

**10<sup>th</sup> June 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly**  
**Question from Representative of a Partner Body**

<b>From</b>	<b>Question</b>
City Councillor Hannah Copley	<p>The newly elected Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has significant concerns about the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), there is much opposition to the so-called “preferred” Southern Route for East-West Rail, and the GCP transport schemes are evolving as shown in the quarterly transport update report. However, there appears to be no revision to the schematic “The Greater Cambridge Future Network 2020”, which provides a holistic overview and helps to show how the various schemes are integrated. Would the GCP therefore provide such an update as a matter of urgency, so that we can understand the progress being made towards a fully integrated, sustainable and environmentally sound transport system that will not require urgent re-adjustment in the near future?</p>

**10<sup>th</sup> June 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
Edward Leigh	<p><b>Agenda Items 8, 11, 12: Busway &amp; P&amp;R car park schemes</b></p> <p>Are new roads, exclusively for buses, and 2,000 space car parks in the Green Belt really the only and best way to spend the City Deal and planning gain money?</p> <p>The Cambourne, A11 and Waterbeach busway schemes have a budgeted cost of £340 million. Officers will have told you that these schemes are the only way to “unlock” new housing agreed in the last Local Plan.</p> <p>However, that is no longer the only, nor indeed the top, priority for the region’s future. Decarbonising road transport, reducing water extraction, restoring ecology, reducing toxic air pollution, reducing illness from inactivity and social isolation, and eliminating deaths on the roads are increasingly urgent priorities.</p> <p>Modal shift is the key to achieving all the transport objectives: people make more trips on foot, cycle, bus or train instead of driving. That will also reduce, and eventually eliminate, congestion. It may be hard to imagine, but that is the future we have to create.</p> <p>Once road congestion is under control, busways serve no purpose. Infrastructure with a design-life of over fifty years will become redundant within ten years.</p> <p>Ex-councillor Ian Bates said at the last board meeting that he now agreed with Cllr Bick that the GCP needed to develop a revenue stream to support an expansion of bus services. That would make possible an alternative strategy with better outcomes for all transport objectives.</p> <p>That strategy would replace building busways and car parks with investing, alongside the Combined Authority, in ‘pump-priming’ new, extended and expanded bus services; building more safe cycling infrastructure and highly-connected travel hubs; installing localised bus priority measures and smart traffic management systems; and much more.</p> <p>People voted in the last local election for change. So, ask the officers: what other options can they offer you to recommend to the Board to take forward?</p>
Melanie Hale Chairman, Landbeach Parish Council	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>1. Will you arrange a proper consultation on the Revised Central Option before it is taken forward to the Executive Board? It is scheduled to come up at their next meeting on 1 July but this should be delayed. The route has changed significantly (re. p169 of 617 in the Agenda pack) and should not be considered an Option until it has been properly consulted on. It would have a significant impact on Landbeach residents, heritage and farmland. It would be very undemocratic to select an Option which has not even been consulted on.</p> <p>2. Can you confirm that you are fully considering the interests of existing communities? Your preferred Options do not really serve Waterbeach village (population 5000+) or Milton (population 4600+).</p> <p>3. Why have you constrained the study area so that Cottenham (population 6000+) is not included? A Western Option which is further west could be designed to benefit Cottenham residents.</p>
Roger Hale	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>1. The Revised Central Option has not previously been consulted on. On what basis can a new option be included in the decision making without democratic consultation?</p> <p>2. Neither the Revised Central Option, nor the Western Option serve Waterbeach or Milton villages. How is this consistent with the following statement in the report: "Response to the public consultation suggested that public transport connectivity to</p>

