

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p>Sara Lightowers on behalf of Cambs Parents for Sustainable Travel</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>Many residents are concerned regarding the impact of the proposed sustainable travel zone on those who have disabilities. Disabled people are not necessarily car users: in fact only 55% of disabled people in England aged 17-64 hold a full driving licence, compared with 83% of non-disabled people (though disabled people are much more likely to travel as passengers in a car or taxi). But research from the Motability Foundation has found that 30% of disabled people say that difficulties with public transport has reduced their independence. In the UK those with disabilities (as defined under the Equality Act) take 28% fewer trips than those without. While this ‘transport accessibility gap’ is driven by many factors, a significant proportion is due to the current provision of transport, both public and private, not adequately catering for the needs of disabled people. This in turn contributes to wide ranging socio-economic disadvantage: for example disabled people are almost twice as likely to be unemployed as those without disability. Obviously this is a complex area, so my question is: what assessment has been made of the impact of sustainable travel for disabled people and those with long term health conditions compared to the status quo?</p>
<p>Jennifer Williams and Alexander Blandford</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>We’re a car-less family who cycle and walk with our pre-schooler across Cambridge and the surrounding villages. We don’t have a car for a variety of reasons: firstly, due to Type 1 diabetes and the extra difficulties this creates for getting and keeping a license, my husband has never learnt to drive. Secondly, our last car broke down 2 and a half years ago and we couldn’t easily afford to replace it, so we decided to see how long we could live without it.</p> <p>We recognise there are lots of benefits to our active travel, including increasing our daily exercise and exploring the outside world with our daughter. However, it also means dealing 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 the busy roads; as well as poor driving and aggressive attitudes from drivers desperate to get through congestion as quickly as possible. This can all make active travel with kids extremely nerve wracking. Additionally, the poor and potholed state of our city’s roads and walkways has caused damage to our bike and tripped up our daughter numerous times.</p> <p>Less traffic on the roads is welcome, however, what further physical improvements to encourage and support active travel does the GCP intend as part of the Making Connections proposals?’</p>
<p>Lilian Runblad</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>The Histon Road Corridor Project, part of the City Deal, focusing on Walking, Cycling and Public transport, was finished about 2 years ago with new bus lane and “floating” bus stops accommodating the Guided Buses and promised improved public service. Especially the Guided Bus A direct service to the Station and Addenbrookes was of great importance. Schoolchildren travelling to the Long Road Area and personnel to the</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Biomedic campus, Addenbrookes, Papworth etc. have had a direct bus facility. This is in line with the 1.6, 1.29, 1.33 points.</p> <p>The new services should be delivered before any STZ charges, see e.g. 6.6,6.7, 6.10. In point 8.2 the GCP corridor schemes e.g. Histon Road, is included.</p> <p>But does GCP and partners really have the will and capability to enforce the necessary obligations from the bus service companies?</p> <p>On September 3, Stagecoach suddenly declared that it will no longer stop at the special bus stops by Brownlow Road and Carisbrooke Road, nor at Blackhall Road which is serving the new Franklin Garden/ Darwin Green area. There have been no discussions or consultation with the residents along the road. The residents suddenly face changes in the city centre or Histon Village Station and almost twice the cost.</p> <p>What action will GCP and Partners take to reinstate the A Bus service at above bus stops?</p> <p>Depending on actions taken on the above question, which is challenging the trust we should have in the coming STZ projects' reliability and the GCP and partners.</p> <p>Can we trust that we will really have the bus service as outlined in 6.10 – 6.13 before the STZ?</p> <p>And will the service remain for the future and not suddenly stop on a whim of the bus company?</p>
<p>William Bannell</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>Given the universal unpopularity of the proposed STZ, and the continued unworkableness of the adaptations that have been put forward, providing less income and limited effect, while still managing to inflict unprecedented hardship on the people of Cambridge and surrounding region, why is the GCP so seemingly reluctant to listen to reason and observe reality, when there are viable alternatives available which would avoid all this angst and fear and pain, what is the reason that the GCP is still refusing to explore alternate funding models for transport?"</p>
