

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Phil Allmendinger	University of Cambridge
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find a complete log of the public questions asked to the **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**, this year.

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.

AGENDA

4. Questions from Members of the Public

**PAGES
1 - 22**

This page is left blank intentionally.

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
6	Cllr Susan van de Ven	25 th January 2017	A10	<p>The A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme is continuing to attract match funding opportunities. In order to complete the scheme we must find a way of funding the Melbourn-Royston missing link, which traverses the Hertfordshire border.</p> <p>The Greater Cambridgeshire/Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership, which includes North Hertfordshire in its economic zone, discussed the case for funding the Melbourn-Royston link at their December Board meeting. A report by cross-border, crossparty councillors was presented to the LEP for consideration and is published on the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign website.</p> <p>The LEP authorizes to me to say to you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board was supportive of finding a multi-agency route to finalise delivery • The Board understood the commercial and environmental advantages of the link • That local sources should be utilised alongside private sector support • The Board would be prepared to consider a financial ask provided other mechanisms were supportive too. <p>I would like to ask the City Deal Executive Board to consider joining forces with the LEP to fund the final link, which is shovel-ready and could present a finished product even this year, all sticking to City Deal core principles of collaboration, match-funding, economic growth and modal shift to reduce car use on key corridors into Cambridge.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
19	Cllr Bridget Smith	25 th January 2017	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	Does the GCCD Board agree that the new Combined Authority, instead of working in collaboration with the City Deal, might actually pose a threat to its future? Might public criticism and the recent external report result in future tranches of money being paid directly to the CA? What is the GCCD Board going to do to mitigate this risk?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
8	Stephen Coates	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	When will the independent review of the City Deal by Mouchel become an agenda item for both the City Deal Assembly and the City Deal Board so there will be a full discussion and full Q&A session in both forums on the report? Many people who should have been consulted for the preparation of this report were not, including some Assembly members. Will there be a mechanism for residents groups or councillors to share further concerns on governance issues that either flow from this report or should have been included in this report?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
9	Carolyn Postage	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	<p>I have read the Mouchel's Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review. I can see that some of the recommendations have already been put in place, such as limiting questions at public meetings and recruiting dedicated staff to the City Deal.</p> <p>However, the report also highlighted that the officers were unclear of the GCCD objectives, the Board reports were not "fit for purpose" and that recommendations have been made on out-of-date evidence. Therefore can the Board explain why it is still progressing with recommendations based on out-of-date evidence and why is option 3/3a still being worked up?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
18	Edward Leigh	25 th January 2017	Mouchel Report	1) Will the Board move quickly to commission an external review of the appropriateness and rigourness of the procedures used to prioritise and develop schemes?	<p>The question was answered in the meeting as part of a group of three questions, and was published as part of the public questions document.</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				2) So will you, as members of the City Deal Board and representatives of the LA' s. LEP and Cambridge University, commit to developing this year a clear vision for the Greater Cambridge region in the 2030's along with a new coherent transport strategy?	http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	
1	Dr Joanna Gumula	25 th January 2017	City Access – bus routes	<p>1) Among the “number of projects to help to achieve” the transport vision set out by the Greater Cambridge City Deal, what new bus routes have been planned or are being considered (in addition to the bus route from Cambourne to Cambridge along the A1307) to ensure better bus services into, out of and around Cambridge?</p> <p>2) Are there any new bus routes under consideration that would allow the area of Newnham to be properly linked with the rest of Cambridge by bus?</p> <p>3) Do the projects related to the vision of the Greater Cambridge City Deal include new bus routes and services, which would allow students of schools located in the areas subject to traffic congestion to reach and leave their respective schools by bus? Have the schools been consulted regarding this issue and have any co-operative arrangements or projects been proposed to the schools by the City Deal team?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
2	Andrew Dutton	25 th January 2017	Workplace parking levy.	<p>I note that you still intend to introduce the non-progressive parking tax on those who work in Cambridge. Whilst £1.75 might not be significant to many of the well paid workers in Cambridge (Most companies will pass this charge on to their employees) for the low paid or disabled this is a significant an unfair burden. Many of these people have no option but to drive due, physical disability or time constraints of running a family i.e. getting children to schools and working. I am surprised a socially responsible party such as yourselves have not considered the negative implications of this.</p> <p>How do you plan to resolve this unfair burden on some of the lowest paid workers in Cambridge? These people have to drive due to housing costs and cannot use public transport or cycling due to physical disability or time constraints and the need to both work a full day and take children to schools. Would you consider a wage limit below which it cannot be passed on or an exemption for those below a certain wage or for those with disabilities?</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
3	Dr Drew Milne	25 th January 2017	Air pollution	<p>In beginning to tackle air pollution in Cambridge, could the City Deal Executive Board address the problem of diesel cars?</p> <p>In years to come, when the full damage done by diesel cars in particular is understood, it will turn out to be a tragedy that institutions with a responsibility for considering air pollution did not act sooner. Please take action.</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes.
