>
<p>Neil Mackay Managing Director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>In 2003 when a Congestion charge was first introduced to London, Mackays of Cambridge went down to investigate the effects on business because we had heard that Cambridge may be considering following suit.</p> <p>What we discovered in our research gave us great cause for concern. The tourist centre of the city saw little effect as the majority of people used the mature and excellent public transport system that existed already. However we found businesses in the outer reaches of the zone that reported reduction in footfall of 60%. Those businesses were being forced to relocate completely altering the business demographic of the city.</p> <p>I have been out and interviewed many business owners and posted those interviews online. Every County councillor has received a link to those filmed interviews.</p> <p>The effect on small and medium sized business of introducing a congestion charge will be hugely negative.</p> <p>Given the massive and conclusive rejection of Congestion charging by business and the public will the executive board finally decide to put this plan to bed once and for all so local business can plan for its future within our city?</p>
<p>Rory Comyn</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Cambridge City Council has considered setting targets for PM2.5 reduction and we welcome the introduction of targets under the Environment Bill, although the potential to achieve significant reduction is limited by the high regional contribution.</p> <p>There are few measures that can be undertaken locally that will specifically reduce the small amount of PM2.5 produced locally.</p> <p>Regional, national and international measures will be more effective.'</p> <p>Is the GCP aware that it's widely understood, outside this chamber, that, although the climate emergency is a pressing matter, the real necessity for the congestion charge, here and now, is to enable further speculative development of the city.</p> <p>Does the GCP know that the target, set out as one justification for the Congestion Charge: for the GCP to help create 44000 jobs by 2031, was met in 2022! ?</p> <p>Does the GCP know that the concomitant delivery of housing due by 2031, is merely on target?</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Does the GCP understand that development which eviscerates communities, and scatters them to the winds, and which entrenches and exacerbates inequality is, by definition, unsustainable?</p> <p>Is that what the GCP stands for?</p> <p>[References: Cambridge City Council Air Quality Status Report 2022 [page 31] : https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/11277/air-quality-annual-status-report-2022.pdf&ved=2ahUKEWjX1dTii8SBAXUaTOEAHQoWD9UQFnoECA8QAQ&usg=AOvVaw36gw3njsowg0uStSf00z-Y 2022 Cambridge City Council Annual Monitoring Report: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s61554/AMR_2022_FINAL_FINAL.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiUms7FiMSBAXVOXkEAHSHPDYMQFnoECBAQAQ&usg=AOvVaw0G7GCYjhdT_aMthXDh2iNg Employment Land and Economic Development study. GL Hearn Nov 2020: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/1399/greater-cambridge-employment-land-and-economic-development-evidence-study-gl-hearn-nov2020.pdf&ved=2ahUKEWjvhvKbLkcSBAXVggf0HHd3rAGMQFnoECA8QAQ&usg=AOvVaw28nO80mYlwaLtwXlW2UN- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment. Stantec. Nov. 2020 [Para 3.3]: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/1391/gclp-strategic-spatial-options-assessment-integrated-water-management-study-nov2020.pdf&ved=2ahUKEWjfooz-kcSBAXVug_0HHd7qBQU4FBAWegQlAxAB&usg=AOvVaw3aaAuQ8AkpLsRZNfK_8l6m]</p>
William Bannell	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>In the Government's guidelines regarding the proper carrying out of consultations with the public, it states the following</p> <p>"We will also reduce the risk of 'consultation fatigue' by making sure we consult only on issues that are genuinely undecided." (- gov.uk website "consultation principles")</p> <p>Considering that since 2018, there have been more than 65 consultations, 15 of which took place during the pandemic, regarding a wide range of GCP schemes which are clearly all part of a wider, overarching general scheme to transform Cambridge's roads, some of which consultations have been open for a mere 3 weeks before closing again, how can the GCP expect to receive meaningful feedback from the public when there is an obvious likelihood of "consultation fatigue", and how can the GCP justify the blatant over-use of the consultation mechanism, against the government's guidance, to show support of any part of their over-arching agenda for Cambridge?</p>
Ian Black	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>The Making Connections 2022 consultations raw data posted at the link below on 26 May 2023 remains incomplete, i.e. the data set does not contain the redacted unstructured text comments entered by survey participants. Given the length of time which has passed since the consultation concluded, the delay in releasing the full cohort of data raises a number of concerns.</p> <p>To explain:</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>The total number of submissions recorded in the raw data of 24,071 confirmed that 57.92% (or 58% rounded) either 'strongly opposed or opposed' the congestion charge. The total number of submissions has not changed since the conclusion of the consultation so, the configuration of hardware and software used to capture the submissions online either automatically identified duplicated submissions at the point of capture (i.e. the same individual repeatedly entering the same data) or if the configuration of hardware and software was not able to identify duplications, work since the conclusion of the consultation has taken place to identify duplications, but that the unstructured textual comments has not changed the total number of responses.</p> <p>QUESTION: When will the final set of redacted unstructured textual comments be available, and by what hardware, software or manual method was it de-duplicated and what chain of custody was employed to ensure its integrity since that time?</p> <p>FYI, for part of my career, I sponsored the acquisition and latterly led the growth of the world's largest financially regulated compliance archive, meeting Securities and Exchange Commission 17/a 3 & 4 regulations. This platform required the de-duplication of petabytes of real-time (i.e. billions of messages) streaming data from many of the world's largest financial institutions. To that end, I am familiar with technical data, architecture standards, and working practices, and I would appreciate a technically complete response, including a survey capture and process workflow diagram.</p>