<p>David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>Young people are calling for change. They want independent travel: more walking and cycling, fewer cars on the road. They want a cleaner, greener environment.</p> <p>Research by Imperial College, London found much higher levels of concern among 16-24 year olds about climate change than about COVID, even though COVID had more immediate, disruptive impact. Young people reported “anger, disgust, guilt and shame” about inaction on the risky environmental future they will inherit <a href="https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/issue/vol6no9/PIIS2542-5196(22)X0009-0">https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/issue/vol6no9/PIIS2542-5196(22)X0009-0</a> .</p> <p>For young people, carbon reduction and active travel options are closely linked. Over 70% of under-24s who responded to the 2022 GCP consultation wanted better buses and improvements for walking and cycling. 61% of 16-24 year olds supported the creation of a sustainable travel zone for Cambridge along with 55% of under-15s.</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Living Streets asks the Assembly to reflect on these numbers. If young people had been as fully represented in the consultation as older people, it's possible that the sustainable travel zone would have got majority support. Instead older people – who were significantly over-represented in the GCP consultation responses – might be allowed to continue polluting and congesting our streets.</p> <p>It is young people who will have to grapple with congestion, pollution and global warming. Surely, as floods and firestorms engulf the planet, it is time to 'think globally and act locally'? 33.4% of carbon emissions across Cambridgeshire come from motor traffic. Will the Assembly now take a strong and principled stance that supports our young people in building a better future?</p>
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith Petersfield Resident</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>The STZ compromise proposals remove a number of the elements of the scheme on which many people have been most critical. But in doing so, this has naturally reduced projected income significantly, from £60m to £33m per year.</p> <p>The report for the February 2020 Exec Board meeting stated that a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) based on £400/year (lower than was consulted on subsequently) and a £5 increase in parking rates would raise ~£23m annually.</p> <p>At the previous 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>That answer is now totally irrelevant. The proposed STZ income has been chopped in half. The income that would be raised is now in the same ballpark. So you now have a congestion charge proposal which would raise £33m but be subject to multiple difficulties in political deliverability and risk, vs a WPL scheme that both sides seem to agree on raising £23m public transport subsidy and which could be implemented in 2025.</p> <p>While it is true a WPL would require a further statutory consultation, this seems a poor reason to reject it. Wouldn't a massively modified STZ also need further consultation? 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. Not to do so would undermine your own argument given at the last meeting.</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>In the absence of a national road pricing scheme Milton Cycling Campaign remains convinced that the sustainable travel zone is the right way of pricing the road danger, pollution and congestion motor traffic generates, but we are concerned that the new proposals will reduce the amount of money available to active travel schemes specifically.</p> <p>In order to encourage more and more people to walk and cycle more infrastructure is needed, but with limited income streams is hard to see how this is going to happen.</p> <p>What additional funding streams are there available for walking and cycling schemes?</p>
<p>Neil Mackay Managing director Mackays of Cambridge Ltd.</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>I invited the GCP Executive Board to visit Mackays of Cambridge to address concerns about the 'Making Connections' proposals as consulted on at the end of 2022. We held a 90-minute meeting, which included two members of the Cambridgeshire Residents Group, and discussed a public-generated document containing ideas and suggestions harvested from comments made on social media platforms that were not endorsed by Cambridgeshire Residents Group. I request the removal of any suggestion in the meeting agenda pack attributing the congestion charge idea to CRG. For the record, we view such a charge as unfeasible and urge the government to fund required infrastructure improvements needed to support the growth of the area, instead of taxing the less affluent. Please confirm the agenda pack will be corrected, and will you now scrap Congestion Charging as the funding mechanism for Cambridge's much needed improvements to its transport system?</p>
<p>Pam Parker on behalf of East Cambs CAN</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>East Cambs CAN is broadly supportive of the Making Connections proposal. It is our understanding that not proceeding with the proposal jeopardises £50m in funding towards improvements to buses, walking and cycling and that the congestion charging element is a key part of the strategy to encourage a modal shift from cars to buses or active travel. Can the GCP say what would the impact on congestion, air quality and carbon emissions from transport be if the proposals (including the congestion charge) don't go ahead? And, secondly, are local politicians willing to put aside short term party politicking and put an end to the decades of back and forth over transport policy locally by supporting the new revised plan?</p>