4	Magda Werno	25 th January 2017	City Access	<p>1. Please can you elaborate on the current plans in relation to the planned <i>traffic management measures</i> and the <i>local interventions in the most congested areas of central Cambridge</i> mentioned in the press release?</p> <p>2. Please can you explain what specific measures will be taken <i>to improve bus journeys</i>? What criteria for improvement are you going to use, and how will this improvement be measured?</p> <p>3. What are your plans in terms of making public transport more affordable for the local residents?</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
7	Nichola Harrison	25 th January 2017	City Access	Will you please confirm whether your plan for physical demand management measures, illustrated by the flower petals drawing with the title "Concept diagram of local area accessibility" that was tabled at last week's Assembly meeting, might involve partial or full road closures at peak times in Cambridge?	The question was answered in the meeting as part of the discussion on agenda item 7, and was published as part of the minutes. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
12	Cambridge Past Present and Future	25 th January 2017	City Access	Will you listen to the advice of the Assembly and undertake a six-month assessment to quantify all of the options so that a better informed decisions making process can take place OR will the Board merely rubber stamp what it is being given to agree a package of measures with no clear idea of the outcome or future consequences?	The question was answered in the meeting as part of the discussion on agenda item 7, and was published as part of the minutes http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
16	Lynn Hieatt	25 th January 2017	City Access	In three 'zones' surveyed [1], 3,612 non-residents' cars parked on residential streets in the morning. That's higher than the capacity of our 5 multi-storey carparks [2] and parked at Park/Rides. [3] 42,149 vehicles come in between 7am-10am [4] – commuter parkers = 8.5% of all morning traffic. Add in areas not surveyed, and that's 10%. CJAC policy [5] for parking controls is a start.[6] The City Deal could propose alternatives for commuters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased P/R capacity • Improved bus frequency, directness, start/end times • Deter residents from filling de-congested streets • Employers could create 'travel-to-work' plans.[7] • Rail commuters should be able to use Cambridge Leisure carpark for the same price as at the station.[8] A 'carrots & sticks' package could be developed – and it could work. Will the City Deal Board seize this opportunity for a joined-up plan to tackle congestion and the problems commuters face?	The question was presented by Edward Leigh. It was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
17	Robin Heydon	25 th January 2017	City Access	With regard to Agenda item 7, paragraph 3.b.v, we believe that the Greater Cambridge City Deal is missing a long term vision of the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure that it will need to accommodate the modal shift expected. As shown with the proposed City Deal Design Guide there is a significant lack of ambition for the high quality of infrastructure needed to enable the modal shift required. Our estimates have determined that the number of people cycling will double within the city and the surrounding area by 2031 [1]. This vision would provide the Greater Cambridge City Deal Board with a strategic view of what is needed to accommodate this increase in cycling and walking traffic so that the city doesn't grind to a complete stop and help validate the cycling provision delivery plan. We would like to offer to work in partnership with the members of the City Deal, the County Council officers, and other stakeholders and partners to create this long term walking and cycling vision, and help create the delivery plan that could over the next 15 years provide infrastructure that caters for people walking and cycling of all ages and abilities. Is this possible?	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4	Yes
20	Neil Mackay	25 th January	City Access	Given that Cambridge small businesses were at the heart of the recent protests	The question was answered in the meeting and was	.Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
		2017		<p>against the introduction of peak time road closures by the use of PCCP cameras. Why is it that small business is not now being fully consulted with, in an attempt to find a solution to the problem.</p> <p>The future of a considerable number of small businesses and the livelihoods of all those employed by those businesses depend on the correct solution being implemented. We feel that rather than you simply concocting an 'even more Scary City Deal' and then effectively paying 'lips service' to consultation once more. It is our opinion that you should be inviting the 'involvement' of all the small business potentially effected, to be included in the process of developing the proposals. Are you willing to do so?</p>	<p>published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	
21	Pete Howard	25 th January 2017	City Access	<p>Given the concerns raised from the 10,000 plus residents and businesses who signed the petition against the planned road and traffic restrictions, will the council now agree to consult and listen to all stake holders regarding its planned roads closures or traffic congestion measures, well before any degree of implementation?</p>	<p>The questioner was unable to be present but the question was asked by the chairman, and the answer to the question has been published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
15	Richard Taylor	25 th January 2017	Milton Road	<p>When the board next considers plans for Milton Road will it receive a report: collating the results of responses to the initial public consultation which ran until February 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying who attended the private workshop events, and the basis on which they were invited. Addressing the 200 responses from 300 families to a Milton Road Primary School consultation on the Milton Road plans [1], and if the school representative reflected the views expressed when participating in the private workshops. Clarifying if the report on private workshops stating: "The majority of attendees were keen to retain as much green verge and as many trees as possible"[2], is referring to the retention of the existing trees and verges? <p>When the board next considers Milton Road will it formally endorse the letter dated 14 September 2016 from the board chair to the LLF and Assembly chairs [3]?</p> <p>Could a Local Liaison Forum (or Cambridge City Council North Area Committee) meeting be held between publication of the next City Deal Board report on Milton Rd and its consideration by the board so recommendations get discussed locally, by the area's councillors, before decisions are made? Such a meeting could include a detailed public presentation of, and opportunity for the public to ask questions on, the LLF endorsed "Do Optimum" plan.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6853&Ver=4</p>	Yes
5	Bob Jarman	25 th January 2017	Histon Road	<p>Cambridge City Council has a nature conservation strategy with the Wildlife Trust entitled "Enhancing Biodiversity". Recommendation BU4 says: "Maintain and seek to increase the number of street trees"; and recommendation BU6 says: "Prevent the loss...of street trees". Do you plan to remove the street trees in Histon Road?</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions related to an item scheduled for the March agenda.</p>	The questioner was contacted and invited to re-submit the question at the March meeting.
10	Alistair Burford	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>1. Residents have raised serious concerns about a flawed consultation only to be told that it is not an agenda item. When members of the public raise concerns of this nature does the Board not think that they should be listened to regardless of whether it's an agenda item or not?</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.</p>	No action required from the Executive Board meeting

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>2. Will the Board (not officers) undertake to investigate my concerns and provide a full written response?</p> <p>3. Mr Menzies stated at the Joint Assembly that all Atkins reports are available to the public, would he mind providing the link to the 2 Atkins reports on the Park and Ride Locations?</p>		
11	Dr Marilyn Treacy	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>Many Coton residents are dismayed by the stance that the City Deal executive has taken in avoiding answering their questions submitted by email or in a public forum.</p> <p>If the residents of Coton do not receive adequate answers to their questions regarding the lack of transparency in factors leading to option 3/3a being chosen as the preferred option they may have no alternative but to take legal action .What action will the City Deal take to avoid this scenario?</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
13	Chris Pratten	25 th January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>I submitted a question to the Assembly meeting on 18th Jan 2017 asking that Assembly members recommend that officers release a list of all documents and reports produced by Atkins regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor.</p> <p>This request was made in light of the discovery, via FOI, of an internally published report from Atkins from 2015 that was shared with City Deal Partners including, we assume, the University of Cambridge.</p> <p>The response from the Assembly Chair was encouraging and Mr Menzies stated at the Assembly meeting that he was comfortable making information freely available.</p> <p>Email communication with Mr Menzies since the Assembly meeting has met with a very different response. I have been told that I will need to use Freedom of Information requests to get any information.</p> <p>Will the Board demand that officers immediately produce a list of all documents produced by Atkins and then make copies of the documents available to the public?</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
14	Allan Treacy	25 th January 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	On what grounds could the City Deal executive contemplate backing a £207m off road solution if there is a circa £40m on road alternative? Should not the City Deal be prioritising the saving of £160m of public money to be put towards more progressive solutions for the area's transport challenges?	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda and was ruled out.	No action required from the Executive Board meeting
4	Stephen Coates	8 th March 2017	Conflicts of interest	<p>Mark Reeve is on the Board of the City Deal and is Chair of the LEP. Senior figures like Steve Barclay MP and Steve Count, Leader of Cams CC, are asking serious questions about business conflicts at the LEP. They both do not feel they have had adequate answers from Mark Reeve. Can Lewis Herbert explain why he is not taking action on this as Chair of the City Deal?</p> <p>Through FOI, we have now established the clear intent of the Barton Road Landowners to get a busway crossing their land. Regardless of Cambridge University being a minority member of NBRLOG this seems to contradict prior statements by Nigel Slater. Will Lewis Herbert examine the 800 pages of evidence we have obtained and then reconsider whether he has handled this conflict properly?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g6869/Printed%20minutes%20Wednesday%2008-Mar-2017%2016.00%20Greater%20Cambridge%20Partnership%20Executive%20Board.pdf?T=1</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				The Board has a duty to examine conflicts. Yet these are never on the Board's agenda. How can the Board and the Assembly deny questions on this and also decline questions on the cost of the A428 project?		