	<p>the villages of Waterbeach and Milton was also a very important factor that should be considered"?</p> <p>3. If Waterbeach and Milton villages are not served by two of the proposed routes, the proposed scheme does not fully address the purported need for better public transport in the Study Area. Why therefore is the Study Area constrained not to take in the villages further west? Cottenham is poorly served by public transport and a route further to the west, along the edge of Cottenham, could address this.</p>
Shelley Mason Parish Clerk & RFO, Waterbeach Parish Council	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>The approach to dealing with the transport issues at Waterbeach appears to those not directly involved to be very fragmented – please can you provide an explanation of the overall blueprint for Waterbeach that explains the relationship of this scheme to the others and how all of them relate to each other.</p>
Jane Williams	<p><b>Agenda Item 8 - Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to Cambridge</b></p> <p>The revised central option has been significantly changed as shown on page 169 of 617 of the agenda pack and was not included in the consultation that ended on the 14th December 2020. Does the Joint Assembly agree that a further consultation is undertaken before W2C is progressed to the next stage and that a new consultation is also appropriate on the grounds that the revised central option bypasses Waterbeach village and in tandem with the proposed relocation of Waterbeach station to the New Town, residents especially the less mobile and financially able will not have as much access to public transport as they do at present. Does the GCP Joint Assembly agree that a new consultation may change residents views and therefore the revised options? Bearing this in mind and considering that proposals to dual the A10, relocate Waterbeach Station to the New Town and W2C are currently unfunded, developers of the New Town Urban &amp; Civic and RLWE's transport plans are substantially underfunded, Cam Metro scrapped by the Mayor of which W2C is a part, loss of huge swathes of the Cambridge Green Belt, farmland and habitat, does the Joint Assembly agree that the GCP and the Combined Authority work together to provide sustainable, accessible, affordable transport for Waterbeach residents at least cost to the public purse and the environment?</p>
Heather Du Quesnay Chair, North Newnham Residents' Association	<p><b>Item 11 Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</b></p> <p>NNRA welcomes the publication of the audit report on the Cambridge to Cambourne scheme.</p> <p>Will the Joint Assembly please reaffirm its commitment to the safety of the 5900 cyclists a day who use Adams Road as the main route between the West Cambridge site and Grange Road and ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment takes account of the environmental factors affecting this important part of the West Cambridge Conservation Area which led 3300 people to sign a petition against the use of Adams Road for buses?</p>
Dan Strauss	<p><b>Item 11 Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</b></p> <p>As one of the organisers of the Save Your Cycle Route petition of 3300 signatories, which urged the GCP not to use Adams Road, the busiest cycle route in Cambridge, as the final stage of the C2C, I welcome the Audit report.</p> <p>Leaving Adams Road Bus-free will improve the safety of 6000 cyclists a day.</p> <p>However, more needs to be done on Adams Road as cycle traffic is set to double as the West Cambridge site grows. When will parking be removed and traffic-calming measures introduced?</p>
Dr Marilyn Treacy	<p><b>Agenda Item 11 - Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</b></p> <p>The mayor has withdrawn support for the CAM and the major transport infrastructure scheme now being proposed is EWRail with a station planned for Cambourne. Against this background, I would like to ask members of the J.A. (rather than the officers) whether they have doubts that the deeply unpopular and environmentally destructive C2C off-road busway scheme with its route through the Cambridge greenbelt is really justified. Given the withdrawal of the CAM and the implementation of a fast rail link from Cambourne to</p>

	<p>Cambridge and knowing the local geography and commuter destinations, who in their right minds would now endorse a £195m off road busway that runs from Cambourne to Grange Road? The audit raised major issues that have been glossed over in the auditor's conclusions and officers comments. If the purpose of the JA is to scrutinise, why is it not performing its function?</p>
<p>James Littlewood Chief Executive CPPF</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 11 - Cambourne to Cambridge Independent Audit</b></p> <p>Cambridge PPF has identified a number of significant factual errors in the C2C Independent Audit report. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "The EWR does not provide an alternative to travel [to] the City Centre." [Key Finding 7 on p7 / p 312 of the agenda pack]. It will take about 17 minutes by train from Cambourne to Cambridge central station, adjacent to the CB1 business district. From there it is a 20-minute walk, a 6-minute cycle ride or a 5-minute bus ride to the city centre. By comparison, the forecast C2C journey time from Cambourne to the city centre is 31 minutes. How is East West Rail not an attractive alternative?</li> <li>2. "Current delay on the A1303 ... in the westbound PM Peak [is] between 50%-75% slower speeds than night-time average speeds." [Section 3.2 on p19 / p324 of the agenda pack]. Analysis of data provided by GCP's Smart Cambridge programme shows there is no significant delay to traffic westbound at any time of day. There is therefore no benefit to be gained from building a westbound busway lane.</li> <li>3. "Development of a new all-ways junction or any other development at Girton Interchange would most likely need to be delivered by Highways England and therefore beyond the control of local stakeholders." [Section 6.6.2 on p66 / p371 of the agenda pack]. Junction 7a on the M11 is being delivered and part-funded by Essex County Council. A consortium of stakeholders, including GCP, could co-fund and deliver a major transport hub at the Girton Interchange.</li> </ol> <p>These misunderstandings clearly influenced the auditors' conclusions in denying that East West Rail radically alters the business case, and in rejecting 'quick win' in-highway proposals and 'fixing' the Girton Interchange. We ask Assembly members to recommend to officers that they seek corrections to the audit report before it is presented to the Board on 1 July.</p>
<p>Glyn Huskisson</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p><u>Babraham to Bio-Medical Campus proposed Busway and Park and Ride</u></p> <p>A 2020 King's college, London study found that pm2.5 particulates from tyres and brakes are 1000 times more harmful than car exhausts as they cause and exacerbate asthma and COPD. Pm2.5 particulates have been known to be dangerous for some time. Bus tyres are large so they will cause significant pollution in what is currently clean air in our countryside. Did you consider this factor when opting for a busway e.g. in your environmental assessment, or when you stated that the busway would be 'cleaner' and 'improve air quality'?</p>
<p>Cllr Howard Kettel FRICS Chair Stapleford Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>Only air quality, greenhouse gases and noise has been included in the GCP report on the Economic Case covering Environmental Impacts. However the Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) includes monetising environmental, social, heritage and other "non-market" features of the project. Why is it that the BCR which is "poor" (at 0.71) takes no account of these key environmental impacts?</p>
<p>John Hall</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>If the Joint Assembly acknowledges that, since the vote/choice approx two years ago for the proposed South Eastern route, on which this proposal rests, that firstly, through the efforts of the GCP, the public is much better informed about the advantages and disadvantages of the route, and secondly, that much has changed, including the future of flexible working, the global climate and environmental sensitivity of the public, local conditions on water stress, local decisions on the Cambridge Metro etc,</p>