Jenny Williams	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>We're a car-less family who cycle and walk with our pre-schooler across Cambridge and the surrounding villages.</p> <p>In quiet, safe streets, we recognise that there are lots of benefits to our active travel, including increasing our daily exercise and exploring the outside world with our daughter. However, for large parts of the city, this is not our experience. We deal with walkways that are too thin for our stroller and too thin to walk holding hands with our child; pavement parking that forces us into busy roads; as well as poor driving and aggressive attitudes from drivers desperate to get through congestion as quickly as possible. It means walking in polluted air and next to overly loud traffic that terrifies our child. The poor and potholed state of the roads and walkways has caused damage to our bikes and tripped up our daughter numerous times. All of which can make active travel highly nerve wracking.</p> <p>In light of the Joint Assembly's request to the Exec to reflect and report back on Making Connections yet again, we want to know why our needs are not as important as those of people in cars and how much longer we need to wait to see substantial improvements to our safety when travelling around the city?'</p>
Martin Lucas-Smith, Petersfield resident	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>If one thing has achieved consensus, it's that public transport needs massive improvement, and that this should be done through franchising, to end the current Stagecoach monopoly.</p>

28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>Those unable to afford a car are highly dependent on an ever-dwindling bus system, especially in rural areas. Those at the income level just above are forced to spend thousands for a car they can barely afford. Those too young to drive, and many others, have little transport independence. Those who can afford a car, and businesses, sit in traffic congestion, wasting time and money. These cannot continue.</p> <p>The hard fact is that improving public transport under franchising requires a subsidy income stream. There are really only two routes that raise enough funding. A congestion charge, or a Workplace Parking Levy which taxes large businesses.</p> <p>The report for the February 2020 Exec Board meeting stated that a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) would raise ~£23m annually.</p> <p>At a Joint Assembly meeting, I asked why a WPL was not being pursued. The answer given was that 'WPLs can raise revenue and reduce traffic but on a smaller scale than the proposed STZ'.</p> <p>However, officers now propose a smaller STZ, to raise only £33m, so it and the WPL are now in the same ballpark. So the answer given last time is irrelevant.</p> <p>A WPL has already seen surprisingly high levels of support, from both sides, including the South Cambs Tory MP. It would be a much simpler scheme and has no significant regressive effects. It would be one of the few ways of taxing the growth industries exacerbating the congestion problem.</p> <p>I ask that the WPL be put back on the agenda.</p>
Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>If the Board is unable to support the Making Connections plan, which includes the only funding mechanism on the table to pay for an expansion in bus services, will it instruct officers to develop a business case for introducing a Workplace Parking Levy?</p> <p>This would provide a reliable income stream to start funding long-term improvements to bus services and reductions in fares. It would also create an incentive to employers to assist their staff in finding new ways to travel to and for work, including cycling, taking public transport, and car-sharing. All of these outcomes are widely supported and essential to decarbonising transport, reducing road congestion and improving public health.</p> <p>There is in Nottingham a successful model for implementing a Workplace Parking Levy. It can be tailored relatively easily to avoid unintended consequences: for instance, schools, hospitals and care homes could be exempted at the outset. And it costs very little to run, as there are no cameras or complex billing system.</p> <p>Whatever the board's collective view is, could the business and University reps please state for the record their respective positions on the principle of a Workplace Parking Levy.</p>

<p>Elisabeth Whitebread Cambridgeshire Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Like most parents, I am deeply concerned about the impact of climate change on my children's future. Indeed, it is the top thing that will determine who I vote for in both local and national elections. Transport emissions account for a full 35% of Cambridgeshire's carbon emissions and are the single biggest source of emissions across the county, as well as contributing to local air pollution which breeches World Health Organisation limits across Cambridgeshire. My home in Cambridge breeches three WHO limits, which means my children - who are 5 years old and 18 months - are at risk of reduced lung development, cancer, and disease-related mortality.</p> <p>Given the failure of all Parties thus far to deliver a solution to these problems, I would ask who the politicians represented here think I should vote for? I can't vote Conservative as they campaigned against the STZ. I can't vote Lib Dem, as they withdrew their support first. I can't vote Labour as they didn't stick up for the STZ when the Lib Dems withdrew, and campaigned against it in Cherry Hinton. And I can't vote Green, because they failed to campaign for the STZ when it was the single biggest opportunity we've had - and are likely to have - in this region to cut carbon emissions, which I thought was their main concern.</p> <p>What are you all going to do now to rebuild trust and address the twin emergencies of climate and air pollution? Are you going to fight to do what's right and win my vote? Or do you not care about either?</p>