2	Antony Carpen	8 th March 2017	A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge	<p>The City Deal Board announced an award of £50,000 of funding for research into the Cambridge Bullet Bus (reported at http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/cambridge-news/city-deal-invests-futuristic-120-12124803). I have not been able to find any explanation into this project online - the complete opposite of the case for Rail Haverhill and for Cambridge Connect Light Rail.</p> <p>Please can the City Deal Board:</p> <p>1) release a formal document explaining at least the basics of what the bullet bus project actually is, and the considerations made before approving the release of £50,000 of funding for research for this project (which seemed to come out of the blue)</p> <p>2) please comment on whether they will be willing to fund the necessary technical and financial feasibility studies for Rail Haverhill and the Cambridge Connect proposals in tranche 2 as part of the research budgets. I find it astonishing that such proposals were swept aside in tranche 1 given the levels of growing public support for both projects which have had extended publicity on the work already done, compared to the bullet bus project</p> <p>3) please comment on how you will ensure the public - and in particular the academic community & experts in & around Cambridge will be able to scrutinise the assessments you make on the cost/benefits of proposals put forward given the disquiet of your conclusions originally for the rail haverhill project.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g6869/Printed%20minutes%20Wednesday%2008-Mar-2017%2016.00%20Greater%20Cambridge%20Partnership%20Executive%20Board.pdf?T=1</p>	Yes
3	Barbara Taylor	8 th March 2017	Milton Road	<p>In Note number 3 under Appendix 2 on page 26, it states that the delivery plans for the bus, cycling and walking improvements for Milton Road 'assume two further rounds of consultation in late 2017 and early 2018'. However in the Milestones Plan, on page 29, it shows only one consultation event to take place in quarter 3 of 2017/18.</p> <p>Can we be assured that there will indeed be two further rounds of consultation and that these will be reflected in the Milestones Plan?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>Whilst Milton Road bus priority was not an item on the agenda for discussion, the question related specifically to the Progress Report item, hence it being taken at this meeting.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g6869/Printed%20minutes%20Wednesday%2008-Mar-2017%2016.00%20Greater%20Cambridge%20Partnership%20Executive%20Board.pdf?T=1</p>	Yes
1	Bob Jarman	8 th March 2017	Histon Road	<p>Cambridge City Council has a nature conservation strategy with the Wildlife Trust entitled "Enhancing Biodiversity". Recommendation BU4 says: "Maintain and seek to increase the number of street trees..."; and recommendation BU6 says: "Prevent the loss...of street trees". Do you plan to remove the street trees in Histon Road?</p>	<p>Standing Orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item.</p> <p>This question relates to an item that is not on the agenda for discussion, but is on the agenda for the June meeting cycle. It is therefore not an issue that warrants an exception to the presumption in the Standing Orders that questions should relate to agenda items.</p> <p>A written response was provided to Bob Jarman's</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
					question to the 1 st March 2017 Joint Assembly meeting, which also answered this question. http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s100329/Joint%20Assembly%201%20March%202017%20public%20questions%20with%20written%20responses.pdf	
9a	Councillor Rod Cantrill	26 th July 2017	Rapid Mass Transit	<p>Assuming the Board approves the proposed feasibility study into a Rapid Mass Transit system for the Greater Cambridge Area, does the Board not agree that work on the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should stop until there is clarity on the way forward?</p> <p>Assuming the Board progresses a Rapid Mass Transit system following the feasibility study, does it not agree that the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should constitute no more than a low level intervention along the lines of the LLF's Option 6 and including smart transport features?</p> <p>This would still allow those living west of Cambridge to access the City quickly and reliably, yet would be far less expensive and would offer greater flexibility when Rapid Mass Transit decisions are made.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
9b	Roger Tomlinson	26 th July 2017	Rapid Mass Transit	<p>The Mayor James Palmer of the new Combined Authority we are told has agreed with the Greater Cambridge Partnership to commission a study to establish an overall vision for transport for Greater Cambridge, including Light Rail and tunneling options. However, consultants previously commissioned by the officers of the County Council and former City Deal have shown a bias to buses and excluded other options, and the community does not feel they can rely on their independence, indicated when one consultant told the LLF he was preparing a "rebuttal" of LLF views for the GCP.</p> <p>The question is therefore: Will the Executive Board please appoint new consultants with no previous involvement in planning for current schemes and options, and no contractual or personal ties to the County Council Directorate of Economy, Transport and Environment, or any other conflict of interest, to provide a genuinely independent study of the wider needs for transport, without influence by officers?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10a	Edward Leigh	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>Will the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and restate objectives for Milton (and Histon) Roads so that they are clear, forward-looking and coherent across all projects? Commission a feasibility study of connecting the Milton Park & Ride to the busway via the A14 underpass behind the Regional College, which would bypass up to a mile of queued traffic and five sets of traffic lights? Commission analysis of Inbound Flow Control on Milton Rd as an alternative to constructing 1.3km of bus lanes? 	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10b	Matthew Danish	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>We ask the Executive Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will you take up our proposal to put forward a hybrid design that is based on 'Final Concept' for the junctions and junction approaches while incorporating the concepts of 'Do Optimum' for much of the links in between? Will you instruct officers to take into account the diminishing returns of lengthy bus lanes, and to consult the Local Liaison Forum to find when the costs of lengthy bus lanes exceed the benefits? 	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
10c	Erik de Visser	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>The present plans of the GCP, whether Cambridge-wide or just for Milton Road, need major alterations or a different mind-set before spending tax payers' revenue on them.</p> <p>You aim to solve contemporary and future problems with somewhat outdated methods. In 2035 your present choice will be seen as antiquated. Your legacy will not be applauded.</p> <p>The question is: how will the GCP successfully manage a modal shift away from cars to trains and buses?</p> <p>It is high time this question is answered satisfactorily before new tarmac is put on Milton Road and elsewhere around the city.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10d	Anne Hamill	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>Cllr Lewis Herbert's letter of 14 September 2017, states that the Board supports '...an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road, and also the provision of grass verges...' but the 'Final Concept' doesn't follow this through.</p> <p>The flat-plan graphic (Appendix D, page 1) shows a miniscule verge between Herbert Street and Chesterton Hall Crescent – too narrow for tree planting – conflicting with the letter's commitment. The problem is this is the narrowest section of the road.</p> <p>However, at the 19 July Joint Assembly meeting, in his report on 'Final Concept', Chris Tunstall said that the officers will continue to look at this narrowest section of the road, and acknowledged that, here, there is no buffer of verges with trees. He also said that they could reduce some of the lane widths further, as well as the length of the bus lane.</p> <p>So to ensure there's enough space for adequate verges with trees along the whole length, it'll be necessary to vary the widths of the carriageway, pavements and cycle ways locally – as well as minimise bus lane lengths.</p> <p>My question is: will the Executive Board commit to instructing the officers to use flexibility in determining the widths of the carriageway, pavements and cycle ways, and the lengths of the bus lanes, to provide sufficient space to achieve healthy verges planted with mature trees on both sides along the whole length of Milton Road?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10e	Jamie Dalzell	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>In a letter dated 26th September 2017, Lewis Herbert wrote to the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum on behalf of the City Deal Board to confirm your support of 'an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road'. The 'Final Concept Design' being discussed later, in an effort to squeeze in bus lanes, incorporates grass verges of only 1m width which would be insufficient for 'mature trees' and has now started to refer to 'semi-mature trees' as a design element.</p> <p>Will the Board therefore honour its commitment to local residents and reject the current proposals?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10g	Gerry Rose	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>QUESTION: What measure are being prioritised to ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				If it is decided that the road-space is inadequate to support 3 motorised lanes, will the design team either remove the bus lane from the design or restrict the width of vehicles using Milton Road, effectively banning use by wide lorries?	http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf	