<p>Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>Have Joint Assembly members considered the risk of losing a proportion of the City Deal funding, through such procrastination?</p> <p>Do Joint Assembly members agree that the revised package of measures announced recently are the best way forward to keep our city moving by reducing congestion, and also providing a reliable, sustainable, locally-controlled funding source that is so urgently needed to deliver better sustainable transport options?</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Affordable, frequent, convenient bus services cannot rely solely on farebox revenue, nor on sporadic, precarious, central government grants.</p> <p>Over many decades, a variety of proposals to improve public transport and to tackle traffic congestion in the Cambridge travel-to-work area, have been considered, then suspended and, ultimately, abandoned. There should be no more delays.</p>
<p>Roxanne De Beaux on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>The Outline Business Case celebrates the increase in cycling within Greater Cambridge in the last two decades. In 2021, 28.1 million cycle trips were made here.</p> <p>According to Sustrans these journeys, along with those which are walked, have saved 19,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions, prevented 827 serious health conditions and created £215.6 million of economic benefit each year.</p> <p>They are just the tip of the iceberg: there’s a huge opportunity for growth in active travel if councillors decide to take it.</p> <p>Every additional journey that involves walking, cycling or public transport instead of driving would deliver huge benefits for our city and save the increasing costs of air pollution, carbon emissions, poor health and road danger imposed by motor vehicles. Children could be more independent, young people could have more work and educational opportunities, older people unable to drive could become less isolated.</p> <p>However, for that we need consistent, continuous investment in active travel infrastructure and we need reduced levels of motor traffic on our roads to free up space for safe routes.</p> <p>The revised STZ proposals would still deliver on both, but at a significantly reduced level compared with those consulted on. If they are to be approved as is, or watered down even further, supplementary funding and demand reduction schemes will be essential to deliver high-quality networks for public transport and active travel. Local authorities cannot meet their commitments on the reduction of traffic and carbon emissions without them.</p> <p>Point 6.18 of the report and A.3.44 in the appendix say that additional funding options for buses would be looked at by the Combined Authority as part of its work on bus reform. What about income for walking, wheeling, cycling and public space – how would the shortfall resulting from the revised proposals be met?</p>
<p>Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>This summer, we talked to 300+ bus users in Cambridge, Ely and Huntingdon. We found that much of the public is unaware of the benefits of the Making Connections proposals, mistakenly believing the scheme is all ‘stick’ and no ‘carrot’. Only 15% of those we polled recognised that the money generated by the road charge would be spent on improving bus services. 61%, however, had heard of the proposed road charge. We think that the lack of positive communication about the benefits of the proposals is</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>leaving a void that is being filled with anti-STZ messaging, which further entrenches poor understanding and fear. Improving public understanding of the benefits of Making Connections will increase support for the scheme.</p> <p>When asked what the best thing was about the bus, the most common theme among Cambridge bus users (excluding Park&amp;Ride) was that the bus was affordable. Some people were taking the bus more due to the £2 fare cap. This is no surprise in a cost-of-living crisis: cars are expensive to own and run.</p> <p>Our buses are in a poor state, however. The network in our region is 20% smaller than it was pre-pandemic, and, on average, more than 20% of bus services run late. We fear that without extra funding coupled with measures to reduce congestion, bus services will be stuck in a continuing spiral of decline.</p> <p>Our question is around the consequences of not proceeding. Please tell us how much our region - both in terms of one-off investment and annual funding - spends supporting buses and active travel currently, how much would be available to spend under Scenario 1A or what funding there would be in the future without a Sustainable Travel Zone; and explain how that compares to other English regions outside London.</p>