<p>Sarah Hughes STZ Campaign Officer Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>The CSTA firmly supports the principle of a Sustainable Travel Zone for Cambridge. The funding and opportunity it presents offer a unique moment to reshape the city and wider county around the needs of its people.</p> <p>Years of work by officers, a Citizens' Assembly and wide consultation have brought us to the current point where there are detailed plans for a single scheme that acts powerfully in three ways simultaneously towards City Deal objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First, it reduces traffic, which frees up road space for public transport and active travel, reduces carbon emissions, improves air quality and makes Greater Cambridge a nicer place to be - Second, it puts in place a mechanism to generate substantial funds every year, ring-fenced to spend on sustainable transport - Third, it encourages people to make the switch from driving to sustainable transport. <p>The scheme also offers a strong response to the concerns raised in the consultation. With chargeable hours reduced by half and a system of free days, there are considerable opportunities to drive without paying a road charge. There are also discounts for local SMEs and those on low incomes, and there is no charge for most patients and staff visiting the hospitals.</p> <p>Transformational change is within reach. Will politicians choose to lead the way? If they vote not to proceed, the problems of congestion, pollution and underfunding will</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>remain, and they will need to turn to ‘next best’ solutions and bring in a patchwork of smaller, less powerful schemes, each requiring months or years of planning, consultation and debate.</p> <p>Can Officers outline how the current proposals meet the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and explain how these objectives could be met by other schemes if the STZ doesn’t go ahead?</p>
<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users Cambridge Area Bus Users Website Manager</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Do board members recognise that others are doing their bit for clean air, connectivity, and countering the climate crisis?</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are pursuing the case for bringing bus services under public control (franchising) and a number of rail schemes.</p> <p>Bus operators are decarbonising their fleets, and bringing their diesel buses up to Euro VI (super-low particulate emission ULEZ compliant) standard.</p> <p>Will the Greater Cambridge Partnership seize the opportunity to play its own part?</p> <p>The GCP has a unique opportunity to reshape the city and wider county around the needs of its people.</p> <p>The current, amended, Sustainable Travel Zone Scenario 1A meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing traffic, freeing road-space for public transport and active travel, reducing carbon and particulate emissions, making Greater Cambridge greater; • generating substantial funds, ring-fenced to spend on sustainable transport; • enabling and encouraging people to use sustainable transport <p>Scenario 1A also offers a strong response to issues raised in the consultation. Discounts for local SMEs and for those on low incomes, together with alignment for hospital visitors and patients to existing car park discounts, address initial concerns.</p> <p>Do board members agree that these amended proposals offer the most equitable way forward?</p> <p>Can GCP Officers explain whether the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme could be met by other schemes if the STZ doesn’t go ahead, and give an estimate of the time delays and financial costs which the GCP would incur whilst work on other schemes was progressed?</p>
<p>Sara Lightowlers Cambridge Parents for Sustainable Travel</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Families in Cambridge and the surrounding area are like those anywhere else. Most of us want the same things: things like getting the drop off done and to work on time, having enough money to live comfortably, a home and a community somewhere that’s safe and healthy for our kids, and feeling secure about their future on this planet. Lots</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>of us feel like we're struggling with some or all of these things now, and the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone was aimed at helping with that. But whatever solution is suggested to deal with our problems, there will always be naysayers who try to profit by spreading opposition and stirring up divisions. So my question is, will the politicians have the courage to get a solution - which we all know we need - over the line, so that the process of healing our communities can begin?</p>
<p>Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>Last week, following the government's decision to water down its net zero commitments, Greenpeace said that Britain had "gone from leader to laggard on climate change". Car manufacturers agreed, with Ford saying that the three things businesses needed were "ambition, commitment and consistency".</p> <p>Local politics seems to be following the same depressing path: where is the decisive action we need to provide safe and affordable transport networks for residents of all ages, tackle our region's climate goals and help our businesses thrive?</p> <p>Cambridge has been a pioneer in transport planning: often the first to trial new cycle infrastructure and the first UK transport authority to embed "demand management by road pricing" in its policy back in the 1990s.</p> <p>This area is not a leader any more. It's a national embarrassment that we cannot include our city in the list of places that are taking decisive action on pollution, congestion and carbon emissions such as Bath, Birmingham, Bradford, Bristol, London, Nottingham, Oxford, Portsmouth, Sheffield and Newcastle.</p> <p>The publication Local Transport Today called the Sustainable Travel Zone scheme "an exemplar of integrated mobility", yet you are about to throw that all away.</p> <p>If you do, what is the ambitious alternative that will match the boldness called for by the Citizens' Assembly?</p> <p>Where is the commitment to the economic, social and environmental goals that each council has signed up to? The climate emergencies that have been declared? The focus on reducing road deaths?</p> <p>Where is the consistent funding we need to improve cycling, walking and public transport?</p> <p>If you do not have a feasible solution to reduce vehicle traffic and generate income for sustainable transport, it will impoverish every person, business and community in this region.</p> <p>If this plan goes back to the drawing board, when's the next consultation on a viable alternative?