10h	Barbara Taylor	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>The Final Concept design increases the length of cycle lanes on Milton Road. However many local residents will be unable to access these lanes, as safe crossings with several side streets have not been included. At the Joint Assembly meeting officers promised to review potential crossings as part of detailed design.</p> <p>Will there be a commitment to allow all residents in side streets off Milton Road to access both north and south bound cycle lanes via the provision of safe crossings? Will these crossings be included at the earliest possible stage of detailed design development, rather than as an afterthought?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10i	Roxanne de Beaux	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>We ask the Executive Board: will you instruct the officers to protect the segregation assumption of the model by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring respectable signal timings for cycling crossings of carriageways, and reasonably scaling back the lengths of the bus lanes in order to provide safe bus stops, places for loading bays, and sufficient space for trees to grow? <p>With these changes, the integrity of the cycle ways and footways is maintained</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10j	Richard Taylor	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>I am surprised the results of a safety assessment are not available to inform today's decision on remodelling Milton Road. When a safety audit is carried out will it take account of risks to pedestrians and cyclists and will it be possible to amend the plans to implement any changes arising as a result of the safety audit process?</p> <p>Also In relation to Milton Road could we please have clarity on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> which, if any, elements of the plans are fixed today and what remains up for discussion who will be able to participate in and observe proposed workshops to discuss elements such as tree selection, bus stops, crossings and loading bays? 	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
10l	Michael Page	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>I note that the 2031 predicted maximum inbound queue length at Gilbert Road junction is 12 cars, yet a 40 car length overtaking lane for buses is planned. At the Arbury Road junction the 2031 predicted maximum queue length is again 12 cars but an overtaking lane equivalent to 140 cars is planned.</p> <p>I believe that there is real scope here for further optimisation without compromising bus journey times or reliability. Any reduction in lane lengths would unlock the potential for accommodating properly-sized bus stop boarding areas or allow for better trees and verges and unloading bays which would help overcome some of the potential conflicts and safety fears which put off cyclists and bus users.</p> <p>Question: rather than accept that bus lane lengths "will be considered further" as in para 34 page 30 of the report, will the Board please make this more substantive by requiring officers to "make bus lane lengths subject to further technical review with the objective of reducing their length wherever possible".</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
12a	Roger Tomlinson	26 th July 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge	Will the Board accept that a fair allocation of scores of Options 1, 3a and 6 does not support the Interim Transport Director's assertion at point 33 of his report	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
	[on behalf of Dr Gabriel Fox]		scheme	that "Option 6 does not score as highly as Options 1 or 3a" and that Option 6 should therefore remain in the process and undergo a full, fair and, most importantly, independent assessment?	http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf	
12b	Allan Treacy	26 th July 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>With reference to Table 15 on pages 153 and 154 of the board papers, I have noted many glaring inconsistencies in the scoring. In particular I have noted that the promoters of Option 3A, the GCP transport officers, have estimated that Option 3A would deliver a modal shift from car to bus of 31% compared to 28% for Option 6.</p> <p>How many real people does that 3% represent and given the difference in capital cost, what does that equate to in £s per person?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
12c	Alistair Burford	26 th July 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>Question in relation to Agenda item 12 A428/A1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme (further scheme development update (Park and Ride).</p> <p>Last week, the GCP Joint Assembly voted 10 to 1 (3 abstentions) in favour of removing Crome Lea from the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Park & Ride shortlist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to restore some public confidence, will the Board confirm that this democratic decision will be upheld? If the Board is minded to reject the Joint Assembly's recommendation then, could the Board explain the purpose of the Joint Assembly? 	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
12d	Edward Leigh	26 th July 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>Will the Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerate the Rural Travel Hubs project, to bring a much-needed bus station to Cambourne? Commission analysis of Inbound Flow Control on the A1303 as an alternative to constructing 2 miles of busway or bus lanes? Examine the implications of adding connections and a Park & Ride at the Girton Interchange, as set out in our A428 LLF resolution? 	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
12e	Roger Tomlinson	26 th July 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>The 'technical group' of the Local Liaison Forum for the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys, and others, have identified glaring inaccuracies and blatant bias in the comparative assessment of route Options 1, 3a and 6, and in the assessment of Park and Ride sites by officers and their consultants. Experts have noted that this has occurred on previous reports.</p> <p>The question is therefore: Will the Executive Board please appoint consultants with no contractual or personal ties to the County Council Directorate of Economy, Transport and Environment, or any other conflict of interest, to provide a genuinely independent technical review of options, without influence by officers, for the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys scheme?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes
13a	Bill Jenks	26 th July 2017	Cross-City Cycling – Green End Road	<p>The proposed TRO is to impose double yellow lines [no waiting at any time] on both sides of Green End Road from Scotland Road to Chesterton High St where the cycle lanes end [there being none on the next section through Water Lane to Water Street].</p> <p>This is very short residential section of about 150 meters, on which 20 out of 30 houses have no space on their property for visitor parking, a number considerably underestimated in the officer's report to committee. The no parking/waiting of any kind would deny 2/3 of our residents the kind of visitor parking which must be very near each property for serious matters including;</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>essential maintenance by tradesmen with heavy equipment; essential care visits by social and health workers and other important services who do not have parking exemptions as a matter of routine; deliveries of heavy items; setting down, and picking up, including hospital cars and taxis.</p> <p>While understanding there is no right to parking on highways, there are basic legal and/or common sense rights in matters of personal health and safety including emergency/routine maintenance of properties which we strongly feel should not be prevented, and that doing so could result in the risk of real harm to residents and the general upkeep of the neighbourhood. Officers suggest in reports alternative parking spaces in nearby roads, however these are no longer free since the increase in high density buildings with no parking provision, and in any event any such spaces would not be appropriate for the type of essential visiting services parking we are very worried about.</p> <p>The question or proposal, therefore, is that some parking rights be retained on one side of the road only, the north/east side, where there are a few spaces in between large properties who benefit from large courtyards or drives for visitors. Perhaps it would be a reasonable compromise to have the lines on both sides but with the north/east side banning parking only between the busy commuting hours on weekdays, [perhaps 0730-0930 and 1630-1830?] when the cycle lanes are most used?</p> <p>Many of us have lived here for decades, are cyclists, and are broadly in support of the intent of the cycle scheme when it adds to health and safety, but not when it would seem to needlessly threaten the health and safety of people and property. Many residents did not realise the extent of the ban on parking and a petition and/or request for a judicial review is being prepared which, it is hoped, will not be necessary if a decent compromise can be achieved that allows improved cycling for visitors as well as vital services to local citizens.</p>		