<p>Antony Carpen.</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</b></p> <p>Over the summer I attended a number of Cambridge-based consultations on medium-large sci-tech park developments. These included Marshalls Airport, The Beehive Centre, and Capital Park Fulbourn. Developers and their consultants all told me they were willing to meet with the GCP, CPCA, and local councils to discuss co-operating on improving transport links to their sites, and making financial contributions.</p> <p>Both The Grafton Centre and The Beehive Centre have submitted planning applications that are out for formal consultation. Mindful of the request to pause CSET and Foxton due to inflation-related pressures and the inevitable impact this is having on Benefit-Cost-Ratios of the chosen and rejected projects, what conversations have GCP Officers had with developers of medium &amp; large developments in/around Cambridge in seeking financial contributions towards their transport plans, and what considerations have GCP officers made of any representations to re-evaluate BCP calculations given inflation - in particular seeking S106 contributions for new transport infrastructure from developers seeking planning permission?</p>
<p>Jim Rickard</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</b></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</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>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 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, and which will be valid whatever else may happen in the future.</p>
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>2. In relation to the A1307, what will happen if the GCP is not able to secure £160m, given that no budget allocation is being proposed?</li> <li>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 Assembly consider withdrawing this scheme in order to save budget, save ecology and save the well-loved landscape of the Gog Magog Hills?</li> </ol>
<p>Stephen Partridge-Hicks Resident of Sawston</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme and agenda Item 7 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 and</b></p> <p>Now that the GCP has decided to "pause" CSET, 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 T&amp;WAO? Does this represent a good use of funds for a scheme that will cost at least £160m and has no funding available for it?</p> <p>Rather than continue to progress an unaffordable £160m scheme and further delay improvements to bus services from Haverhill, why won't you allocate a small budget, say £250k, to work up the alternative, based on the GCP's scheme from 2017/2018 which involves building a spur road into the biomedical campus and associated bus lanes for £100m less?</p> <p>If any money is going to be spent on continuing to progress CSET shouldn't at least an equal amount be spent on working up the much cheaper alternative that can be</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>delivered without a T&amp;WAO so much more quickly, benefiting the travelling public and employers alike?</p>
<p>John Latham Chairman Hobson's Conduit Trust</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</b></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 to reduce 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>I note the following. In the Papers for the Joint Assembly meeting (Agenda Item 8 page 401) I read:</p> <p>‘ 1.19 A full statutory, Environmental Impact Assessment was completed. ‘</p> <p>I am unable to locate this document on the GCP website, or evidence that the full EIA has been completed. I am aware of an earlier EIA consultation, which was not a full statutory EIA .</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>Can you explain why your report does not refer to pursuing the alternative scheme ?</p>
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</b></p> <p><b>1.</b> There are no traffic lights or roundabouts on the section of the A10 between Waterbeach and the Milton Park &amp; Ride, so a bus road has no real advantage compared to a bus lane, in terms of journey times and reliability. So please can you direct us to the evidence that shows that the option of providing bus lanes to bypass any queuing traffic has been considered, and a comparison of the costs and the benefits of such an option compared to that of a £110m scheme through open countryside?</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>2. The recommended location for the Park &amp; Ride is on a site that has hidden archaeology. The Historic Environment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council have advised me that the area proposed for the park and ride is an area containing a significant level of cropmarks indicating Roman settlement and enclosures, as well as a clear trackway. There is no mention of this constraint in the report. Please can you say whether there would be any archaeological damage caused by building a park and ride in this location?</p> <p>3. The consultation material for the route options did not include any information about the likely ecological impacts of the two options and therefore any responses were made in ignorance of any ecological differences between the two. Please can you tell us if there are differences in the ecological impacts of the two route options?</p>