</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>1. In relation to A1307 and CSETS Phase 2, given the pressures on budgets, why not revert to the 2017 scheme which is £100m cheaper and would deliver similar transport benefits and a higher BCR – rather than allocating no budget at all to improve journeys on the A1307, which you are still advising is one of the most important transport corridors into Cambridge, serving the Biomedical Campus and central Cambridge?</p> <p>2. In relation to the A1307, what will happen if the GCP is not able to secure additional funding, given that the recommended Investment Strategy is already £122m over programmed?</p> <p>3. Your report refers to CSETS Phase 1 as “under construction”, however Phase 1 consists of several discreet projects and at least one of these, changes to road layout on the Gog Magog Hills, is still at the planning stage and could be halted in order to save funds. This scheme is opposed by our charity because we have an independent road safety report which identifies that the scheme will worsen road safety at Wandlebury and it will also be harmful to ecology and the landscape. Please will the Board consider withdrawing this scheme in order to save budget, save ecology and save the well-loved landscape of the Gog Magog Hills?</p>
<p align="center">Jim Rickard</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>If finance is not available to proceed with the GCP's preferred route for CSET, then rather than pausing all activity, will you consider implementing at least some of the improvements to the A1307 proposed in previous strategies? You will remember that in the 2018 consultation the two routes along the A1307 corridor attracted between them more votes than the GCP's preferred route, so I don't think there would be a problem with public opinion.</p> <p>One example is the bus-only spur around the south-eastern corner of the biomedical campus, which formed part of Strategy Two in the 2018 consultation. I speak as a user of the citi 7 bus service, which suffers chronic delays at peak times on the section of its route between Dame Mary Archer Way and the Addenbrooke's bus station, making a nonsense of the timetable. The same bottleneck also applies to buses on the 'A' and 'U' routes. If a new bus-only spur alleviated those delays and also allowed buses from the key Haverhill corridor to access more central parts of the biomedical campus, it would be a significant step in reducing congestion now and making public transport more attractive. In fact any improvements along the A1307 would complement those you've already achieved with Phase 1 of CSET.</p> <p>So in summary I'm asking whether you will consider using some of the paused expenditure to fund improvements which have a lower cost, which will reduce delays to public transport now, and which will be valid whatever else may happen in the future.</p>
<p align="center">Stephen Partridge-Hicks Resident of Sawston</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>How much money will you need to spend in order to progress CSET to the stage where it is ready to submit to the government for the TWA0? Does this represent a good use of funds for a scheme that has a cost of at least £160m and has no funding available for it?</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Please answer the question - Peter Blake ignored it and refused to give a £ cost when this question was asked at the Assembly.</p> <p>How long will you allow the GCP to search for more money without making any improvements to local transport?</p> <p>Why not set a fixed date of say 3 or 6 months to end CSET if insufficient money is raised?</p> <p>And today why not commit a small budget, say £250k, today to work up the alternative?</p> <p>This alternative isn't new, it is based on the GCP's on-road scheme from 2017/2018 with a spur road into the biomedical campus and bus lanes on the A1307 that can be built for at least £100m less than CSET? This would enable rapid implementation when CSET is finally cancelled, benefiting the travelling public and employers alike.</p>
<p>Dr.Marilyn Treacy</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>The paper states:</p> <p>“Since 2020 significant events have occurred within the national and international context that have caused high inflation within the UK. This has led to costs of projects across the country increasing significantly. Within the construction industry the overall index for construction went up by 40.5% from May 2020 to May 2023.”</p> <p>The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme is the largest by far, and most heavily engineered, of the current GCP schemes. The expected inflation uplift applied to the budget of £157m is low at 15.5%. If the costs increase in line with the more realistic GCP stated inflation figure of 30%-40% to give a cost of over £200m, other schemes will be at risk from a shortage of funds.</p> <p>As approximately 50% of the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge route is scheduled to be on road, the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme could never be called “off-road.” The scheme has a BCR of between 0.43 and 0.47.</p> <p>Question: Would it not be more pragmatic and make better business sense to cut back the costs of this particular scheme by substituting an inbound bus lane down Madingley Hill, avoiding the costs of a heavily engineered additional M11 bridge and saving £100m thus helping ensure the availability of funds for other GCP schemes which will benefit a wider section of the population?</p>
<p>Carolyn Postgate Coton resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>At its meeting on 7 September, the GCP Join Assembly noted: “It was acknowledged that the GCP was already overprogrammed, therefore any new or alternative schemes would also be unaffordable.” (p.37) The GCP has not yet submitted the Cambourne to Cambridge project to the Department for Transport, and thus the costly public enquiry</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>phase has not yet begun. The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme will cost over £200m. What is the process for the GCP to review its original decision, and to consider an on road bus lane scheme, which could be delivered at a quarter of the cost, thereby freeing funds to implement other GCP schemes?</p>