13b	Roxanne de Beaux	26 th July 2017	Cross-City Cycling – Green End Road	Will you support this resolution to create both a safe, protected cycle way and parking for the businesses? [The question refers to a PDF document circulated separately]	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf	Yes
13c	Roxanne de Beaux [on behalf of "Rad Wagon"]	26 th July 2017	Cross-City Cycling – Green End Road	<p>How much money was spent on the Green End Road cycle way which is demonstrably more dangerous to ride now and has been taken over by a car park scheme? Can this money be recouped for proper cycle infrastructure?</p> <p>Will advice on pavement cycling be set in stone throughout these schemes?</p>	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf	Yes
15a	Wendy Blythe	26 th July 2017	Residents and business engagement	<p>You have received the following letter, now signed by 54 community and local business groups:</p> <p>"Residents and businesses in Cambridge and the surrounding villages are concerned that the City Deal is rushing through plans for major development and transport schemes that lack a clear overall vision, are not evidence-based and have been progressed using a flawed model of top-down 'consultation'.</p> <p>"The need to spend the first tranche of funding quickly has meant that so far this has not been a holistic programme to successfully manage rapid growth in a way that is sustainable and not environmentally damaging.</p>	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s102375/GCP%20EB%20Minutes-APPENDIX%20A.pdf	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>"We call upon the City Deal to re-engineer the process to facilitate more effective partnership and collaboration so that the skills and talents of Cambridgeshire residents and businesses can also be engaged in proper research and evaluation of new infrastructure projects, in order to deliver a long-term vision for our region that is about health, well-being and community as well as economic success."</p> <p>My Question is: will the Board act on this letter?</p>		
-	Dr Richard Baird	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>Thank you for your work on planning for Milton Road.</p> <p>I local resident who cycles on a daily basis with children to Milton Road primary school and other local destinations. I am strongly in support of the 'Do Optimum' solution proposed by the Milton Road Alliance.</p> <p>I think this is likely to be safer, greener and will encourage more walking and cycling when people travel.</p> <p>Can this please be the option we go for?</p>	This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.	Yes
-	Adam Reynolds	26 th July 2017	Milton Road	<p>Regarding the recently approved concepts for Milton Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does the board not agree that forcing cyclists to cycle between parked cars, where it's likely to be common for doors to be opened into the cycle lane, and moving busses, where wing mirrors are likely to overlap the cycle lane due to the narrow width of the bus lane, is an inherently dangerous design that should be rejected as a flawed concept. • can the Board explain why a scheme has been approved that, in several places, gives more space to trees than it does to either cyclists or pedestrians? • Given that the average width of a bus is something over 2.5m, does the board think that having the concepts allow 3m, around 20cm either side, is an adequate amount of space? How fast would they be comfortable driving their cars through a gap with only 20cm either side of them, and how much would that speed be reduced by given that drifting outside that zone could result in the serious injury of whatever they hit? • is the board aware that many/most of the concept images supplied for the Milton Road scheme are inaccurate to the point of being useless. The relative widths of lanes are wrong and the verges for the trees are missing in several images, something that was seen as being crucial in this scheme. • Given that cycling is one of the key & core transport methods used in Cambridge, how can the board justify the use of modeling software that ignores cyclists and also pedestrians? It was also admitted that the modeling software in use can't model the Dutch style roundabouts that would make cycling significantly safer. It was recently revealed that such software exists and that if these concepts were being designed in Holland that software would be being used. Why is the board happy to settle for using consultants who are prepared to cripple their design simply because of the tools they choose to use. • One of the objectives for the Milton Road project is "Safer and more convenient routes for cycling and walking, segregated where practical and possible", given that aim what is the board's opinion of the recent 	This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>decision to allow parking on a corner in the cycle lane on Green End Road, something that will force cyclists into traffic on a blind bend? Is there any provision for resurfacing of existing cycle lanes in Cambridge?</p> <p>The poor quality of the cycle lanes are one of the reasons why they're not used (for example the lane around the leisure park on Newmarket Road is in very poor condition in places causing cyclists to have to move over into the bus/car lane to avoid the holes).</p>		
-	Gabriel Bienzobas Mauraza	26 th July 2017	Cross-City Cycling – Green End Road	<p>I am concerned to read that parking is going to be allowed in the cycle lane next to Dino's Barbers and The Mermaid Chinese Takeaway in Green End Road. According to previous statements made by the Greater Cambridge Deal this is being done to balance the needs of both cyclists and the businesses present but it is my opinion that this is not a balancing act but basically putting cyclists in harms way of parked and moving cars, which defeats the original purpose of the scheme. There are two consequences to be observed from this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car drivers expect cyclists to be on cycle lanes – when cyclists don't use these they will be berated by drivers. This intimidation might cause accidents. • Money was spent originally for a cycle path but instead some parking bays have been built. <p>All in all, it seems that the introduction of these cycle lanes where parking is allowed is detrimental to the cycling community of Cambridge so could the following be considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Remove the parking bays so that the cycle lanes can be fully enforced and used by current and future non-cyclists providing a safe space to ride. • Option 2: Remove the cycle lane and paint some parking bays and use the money which was spent in building these cycle lanes to be used as they were intended too. <p>I hope this can be considered, as the scheme, as it stands right now is a hazard to cyclists.</p>	This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.	Yes
-	Lilian Rundblad	26 th July 2017	Histon Road	<p>In a letter to Councillors Lewis Herbert and Roger Hickford on June 28th 2017, I expressed deep concern that the Histon Road LLF Resolutions adopted on January 30th 2017 had not yet appeared on the official website for the GC City Deal/Partnership (see attachment). No reply has been received to the letter and the Resolutions and Appendices have still not been published.</p> <p>The Joint Assembly has earlier questioned why full documentation has not been available in time for their meetings. In this case they may not even be aware that the Histon Road LLF Resolutions and Appendices exist and that they are the result of the hard work undertaken by the residents, associations, schools, small businesses, cycle groups, etc. which in some cases has produced alternative and preferable solutions to those of the officers and consultants. Their contribution should be appreciated and respected. The Chair of Histon Road LLF has several times reminded and urged the officers and staff to publish the documentation.</p> <p>My question is therefore: Why were the Histon Road LLF Resolutions and</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it duplicates one answered in a recent meeting. This question was answered in the 19th July 2017 Joint Assembly meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&MId=6850&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				Appendices not published at the time they were adopted, together with the draft minutes of the January 30th LLF meeting, as in similar instances? I would like to have the answer in writing. I have a copy of the Resolution documents with me to gladly hand over to the Chair of the Executive Board meeting today.		