<p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of Milton Cycling Campaign</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</b></p> <p>Waterbeach Greenway - we welcome the news that a route has been chosen. We are still disappointed that it has taken the best part of six years to get there. Could you please provide more information on when the public consultation stage will open to residents and other interested parties?</p> <p>Waterbeach Busway we are pleased to hear that the central route has been chosen. It is the route which will provide the most benefits to potential active travel users.</p> <p>As part of the public consultation earlier this year there were a number of questions that were raised by Milton Cycling Campaign but we still have not a response to our comments and concerns. These questions relate, amongst others, to cycle parking security at the busway stops, LTN 1/20 junction compliance on Butt Lane, and other issues around connectivity with Milton and Impington. Could you please provide more information on when we can expect a response to the feedback provided during the consultation?</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 9 – Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge and Waterbeach Greenway</b></p> <p>We are happy to see progress on the Waterbeach Greenway. The proposed alignment is an opportunity to correct the mistakes that were made in the A10 cycle project.</p> <p>However, the proposed route alignment presents a number of challenges that will require bold decisions if a satisfactory solution is to be achieved. We are glad to see reference to the closure of the A10 Ely Road slip in Milton; however, there is no mention of the issue of capacity on the Jane Coston Bridge, and we were concerned to read about the inclusion of Coles Road. This street is not on the desire line and its inclusion would strongly suggest that an unsatisfactory solution on the High Street in Milton is envisaged.</p> <p>We should be designing in accordance with the user hierarchy. Firstly, planning for pedestrians, then assessing the cycling demand and providing a suitable provision before finally looking at the remaining space and managing vehicular access.</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>When you complete this process for the High Street in Milton, it is clear that there is simply not enough space to provide both enhanced walking and cycling facilities whilst maintaining two-way vehicular access. Therefore, the GCP should explore and consult on the option of a modal filter and a one-way vehicular loop running clockwise on the High Street and Coles Road. Of particular importance is the section between Edmund Close and Fen Road, which is the most space-constrained section of highway.</p> <p>Choosing not to explore these options and proceeding with a non-compliant design will devalue the travel opportunities of up to 30,000 future residents of Waterbeach New Town.</p> <p>Please can the GCP ensure that the consultation includes a range of options for Milton High Street and ensure that the needs of future residents of Waterbeach New Town are given a voice?</p>
<p align="center">James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge Past Present and Future</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Cambridge Eastern Access</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 scheme were to go ahead. Please can officers say what the impact on the road verges will be before a decision is made to proceed?</li> <li>The GCP is willing to compulsory purchase land for its schemes. Given that the main reason for relocating the Newmarket Road P&amp;R is because the owner does not wish to continue the lease, has the GCP considered compulsory purchase? The current site is closer to Cambridge and therefore much better for Park &amp; Cycle and it would not involve concreting over the countryside.</li> </ol>
<p align="center">Mark Rison</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</b></p> <p>Coldham's Lane in Romsey is a residential road that suffers from excessive traffic during the day and speeding and HGV traffic at night. It is actively hostile to active transport. It has been long-neglected while all roads in the vicinity (Mill Rd, Newmarket Rd, Vinery Way, etc.) have been considerably improved by traffic moderation measures.</p> <p>As the GCP's Executive Board noted publicly in 2021, the Phase A changes to Newmarket Rd will divert 1000s of motor vehicles onto nearby unrestricted roads. A year ago, in September 2022, in response to a public question to the GCP regarding mitigation of the effects of the Eastern Access project on Coldham's Lane in Romsey, the Chair, Cllr Bick, identified GCP consensus that there was a "keenness for the problems in Coldham's Lane to be addressed as soon as possible".</p> <p>How has this "keenness" been translated into actual, specific action, now that there has been a year to work on it? The very least residents of Coldham's Lane in Romsey deserve and expect is a 20 mph limit and a night-time HGV ban, but consideration should also be given to at least a part-time modal filter at the railway bridge, and to a</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>speed camera and/or speed cushions. This needs to be in place by the time the work on Newmarket Rd starts.</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</b></p> <p>We note with concern that in the recent consultation, Camcycle’s response was absent from the consultation analysis. Whilst we accept that mistakes do occasionally occur and responses can be missed, it is worrying that neither the GCP, nor their consultants thought to question this and simply contact us. We would like to see the public consultation analysis revised to record missing responses.</p> <p>We are also extremely disappointed to note the proposal to pause works on the section from Elizabeth Way to Coldham’s Brook. The agenda pack references the uncertainty associated with the Grafton and Beehive Centre redevelopments.</p> <p>However, as neither of these sites are directly served from Newmarket Road and both schemes will reduce vehicular demand, it is unclear why these redevelopments should stop progress on the detailed design; however, we note it is sensible to phase the Eastern Access Project as proposed.</p> <p>We would also like to draw attention to the fact the existing scheme does not include a safe crossing of the McDonald’s access of Wadloes Road, something we have raised continually through the engagement process. Extending the scheme a mere 10 metres and providing a simple continuous cycle track over the junction (making it similar to many of the junctions within the scheme), will ensure the network ties into the existing cycle infrastructure. Failing to do so will greatly devalue the new, high-quality junction with Wadloes Road and Newmarket Road.</p> <p>Please can the GCP identify why the scheme has not been extended a mere 10 metres along Wadloes Road, and why work on the detailed design cannot progress alongside the emerging Grafton Centre and Beehive plans?</p>