<p align="center">Paul Hollinghurst Secretary, Railfuture East Anglia</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>At the Joint Assembly Meeting on 7th September 2023, the option of pausing CSET was discussed, with "Some members raised concerns about pausing CSETS Phase 2, given its strategic importance locally and nationally. The Joint Assembly highlighted the need to pursue options for securing alternative funding at the earliest opportunity."</p> <p>Rather than looking for alternative funding for the bus road, the GCP should instead support restoring the railway line from Cambridge to Haverhill.</p> <p>In 2016 the Cambridge to Haverhill Corridor viability report assessed the rail reopening but was not followed up by the GCP as the indicative capital costs were considered "substantial and cannot be funded within the current City Deal allocation"</p> <p>In Spring 2021 the railway reopening was assessed by the DfT as "suitable for Restoring Your Railway funding in principle" and "a good case for future development".</p> <p>In February 2023 Transport East concluded that the lack of a rail connection to Haverhill was a key challenge and are now carrying out a Connectivity Study which will include how to serve Haverhill.</p> <p>Does the GCP agree that given alternative sources of funding are being looked at and the railway reopening is repeatedly considered of interest by organisations such as the DfT and Transport East, and national strategic importance by the GCP itself, then it is time to seriously look at reopening the railway?</p> <p>This high-quality transport option would transform the whole corridor to Haverhill, covering a catchment area of 100,000, The CSET bus road provides very limited benefits especially beyond Granta Park to Haverhill.</p> <p>(For reference attached is a copy of the Restoring Your Railway bid, and also a recent article about restoring the railway from the industry respected magazine Modern Railways.)</p>
<p align="center">Yunus Bostanci</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>My name is Yunus and I live in Meldreth. My family doesn't own a car, so we go almost everywhere by bike, train or on foot. For today, we booked a car from our local car club because it is the only way to get to Cambourne.</p> <p>When I came to the Greater Cambridge Partnership for the first time, I was 10 and a Junior Travel Ambassador at Meldreth Primary School. I am now 15 and in my last year at Melbourn Village College. I will go to Sixth Form in Cambridge next year.</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>I have noticed that, especially since the pandemic and now with high petrol prices, more and more people cycle in Meldreth and Melbourn. I know from my dad that more people from his work are traveling between Royston and Cambridge by bike or e-bike, using the very dangerous roundabout to cross the A505 and along the dangerous A10. It's therefore such good news that there is now a plan to make this route safe. Many of my friends from Melbourn Village College live in Royston. With the bridge, we will be able to visit each other more easily and independently.</p> <p>My question is, what more can people my age do to help with the next stages of the Melbourn Greenway?</p>
Iris Bostanci	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</p> <p>My name is Iris Bostanci. I was 7 years old and still at Meldreth Primary School when I first came to a GCP meeting to ask you, 'How old will I be by the time the Melbourn Greenway will be completed so I can safely cycle to Royston?' I am now 12 and in year 8 at Melbourn Village College.</p> <p>I'm excited and hopeful that there is now a plan to build a cycle bridge to Royston. I will be using it and so will my friends. Everyone I tell about this is really excited and impatient to see progress. The first thing they all ask is, When will work begin?</p> <p>So I want to thank you for your work on this and also ask you, one more time, 'How old will I be by the time I can safely cycle to Royston?'</p>
Edward Leigh	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>As the Board considers the recommendation to proceed with the Cambridge South West Travel Hub at the revised cost of £69.5 million, please ask yourselves whether this is an effective, proportionate and fiscally prudent use of public money.</p> <p>In essence, this £69.5 million is to build and connect a 2,250-space car park, equivalent to £31,000 per parking space. How many car trips will that remove from Cambridge?</p> <p>Even if every space is used twice in the course of a day, that still only accommodates 17% of the forecast 26,000 additional trips onto the Biomedical Campus in 2031. The Outline Business case for Cambridge South station forecast approximately 3,200 daily rail trips onto the Campus in 2031. Only a proportion of those will be new trips to the Campus. But even if all of them were new, that still accounts for only another 12.5% of the forecast increase in trips by all modes.</p> <p>Now with no funded bus priority plans for the A1307 and A1301, how is the GCP planning to provide sustainable travel options for the other 70+% or >18,000 daily trips onto the Biomedical Campus within the next eight years?</p>
Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle strongly welcomes the inclusion of the A505 bridge to Royston within the reprioritised Greenways programme. We thank officers for this change and the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign for their persistent call over 10 years for this vital link.</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Around a quarter of cyclist fatalities occur at junctions and providing safe crossings is essential to breaking down barriers to cycling for people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that this dedication to providing safe junctions is missing from the Greenways programme as a whole. Too many of the routes are being watered down leaving dangerous crossings, substandard widths and paths that simply won't be good enough to tempt people out of their cars. Camcycle has previously called for the Greenways to be delivered quickly, but it is astonishing to see that the amount of time spent on these schemes has not led to better quality designs, but worse. Now the GCP is clearly sacrificing quality – and safety – for speed and this is not right. If the GCP continues to refuse to engage properly with stakeholders and residents before designs that are not compliant with LTN 1/20 are baked in, then the process MUST be paused. Officers must adjust their designs and board members must not vote through substandard schemes. Routes must be safe and accessible for all.</p> <p>We'd like to ask when designs for the A505 bridge to Royston will be drawn up, when it will be built and ready to ride and, most importantly, how will Camcycle and the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign be included as co-creators to ensure a high-quality crossing that meets the needs of all ages and abilities?</p>