-	Paul Emmerson	26 th July 2017	Milton Road – Highworth Avenue	<p>The current proposal is to retain the roundabout and add traffic light signalling control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I live at 3 Highworth Avenue. Currently for safety reasons we reverse park our cars into our drive. With the planned new lay-out this will become a problem, as we will no longer be able to pull across the left and out of the flow of traffic before reversing. How will safe access and egress to our drive be maintained? If traffic lights are to be used to control the traffic, what advantage is there in maintaining the roundabout? Removing the roundabout would improve traffic flow, move the traffic away from residences, expand green spaces around the junction, and support access to our drive. Why has the closure of Highworth Avenue access been dropped? For minimal disturbance to local residences traffic flow would be improved at one of the worst bottle-necks, and a much greater green area would be created. 	This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.	Yes
6a	Kathy York	20 th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	"With reference to Option 1, we note that a 4.25m bus lane has been drawn which is within the highway boundary. There are pinch points on the section of the Madingley Road from the West Cambridge site to Lady Margaret Road where it would be impossible to accommodate designated cycle lanes as well as a bus lane. We have been very concerned by the current volume of bikes, and this is now due to increase significantly due to the 12,000 bike racks at Eddington. The Ridgeway trail from Eddington to Storeys Way will also contribute to a vastly increased volume of cycle traffic. My question is: without considerable land take (ie residents' gardens), how can Madingley Road accommodate rapid bus transport and cycle lanes?"	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&Mid=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes
6b	Chris Pratten	20 th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>Given that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A route across the West Fields is unlikely to be deemed "required" given the existence of routes that do not cross the West Fields green belt. In the view of LDA in Appendix L1c, the routes across the West Fields are very likely to be considered "inappropriate". <p>The GCP will therefore need to demonstrate "very special circumstances" for any of the more destructive routes to be chosen. It seems unlikely that such circumstances can be demonstrated in the light of the other available options.</p> <p>Will the board instruct officers to further restrict the set of consulted routes to the east of the M11 to routes that are identified as appropriate in the LDA report?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&Mid=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes
6c	Ellen Khmelnitski	20 th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	Appendix L3 indicates that the southerly route options across the West Fields that are proposed in the board papers, would cross a section of Bin Brook that is designated as a Main River. The flood zone at this point is some 30-40m wide. A safe busway crossing at this point would involve significant damage to the environment. The route would need to rise above the landscape at this point to a level well above the current ground which is prone to flooding. The analysis of Appendix N2 restricts itself to simple engineering concerns, thus avoiding a complete and transparent description of the structure that might be required. The LDA Green Belt analysis also avoids this question, assuming that the	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&Mid=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>busway fits into the rather optimistic "Green Lane Concept".</p> <p>The residents of the Gough Way Estate have very significant concerns about any infrastructure that might lead to an increase in the risk of flooding to their homes. Will the Board instruct officers to ensure that consultation documents and future reports present a realistic view of what might be required at a Bin Brook crossing?</p>		
6d	Carolyn Postgate	20th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>Interim Transport Director's Report - "Madingley Mulch to Grange Road Journey Times"</p> <p>The table within the report claims a difference in journey times between Option 3 & Option 6 as 5 minutes. The cost difference between the two options is in the region of £40 million tax payers money.</p> <p>Is it really acceptable to spend an additional £40 million to reduce the journey time by 5 minutes when not time but reliability is of greater importance?</p> <p>Whilst the Officers appear confident with their assessment of journey times and cost, the report has no mention of the frequency of buses, how many people living in the west of the City actually want to travel into Cambridge during the peak period or where the bus will go once at Grange Road, other than, to quote Graham Hughes, "It will turn left or right".</p> <p>Will the Board stipulate that before going to public consultation there should be a detailed employment survey of Cambourne residents, some idea of frequency of journeys, a joined-up plan as to how buses are going to get into the City centre and more importantly a coherent plan for how buses will get commuters to the main employment centres of Addenbrooke's & Babraham in the south and the Science Park & Marshalls in the north?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes
6e	Allan Treacy	20th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>There is a clear and urgent need to deliver people to the Addenbrookes site, the Bio Medical campus and beyond and not just Grange Road where virtually nobody goes to work.</p> <p>Option 6 would offer an economic, speedily implemented and efficient solution to this problem as it would permit connectivity with the M11.</p> <p>So why is connectivity with the M11 not a criteria in deciding whether to adopt option 1, 3a or 6?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes
6f	Alistair Burford	20th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>When Officers were questioned as to why Crome Lea was not identified in the original public consultation document we were told that the original illustration "was only indicative".</p> <p>The Officers have now recommended the Water Tower and Scotland Farm for public consultation. When questioned at the most recent LLF meeting about the exact size, location and any future expansion of the Water Tower site the Officers stated that the illustration "was only indicative" ... and the site was the same size as the current P&R at Trumpington.</p> <p>Given that plans are in place to extend the Trumpington P&R site, if in the future it is deemed necessary to extend the Water Tower site, where will it be</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>extended to, south down the hill adjacent to Long Road or east towards Crome Lea?</p> <p>Will the Board give an undertaking that the Water Tower site will not be extended?</p> <p>Will the Board also given an undertaking that both sides illustrated in the public consultation document will remain in the same location and not end up 500 yards from where we are led to believe they are?</p>		