**Partner Council Members – representations/questions**

From	Question
<p>City Councillor Elliott Tong or City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>1 Main funding method</p> <p>Please could officers confirm what work has been done on using a council tax precept levied by the Combined Authority instead of a congestion charge?</p> <p>In particular, please can you confirm the capital and revenue administrative cost savings for this funding method ( as opposed to the congestion charge)?</p> <p>In addition, please can you confirm the figure previously supplied for a band D property of under £200 p.a. for a Band D property?</p> <p>Finally, please could you state whether this option was formally considered by the GCP board and why it has not been considered in more detail?</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>2 Small businesses</p> <p>We are pleased to see the first attempt at designing exemptions and discounts for local small and medium sized businesses., almost exactly 6 months after the formal proposals from the Green and Independent Group. We note that the proposed discounts only cover in house vehicles and not third party delivery vehicles Small independent shops are much more likely to depend on third party delivery vehicles. What work has the GCP done to assess whether this provides adequate protection for those businesses and the jobs and services they provide?</p> <p>3 The safety net for our vulnerable residents</p> <p>Many local residents claiming benefits have not yet transitioned to Universal Credit from the older means tested benefits. Please can GCP confirm that both legacy and Universal Credit claimants will be treated equally? The national living wage does not reflect the proposed congestion charge and we are aware of residents on higher salaries making heat or eat decisions or with rent arrears. What steps have you taken to establish the increase in numbers of residents unable to pay basic living costs as a result of the congestion charge?</p>
<p>City Councillor Sam Davies</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme and agenda Item 6 – Making Connections Outline Business Case and Next Steps and</b></p> <p>In 2019, the Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review was published. This was an exhaustive investigation into how the projected growth of the Campus to 2031 could be achieved while maintaining vehicle trips to the site at levels equivalent to 2017 ('Target') or even reducing them to 10-15% below 2011 levels ('Stretch Target').</p> <p>The Review quantified the reduction in trips which would be required, as shown in this extract (Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review, Part 3, Section 10.1) <a href="https://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s110160/Biomedical%20Campus%20Transport%20Needs%20Review%20Part%203.pdf">https://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s110160/Biomedical%20Campus%20Transport%20Needs%20Review%20Part%203.pdf</a></p> <p>To maintain traffic at 2017 levels up to 2031, a reduction of <b>17,925 daily person trips</b> to 28,475 will be required. To achieve a Stretch Target of a reduction of 10% below the 2011 traffic levels by 2031 a reduction of <b>24,116 daily person trips</b> to 22,284 daily person trips will be required. This figure is equivalent to 81% of the 2017 traffic levels accessing the Site. To achieve a reduction of 15% below the 2011 traffic levels, the more ambitious end of the Stretch Target, a reduction of <b>25,354 daily person trips</b> to 21,046 daily person trips will be required; equivalent to 85% of the existing 2017 traffic levels accessing the site.</p> <p>It also quantified the contributions to achieving these targets which would be made by a variety of interventions, ranging from major infrastructure projects (Cambridge South Station, CSET busway, Cambridge Autonomous Metro) to smaller projects designed to encourage active and public transport use in a variety of ways.</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>The conclusions of the Review (Part 3, p54) emphasised that "It is critical that GCP schemes are kept to programme (as identified in this Report) to address short-term continued highway traffic growth, mitigating negative impacts on Campus operation and quality of life".</p> <p>On behalf of Queen Edith's residents, I would like to ask GCP officers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. when they last revised their forecasts of the number of trips to the Campus in the period to 2031;</li> <li>2. whether those forecasts reflect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the increased exemptions for trips to the hospitals included in the revised STZ proposals presented today</li> <li>• the postponement of the CSET project presented today</li> <li>• the delays in completing smaller interventions identified in Appendices A and B, such as the wayfinding project started in June 2021</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. how the revised forecasts correspond to the 'Target' and 'Stretch Target'</li> <li>4. what implications the revised forecasts, relative to the 'Target' and 'Stretch Target', should have for the growth of the Biomedical Campus to 2031?</li> </ol>