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Please will you listen to the 5,000 people who have signed a petition asking you to save the green belt countryside, protect the Gog Magog hills and choose a greener solution for the A1307 instead of agreeing to progress an 8km bus road through the countryside? Rather than agreeing to progress to a TWAO application, please will you agree to start work on a greener and cheaper alternative that delivers similar transport and economic benefits?</p>
<p>John Latham Chairman Hobson's Conduit Trust</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I am the Chairman of Hobson's Conduit Trust. The Trustees remain very concerned about the range of negative impacts that the proposed CSET scheme would have on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and on Hobson's Brook, including the 15 metre square concrete deck of the intrusive proposed bridge over the Brook, creating a sterile dark cavern. We have argued, among other things, for splitting the bridge into two and for the use of more sympathetic design and materials.</p> <p>We have made various other proposals reducing the impact on Nine Wells of the CSET scheme, but we do not yet see their inclusion. The CSET scheme threatens Water Vole and Grey Partridge habitat, and the drainage arrangement proposed is likely to bring quantities of salt from de-icing to pollute the pristine chalk stream.</p> <p>The Papers for the GCP Executive (Item 1.19 page 412) state :</p> <p>‘ 1.19 A full statutory, Environmental Impact Assessment was completed. ‘</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>I am still unable to locate this EIA, or any evidence that the full EIA has yet been completed. This is despite being told at the September GCP Joint Assembly that the EIA (rather than an earlier EIA consultation) was about to be published.</p> <p>The Trustees much prefer an alternative scheme in the A1307 corridor which would deliver similar and further transport benefits, and cost £100 million less, with much less impact on the environment.</p> <p>Importantly, the A1307 on-road alternative scheme would not involve building three massive concrete bridges with huge embedded CO2 over Hobson’s Brook and the River Granta. In fact the alternative would not pass anywhere adjacent to Nine Wells and its surrounds, so would not impact water quality, wildlife or habitats, and would leave visitors undisturbed.</p> <p>Why are you not recommending reverting to and expediting the alternative lower cost scheme ?</p>
<p align="center">Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Camcycle agrees with the comments from the Joint Assembly; although the full CSET scheme may be paused, we believe that many of the active travel components could be delivered and would present excellent value for money.</p> <p>Can officers confirm if links such as an active travel route to Granta Park could be implemented if the rest of the scheme was paused?</p>
<p align="center">James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 9 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>There are no traffic lights or roundabouts on the section of the A10 between Waterbeach and the Milton Park & Ride, so a bus road has no real advantage compared to a bus lane, in terms of journey times and reliability. Officers have advised me that they ruled out the option of having inbound and outbound bus lanes along the entire length of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach New Town due to pinch points and the A14 interchange. However they have not responded to my request for evidence that they have considered whether sections of inbound and outbound bus lanes could be provided in order to enable buses to bypass queuing traffic. In most cases, traffic is not queuing in both directions, and the proposal to use Butt Lane also now avoids the A14 roundabout. Before you make a decision to proceed with building a £110m road through open countryside, please can you make sure you are satisfied that this option has been adequately researched, and also direct me to where I can find it?</p>
<p align="center">Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge And Waterbeach Greenway</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes progress on the Waterbeach Greenway which should provide a safe, high-quality cycle route for existing residents of Waterbeach village and up to 30,000 future residents of Waterbeach New Town. If this route fails to live up to its</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>potential, it will negatively affect the lives of thousands of people in the area, reducing access to education and work, impacting health and adding to the congestion around Cambridge. To ensure the best outcomes, engagement and co-creation with stakeholders is key.</p> <p>This is especially important right now on the Waterbeach Greenway because we know that the two options for Milton High Street will include a shared surface for people walking and cycling. Proposing a shared-use path in a residential and shopping area on an active travel route to serve over 40,000 people is not good enough: it is a critical failure for this Greenway. We urgently need a better solution and believe this scheme should not proceed until an appropriate design is agreed.</p> <p>Why then is the GCP not meeting with its Non-Motorised User group (of which Camcycle is a part) until just seven days before the Waterbeach Greenway consultation is due to be published? It's clear that none of the discussion at that group will have any effect on the design of the route or the options included in the consultation. The technical expertise and local knowledge within that forum is being utterly wasted. Once again, we ask when will the GCP reconsider how it works with stakeholders and save itself (and all of us) lots of hard work and frustration?</p>
<p align="center">James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 - Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>1. The roadside verges at Airport Way roundabout are of ecological value and include a rare species of plant, the Lizard Orchid which is listed on Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. There is no mention in the officer's report of this constraint, nor the likely impact on this habitat if the Park & Ride at P1 were to go ahead. At the Joint Assembly, the Director of Transport said that the Lizard Orchids would be protected but he did not say what the impact on the road verge habitat will be, please can he say what the impact will be on the road verge habitat if a decision were made to proceed with location P1?</p> <p>2. If site P1 is not progressed, then planned works in the vicinity of Airport Way roundabout, on the southern side, would not be needed, for example the proposed active travel routes linking to the park and ride. Recommendation 2.1b is therefore unclear. Please can you confirm that a decision on 2.1b will exclude the works to the southern verges of Newmarket Road between in the park and ride traffic lights and Airport Way?</p>