6g	Dr Marilyn Treacy	20th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>The first round of consultation on the Cambourne to Cambridge busway did not conform to the Gunning Principles and this may be just one of the aspects of GCP process to be challenged at Judicial Review.</p> <p>We were informed at the Joint Assembly last week that a consultation is not a referendum which is true however we were also informed that public opinion would play no part in future MCAF scoring for the preferred option of a Park and Ride site or the route to take forward for full outline business case development.</p> <p>May I remind the Executive that compliance with the Gunning principles requires that a decision maker gives "conscientious consideration" to the outcome of the consultation process.</p> <p>Put simply the public authority must be able to show that it has considered the outcome of the consultation process carefully and be prepared to change course in response to the outcome of consultation if appropriate.</p> <p>If MCAF scoring is used and the outcome of the consultation is not fed into the scoring process then the Gunning Principles are not being upheld.</p> <p>Q. If the outcome of the forthcoming consultation is going to play no part in MCAF scoring for the preferred option are we to assume that MCAF scoring will not be used? If that is so will the Executive explain at this stage what form the assessment of options will take.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&MId=6857&Ver=4</p>	Yes
6h	Stephen Coates	20th September 2017	A428 Cambourne to Cambridge	<p>Can the Board explain why GCP officers may be distorting perception by playing potentially misleading facts into public debate over the Cambourne Cambridge busway scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On the record comments from GCP officers wrongly claimed in the Cambridge News (1 September) that new routes sidestep the West Fields by running along the border. And in the Cambridge Independent (6 September), officers claimed new routes address concerns over "potential in-fill and building on the West Fields" by St John's College. Remaining routes still cross Grange Farm, which St John's says makes development there more sustainable. 2. GCP documents claim that a new road through the West Fields will increase biodiversity. They claim arable fields have little biodiversity value and that new planting along the busway will increase biodiversity. James Cadbury, ex Head of Research at the RSPB, has said your analysis is wrong because many declining species (of birds, animals and plants) depend on open, arable countryside and thrive on the West Fields. Skylarks, grey partridge, yellow 	<p>The question was not present to ask the question.</p>	<p>The chair directed the questioner to receive a written response.</p>

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>hammers, barn owls, brown hare are examples of species that need open fields, are distinct from species that reside in woodland or urban habitats. Up to 30 buses an hour will eventually use this road creating a wildlife barrier and pollution. The busway will enable large scale housing development, leading to the loss of these precious nature habitats on the edge of our historic city.</p> <p>3. The GCP claimed in the Cambridge News on 9 August that a potential bus terminus on Silver Street was only last looked at in 2015 when it was in fact looked at in Spring 2017. You have still failed to clarify how so many buses will access the City centre through Silver Street. You have also used the press to wrongly undermine the reputation of SWF.</p>		
7a	Janet Lockwood	22 nd November 2017	Park and Ride site at J11	<p>I agree with the need to persuade as many people as possible to use public transport rather than private car to Cambridge destinations.</p> <p>Please would the Board consider changing its basic plan from bus to the more sustainable train where-ever possible? - that is, away from Park and Ride sites near the City to rail stations further out?</p> <p>It is clear from the Assembly vote that opinion is completely divided over Recommendation 1. Before preparing a Full Outline business case for 2000 new Park and Ride spaces near junction 11 for which there is no site without significant harm - please would the Board investigate other options, particularly rail which I think is a late starter in these studies?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	Yes
7b	Jane Ward, Chair of Hauxton Parish Council	22 nd November 2017	Park and Ride site at J11	<p>I am most concerned that there has been insufficient modelling of the traffic flow along the A10 from Foxton through Harston to junction 11 of the M11. In particular has a survey been done of the peak time A10 traffic through Harston to the junction 11 roundabout? Has modelling been done to show the effects on the A10 when the new Hauxton Meadows exit opens? Have the possible impacts on this traffic by a new P&R been assessed?</p> <p>I believe all these will have a severely detrimental impact on the flow of traffic along the A10 through Harston, plus, there is a great chance that commuters living in Barrington and Haslingfield may also decide to make use of this P&R rather than the Madingley P&R attracting even more traffic along the A10.</p> <p>Please would the Board not rush into making a hasty decision and consider all the above points?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	Yes
7c	Sunanda Billur	22 nd November 2017	Travelling from Cambourne to Biomedical Campus	<p>My name is Sunanda and working in Addenbrookes hospital. My question: is there any direct transportation from Cambourne to Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's or Rosie Hospital)? Please note that Papworth is going to move to Biomedical Campus. So many people from Cambourne and surrounding village people will work in the hospital and have their appointments. Direct Bus facility will be more beneficial to all. So, everyone no need to take the car. Please consider the request and do the needful</p>	<p>This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.
9a	Edward Leigh			<p>Park & Ride parking charges</p> <p>The Economy & Environment Committee received a report from officers in February 2017 that set out clearly why forfeiting £1.2m/year of income is inadvisable.</p> <p>The £0.53m/year with which the Board could decide to compensate the County Council will not create any new bus services; it will not extend services that</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
		22 nd November 2017	Park and Ride charges	<p>currently end too early; it will not increase the frequency of any services; and it will not make bus services more affordable. So, I ask the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where is the analysis showing that removing the P&R parking charge is a more cost effective use of public funds than, say, subsidising extensions to P&R and rural bus services? 2. Where is the social impact analysis – in particular recognising that P&R competes with rural bus services, on which our poorest and least able citizens depend? 3. By how much is peak-time traffic forecast to reduce as a result of this intervention, (at one and two sigma confidence levels)? 4. For how many years is GCP proposing to subsidise parking at more than £0.5m/year? Why is this not stated in the background paper? 5. Will the Board confirm whether overnight parking will still be charged at £10/night? <p>How confident is the Board that this decision will withstand judicial review?</p>		
9b	Dr Ashley Easter	22 nd November 2017	Cycling – Melbourn to Royston	<p>I am a former resident of Cambridge, now living in Royston, and I cycle between the two frequently as well as to my place of work in Melbourn (AstraZeneca, in future at Addenbrooke's). This last June on the A10 near Melbourn (where there is no cycleway) I was struck by a car, luckily escaping with only moderate injuries.</p> <p>After the accident, whilst using the excellent cycleway from Melbourn to reach my Physio in Cambridge, it struck me that despite the hard work by a number of councillors, volunteers and local bodies, as well as detailed plans being in place, commitment for the final stretch was still uncertain.</p> <p>Please can the Greater Cambridge Partnership do everything in their power to complete the Cambridgeshire part of the A10 cycleway scheme, extending the existing cycleway from Melbourn to Royston, before anyone is more seriously hurt?</p>	<p>This question was not taken at the meeting as the questioner did not attend.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.