<p>City Councillor Elliott Tong or City Councillor Naomi Bennett</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 – Better Public Transport –Cambridge Eastern Access</b></p> <p>We welcome the decision to pause the work on Elizabeth Way roundabout and up to the Leper Chapel. It was very clear from the resident feedback that (most)local residents want to keep the underpass and don't want their bus stops moved. Residents have asked if the work is to be delayed whether early attention could be paid to the left-hand filter from Newmarket Road into Coldhams Lane which puts cars turning left in conflict with buses travelling straight on.</p> <p>We also welcome the decision to support the decision to proceed with the Barnwell Road / Newmarket Road roundabout improvements. The present accident record on this busy school route speaks for itself.</p> <p>Residents have asked for further information about the type of traffic lights and whether they will adapt to different traffic flows or adhere to a fixed schedule. Residents tell us they are perplexed at why the Park and Ride is being moved when it is only moving such a short distance. They would like to understand what the perceived advantages are. What does this cost and can such a small move justify the disruption and cost?</p> <p>Meadowlands residents have asked you to think again about felling their mature tree avenue to make way for a cycle lane rather than using the existing side road for cycles.</p> <p>We have already raised residents' concerns about the crossings near Jack Warren Green and explained why this is so important. Finally, we need to talk about floating bus stops. I have no problem with floating bus stops in principle. However, any decision to install them on existing roads with space constraints can mean that the bus stops are moved from where they are most needed to where they can most easily be fitted in. This is a huge disadvantage to residents who are elderly, have a disability or just have</p>

**7<sup>th</sup> September 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

	prams and heavy shopping. If you want to discourage car use in Abbey, leave our bus stops where they are.
--	---

Partner Body Written Statements

From	Statement
<p>County Councillor Susan van de Ven</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 7 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3</b></p> <p>I'd like to express my appreciation to GCP officers and members for listening to the case for completing the Melbourn Greenway, which the local community has been advocating for over many years. Coming out on multiple occasions to see the area for themselves has meant understanding local dynamics and the very significant opportunities that a Melbourn-Royston link stands to bring.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the GCP funded link between Melbourn and Shepreth – the first City Deal spade in the ground – has been hugely successful and is in constant use for local and longer journeys. It has changed the way people get around in their daily lives.</p> <p>I hope that the Joint Assembly will see fit to support this prioritization proposal for the Melbourn Greenway.</p>
<p>County Councillor Alex Bulat</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 10 - Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</b></p> <p>My apologies I cannot be in person at the meeting today, but I would like to share my support for the recommendations for the Eastern Access Project discussed by the Assembly in my capacity as County Councillor for the Abbey division.</p> <p>Many Abbey residents have been involved in the various stages of consultation for this project long before I became a councillor in 2021. The busy and often dangerous Barnwell Road roundabout, the lack of intermediate crossings in key locations for residents and the state of the road and pavements on Newmarket Road have been issues constantly raised by my residents.</p> <p>It is really important the GCP delivers on this project and chooses options that are supported by Abbey residents, which would be mostly affected by the changes to Newmarket Road. While I understand there are objections to consider in the design decisions, I would like to highlight the paper's mention that within the postcodes containing Newmarket Road, including CB5 in Abbey, the level of support in the consultation was higher than the level of opposition.</p> <p>I am particularly pleased to see that Phase A will align with the development of the East Barnwell Community Centre, as it is key the different authorities involved try their best to minimise the disruption to residents during the construction phase.</p> <p>On the Elizabeth Way to Coldham's Brook section which is recommended to be paused, I hope that local councillors and resident groups will continue to be engaged with in future decisions and there will be no unnecessary delay to deliver a solution supported by local residents.</p>