<p align="center">Martin Lucas- Smith, Petersfield resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 – Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>The Elizabeth Way roundabout is an ugly relic of outdated 1960s planning, and blights our area of Petersfield. It caters only for drivers, relegating walking and cycling to an inconvenient dingy underpass with blind corners, graffiti, a generally unpleasant environment, and inaccessible to some with disabilities. No transport professional would even consider designing such a monstrosity these days.</p> <p>The roundabout, and Newmarket Road, without any proper cycle infrastructure, are a huge barrier to mass cycling levels into town from the east. As a result, you see high levels of car use.</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Replacement with a modern, at-grade junction, is already council policy agreed in the Local Plan: the “Eastern Gateway”.</p> <p>It will remain a large important junction for cars, but as a multi-lane crossroads. I was struck by this photo of an almost identical change at Nottingham’s Maid Marian Way – how much better this is:</p> <p>https://www.cyclestreets.net/location/197806/cyclestreets197806.jpg</p> <p>The consultation saw misunderstanding: some thought it would be a ‘Dutch roundabout’. In fact it would be a Cyclops junction. Had the public been shown a clear mockup photo of ordinary pedestrian and cycle crossings separate from traffic, there would be little appetite for keeping a dingy, indirect, unsafe 1960s underpass.</p> <p>Officers suggest delay due to potential Grafton and Beehive Centre changes. But both propose much-reduced traffic levels. I.e., the effect on the road environment will only get better, not worse. So this is no reason to delay.</p> <p>Executive Board members wanted the area to reach higher public realm standards. The logical thing, therefore, is not to pause, but instead keep this as a current scheme, to give officers clarity to get on with follow-up design work to implement higher ambition.</p> <p>Delay risks the city being stuck with this ugly legacy of the 1960s for another decade or so. Please get on with it.</p>
Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>We note the change in levels of support for this scheme between 2021 and 2023 with 53% currently opposing the introduction of segregated cycle lanes and high numbers of respondents saying that they are not needed. Given that a representative survey of Greater Cambridge residents conducted by Sustrans in 2021 found that 74% were in support of segregated cycle lanes along main roads, we believe that this consultation was skewed by the damaging effects of the discussion on the Sustainable Travel Zone. The GCP is right to consider how proposals integrate with the East Barnwell plans, government guidance on cycle infrastructure design, the road hierarchy project and the GCP’s own transport objectives. Protected lanes are essential to deliver a safe route along Newmarket Road.</p> <p>With the current state of the STZ and the growth of anti-cyclist rhetoric within the media and public debate, we call on GCP officers and staff to clearly communicate the benefits and objectives of following the Highway Code’s hierarchy of users and prioritising improvements for people travelling on foot, by cycle and by public transport.</p> <p>We ask the GCP if it will follow the guidance for the DfT, Active Travel England and the Highway Code to put the safety of non-motorised users, the need for modal shift and its own sustainable travel objectives at the forefront of decision making? It has also been stated in previous meetings that the success of the Newmarket Road scheme was</p>

28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>dependent on the reduction of traffic achieved by the Sustainable Travel Zone? Is this still the case and, if so, how would traffic be reduced without an STZ?</p>
Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item No. 11 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Although the GCP Joint Assembly agreed to the fast-tracking of detailed design for the Addenbrooke’s roundabout, no detailed designs for the roundabout were presented at that meeting. Camcycle did not support the proposals as presented at consultation and is extremely concerned that some aspects could worsen rather than improve safety for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>We ask the GCP which teams from the county council they are working with on the redesign (because it doesn’t seem as if the cycling team has been involved), when will the new designs be publicly available and, most importantly, has safety for those walking and cycling (rather than the flow of motor vehicles) been placed as the highest priority?</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

PARTNER BODY REPRESENTATIONS [where supplied]

Member	Question/Representation
<p align="center">South Cambridgeshire/ County Councillor Susan van de Ven</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>As a District and County Councillor and Co-Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board, I am deeply saddened by the scuppering of progress on the Making Connections project and the chance it offers, sooner rather than later, to bring better air quality, and travel and access opportunities to young people for education and work, and indeed all those disadvantaged by lack of transport choices.</p> <p>Reducing health inequalities is the ambition of all Cambridgeshire councils working together with the local NHS in our Integrated Care System.</p> <p>Transport and access are important levers in the wider determinants of health. With access, one has opportunity. Without it, the likelihood is worse outcomes in life.</p> <p>The story of a village I represent is one which Making Connections is trying to address, and it will be replicated hundreds of times, in different ways, in all our communities.</p> <p>The last bus connecting Bassingbourn to Cambridge was withdrawn in 2017 due to congestion holdups in Trumpington. It was unable to deliver students to Long Road Sixth Form on time. Those who could started driving, adding to congestion and air pollution. Those young people in households without a car have had their education severely compromised.