9c	Sambor Czarnawski-Iliev	22 nd November 2017	Cycling – Melbourn to Royston	<p>Hello all! I am Sambor, a Year 9 student from Melbourn Village College. Last May I got involved with the A10 cycling campaign, and began a survey which was completed by 62 students, to find out how much support there is for cycling to school.</p> <p>The results were pleasing, as you can see on the sheet we've given out. The survey also showed that the lack of a safe route for cyclists along the A10 between Royston and Melbourn hindered quite a few students from being able to cycle to school. I am here to ask for your support in funding that path. I would be delighted in also giving you a first-hand tour of the route.</p> <p>The College itself has dozens of students from Royston. This number has been increasing at an ever-faster rate over the last few years, and with the planned housing developments, it's bound to keep increasing. Most of the ones I know will be glad to use such a path.</p> <p>My whole family travels by bike, virtually all the time, virtually everywhere. A path like this will open up a much-needed link between Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=6858&x=1</p>	Yes
9d	Cllr Susan			With a modest investment, the final link in the Cambridge-Royston cycle	The question was answered in the meeting and was	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
	van de Ven	22 nd November 2017	Cycling – Melbourne to Royston	<p>scheme could be quickly completed within the GCP Tranche 1 timeframe. The two-mile Melbourn-Royston link needs a path in Cambridgeshire and a bridge in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>This is a shovel-ready project that would deliver significant economic benefits, and make a substantial contribution to reducing reliance on the private car for travel to key areas of employment in Cambridge and along the A10 corridor from Royston. It will maximise the benefits of the investments in this route already made by GCP. Because it has the potential to be delivered within the existing GCP funding period, it can demonstrate real progress on innovative, economically led schemes to Government.</p> <p>Today, I am here to ask for your support just for the path in Cambridgeshire. This has been costed at £1 million. While Cambridgeshire County Council has no funding to offer, the GCP is ideally placed to make this happen.</p> <p>You will want to know what's happening on the Hertfordshire side for bridge funding. Following the LEP's indication of support on a collaborative basis, Herts County and Royston Town Councils, local businesses including AstraZeneca, and many small private donations are coming together to create a funding package.</p> <p>That this overall effort has persisted for so long is really down to commuters who want to leave their cars at home. As the owner of Melbourn Science Park said to the GCP Board last year, this sustainable transport link will not only alleviate pressures on Science Park parking, but will allow the creation of more jobs.</p> <p>So, today we are asking the Board to get fully behind the project, by proposing that the GCP commit the necessary funds to complete the Cambridgeshire portion of the scheme.</p>	<p>published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MId=6858&x=1</p>	
9e	Dr Michael Prior-Jones	22 nd November 2017	Cycling – Melbourne to Royston	<p>The Quarterly Report notes that the Shepreth to Melbourn section of the A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle route opened in March, and came in slightly under budget. I would like to thank the board for funding this part of the route, and ask them to seriously consider funding the proposed path from the south end of Melbourn to the A505. This would be as part of a package with a bridge over the A505 to Royston, with funding from several other agencies and private businesses. The total cost of the project is estimated at £2.5m.</p> <p>I work at a firm on the Melbourn Science Park. I have around 25 colleagues living in Royston, who make the two mile journey to work by car because it is not safe to cross the A505 - and there are plenty more working in the other businesses on the park. Our business is expanding and we are creating more jobs in Melbourn. The high cost of housing in Cambridge and South Cambs means that even young professionals on good salaries are struggling to buy homes in Cambridgeshire. More of our staff are choosing to live in Royston, where housing is fractionally cheaper, and the lack of safe routes to walk or cycle to work means that we are generating a lot of short-journey commute traffic and demand for car parking on our site.</p> <p>It reflects poorly on the structure of our local government institutions that the county boundary causes so many issues with the funding. I would urge the board to support this proposed scheme, and find ways to resolve the issues</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the minutes.</p> <p>http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MId=6858&x=1</p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				over the border with Hertfordshire, because it will help us create jobs, retain staff, and produce a better quality of life and health for both our staff and the wider community.		
-	Mal Schofield	22 nd November 2017	Housing and Strategic Planning	<p>Minutes Previous meeting. Item 4 Reply to question 6h. <i>" With more than 8,000 homes and 15,000 jobs planned along the A428 between St Neots and Cambridge in the next 15 years, fast and reliable public transport will be key to ensuring more and more people can get to and from the city and without putting additional pressure on the already congested road network. Bus services can address these challenges in the short to medium-term but that doesn't preclude tunnels or light rail - or any another solution - in the future. Our joint study with the Mayor and Combined Authority on this will report early findings in November. Final decisions on this scheme are still some way off and will be made in the wider public interest taking all information, including residents' views, into account." Graham Hughes</i></p> <p>Factual clarification 1. 8,000 homes are planned but only 2,350 approved " MCA developments, a consortium between Taylor Wimpey and Bovis is leading the development which will see investment in community facilities and 2,350 homes - including up to 30 per cent of affordable housing." It is premature at this stage to assume that the Planning Inspector will approve housing at Bourn Airfield 2. The location of the 15,000 jobs is not specified. The inference however is that their location will add significantly to the levels of road congestion</p> <p>Is it now timely to prepare a Master Plan for Greater Cambridge growth 2019 to 2036 (2050?) that provides a credible programme of modal shift intentions, sector by sector and in accordance with car limiting standards as applied to approved new housing schemes* and forecast travel to work volumes?</p> <p>* some specified as car free zones.</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions do not relate to an item that is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.
-	Gabriel Fox	22 nd November 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>At the GCP Briefing for Councillors and Parish Councils in South Cambridgeshire last week, Cllr Burkitt gave a nice closing speech summarising where he felt GCP was now succeeding. Three key achievements he identified were:</p> <p>i. Switching to a "bottom-up" approach, welcoming schemes from the community rather than imposing them in a top-down manner.</p> <p>ii. Listening to the voice of the community.</p> <p>iii. Developing a joined-up strategy.</p> <p>With that in mind, how can Cllr Burkitt and the Executive Board justify:</p> <p>i. Seriously misrepresenting the community's Option 6 bus route scheme in the recently issued Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys consultation. Option 6 can be inbound-only or tidal, depending on further technical analysis. It does not involve gantries or the widening of the M11 J13 bridge, nor does it end at High Cross. These features have all been ignored in the consultation, which is blatantly biased towards the top-down solution being promoted by the County transport officers.</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions do not relate to an item that is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.

No.	Questioner	Date of Executive Board	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>ii. Disregarding the widespread community opposition to an off-road busway through the sensitive Green Belt west of Cambridge.</p> <p>iii. Failing to develop connectivity between the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and the proposed Western Orbital serving major employment centres prior to this consultation.</p>		
-	Roger Tomlinson	22 nd November 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>The Minutes for the Executive Board meeting on September 20th note at length at item 6 CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER BUS JOURNEYS SCHEME - APPROACH TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION INFORMING FULL OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE DEVELOPMENT . My question seeks an update on the Public Consultation arising from the minutes.</p> <p>Please advise what happened in the discussions with the LLF Technical Group to further refine option 6, the input from the LLF Technical Group on the draft consultation document and survey, and what led to the eventual publication of a consultation document with major errors. The revised version still does not represent Option 6 (Route B) as detailed by the LLF.</p> <p>Please advise what steps are being taken to ensure the integrity of the consultation process.</p> <p>In line with the instruction of the Executive Board, a meeting was held with the LLF Technical Group on 5th October 2017. Also at that meeting the strategy for the involvement of the LLF in the consultation material development was set out.</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions do not relate to an item that is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.
-	Cllr Ian Manning	22 nd November 2017	Milton Road LLF	A number of meetings involving officers have happened at which the Chair of the LLF for Milton Road has been invited, but no other elected members. Please can the board confirm that elected members, particularly with regard to political proportionality, should have the opportunity to attend any meetings relating to the LLF that would shape the project.	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions do not relate to an item that is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.	The question was referred to the GCP mailbox for a response.

This page is left blank intentionally.