</p> <p>Bassingbourn resident Kelly Whitley spoke at December’s County Council meeting to ask what could be done to enable her sons to reach their Cambridge sixth form college, as well as their weekend and evening jobs. She and her children also struggle to attend appointments at Addenbrooke’s. Taxi fares are unaffordable.</p> <p>Bassingbourn’s remaining bus service goes only to Royston on such a limited basis that ridership is low and justification for continuing its subsidy is under review. We have watched the gradual decline of bus services and now the future is in question. There has been no investment in safe cycle links out of the village to nearby bus and rail stations.</p> <p>This is the granular detail in the creation of inequalities. These are the inequalities – lack of access to education, jobs, health services – that determine life chances and indeed differences in life expectancy.</p> <p>I welcome today’s report on the potential of Making Connections for dealing directly with these inequalities and look forward to the Health Impacts paper produced in collaboration with Cambridgeshire Public Health. I hope that a way will be found of enabling this transformative project, which has been significantly revised to meet public concerns, to proceed, first and foremost for our children and young people.</p> <p>Thank you to officers for working relentlessly over a long period of time to meet the requests of the GCP’s constituent partners and members.</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

<p>City Councillor Naomi Bennett and City Councillor Elliot Tong</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6 - Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps</p> <p>We note the recommendations on page 40 including particularly</p> <p>5. Considers whether or not the preferred option (Scenario 1A) as outlined in Section 7 and the Outline Business Case (Appendix 5)</p> <p>a. meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal programme and</p> <p>b. responds appropriately to the issues raised during the consultation1 .</p> <p>6. Considers whether or not the proposals are at a stage to enable recommendations to be made to the Highways & Transport Committee of the County Council (as Highways Authority) to endorse the Outline Business Case and to progress the Making Connections proposals to the Full Business Case stage.</p> <p>May we suggest adding the following:</p> <p>5 c. has the support and confidence of the general public ; and</p> <p>d If not, whether any steps can be taken which have a realistic prospect of gaining public support.</p> <p>We would also like to propose a pilot scheme as a proof of concept to tackle one of the major barriers to public acceptance .</p> <p>No one believes that GCP or the Combined Authority can make our buses work . This is nothing personal . Unless residents have lived in London, they have probably never experienced a bus system that more or less works.</p> <p>Will GCP consider funding orbital bus services joining the park and rides, Addenbrookes, and other major employment centres and schools such as the Biocampus and the Cambridge Business and Science Parks ? If these services are not routed through the historic centre, they will be more reliable and much faster.</p> <p>Will the GCP ask the Combined Authority to consider funding these bus services by a council tax precept ? This also provides an opportunity to test this option either as a short term bridge while government permission is sought for a Workplace Parking Levy or perhaps as a longer term solution.</p> <p>We recognise that other proof of concept bus services improvements would be required elsewhere in the region to address public confidence but will leave it local councillors to address those issues.</p>
<p>City Councillor Naomi Bennett and City Councillor Elliot Tong</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 Better Cambridge Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access</p> <p>I would like to comment very briefly on the public consultation responses outlined on pages 441 and 442 in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.6. Although I spoke at the Joint Assembly about these issues, neither the public or councillor questions at that meeting are reflected in the minutes. It is my job as a ward councillor to ensure my residents voices are heard so I am here again.</p> <p>There is a conflict between users of the roundabout with Barnwell Road . On the one hand we have local residents, many of whom are elderly and disabled or with small children or heavy shopping. Most of them are on foot, scooter or bike and travelling very short distances to shops, school and nursery . Their priority is safety not speed. They are</p>

**28th September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>well aware that the roundabout is an accident black spot and support the change to traffic lights and safe pedestrian crossings on each arm.</p> <p>On the other hand, we have a larger group of commuters, mostly travelling by car . They are mostly opposed to the change because they think that traffic flow through a roundabout will be faster than through traffic lights.</p> <p>I urge the board to put our residents safety first and accept the recommendation to proceed with the roundabout improvements described in 4.10 (page 442 to 443)</p> <p>I would also like to comment about Phase A3 and the Elizabeth Way roundabout in para 4.13 and pages 443 and 444. Again safety concerns were behind residents wishes to keep the underpass. Many shared details of accidents seem in this area and were extremely reluctant to consider crossing this busy junction by road. Irrespective of whatever improvements were made.</p>
City Councillor Karen Young	<p>Agenda Item No. 11 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Proposals have been put forward to improve Addenbrookes Roundabout and there is agreement that these improvements should be accelerated given the danger inherent in the current layout. There is a great amount of concern with the proposals from residents who live in the vicinity and also from cycling organisations.</p> <p>On deciding the final scheme under the accelerated procedure, will account still be taken of responses to the consultation? In particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no way from A2 to A3• The A4 crossing is too far away from the roundabout for most people to use it• The narrowing of the island on Fendon Road, will make it very hard for pedestrians• Some trees are being unnecessarily cut down.