	<p>... then would the Joint Assembly therefore recommend to the board, that in view of the reduced urgency following the pandemic, that, it is only reasonable that a further vote /choice should be held by a more informed public, or their locally elected representatives, to affirm support for the proposal against some of the other recent alternatives that have been suggested as improvements?</p>
Roger French	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>A report published in March 2021 by expert consultants i-Transport, commissioned by Stapleford and Gt Shelford Parish Councils and supported by local crowdfunding, found that the Shelford Railway Alignment (SRA) was a viable route option and Mott MacDonald had substantially over estimated the extent of demolition required. The GCP’s own ‘independent’ assessment also found that design compromise was not considered a ‘show stopper’ that rules out the feasibility of the SRA at this stage.</p> <p>How can this be squared with a senior Officer of the GCP making a public statement* “We know that the proposal will require us to knock down a lot of homes and commercial properties”. Will the GCP now agree to pause and review in detail the alternative routes in accordance with industry recognised and transparent optioneering processes which are evidence based?</p> <p>*ITV Anglia early evening news 3/6/21</p>
Rosie Brown	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>According to the National Planning Policy framework, ‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’. And yet the proposed Stapleford CSET Busway stop is adjacent to a 47 hectare potential development site for 987 houses, with over 800 further home developments proposed in proximity to the busway stops between Hinton and Haverhill roads. This proposed development is all situated within Green Belt land and the housing and Busway projects are inextricably linked.</p> <p>The proposed development will, in aggregate, result in significant sprawl and environmental impacts- including loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity, more cars on the road, unsustainable levels of water use, and erosion of flood resilience. These cumulative environmental impacts of the Busway and associated property development will never be subject to strategic evaluation.</p> <p>The CSET busway scheme was classified as poor value for money per DfT methodology before C-19 impacted working patterns and the CAM project was scrapped, and this is without taking into consideration the cumulative impacts that come from the proposed large scale destruction of our Green Belt.</p> <p>I discuss with my children the need for more affordable public transport in this area but I am unable to explain to them the logic behind carving their local environment into bitesize chunks for property developers, or how encouraging people to drive to a 2,000+ space park and ride facility will take us towards carbon neutrality. How can the GCP continue to propose the CSET ‘white elephant’ to current residents, taxpayers and future generations? Please pause the scheme and rethink smarter, sustainable public transport solutions for this area.</p>
Martin Goldman	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>Since COVID-19 our way of living is challenged. Our outlook and our future vision transformed.</p> <p>Aspects of Cambridge transport access - Waterbeach, Northstowe, Cambourne, Bedford, Great Abington - are being addressed separately. No Linton or Haverhill. An even more fragmented Cambridge approaches.</p> <p>East-West Rail - without public consultation - rejects a northern route. They plan to divide communities. Viaducts twice the height of our houses are proposed to carry noisy trains with smelly and dangerous diesel freight fumes to be broadcast far and wide. No electrification!</p>

	<p>The wisdom and practice of professional consultants claim to quantify value and economic benefit. This is in the process of having its principles challenged. The how of its measurement and for whom.</p> <p>The wisdom of hindsight is wonderful. 25 years ago a campaign for a railway to link Cambridge to St Ives was defeated. We got the guided bus, with half the number of promised passengers. It is 8 kilometres short of the Edinburgh-London mainline. Freight cannot use it. Two thirds of the time it is empty.</p> <p>Another bus route is proposed, dividing the Gog Magog Hills. Perversely, it does not align to existing routes. More congestion. More opportunities to litter the Green Belt with housing.</p> <p>More than any other part of England, wildlife has declined in Cambridgeshire. A call for a Nature Network is made. A band of opportunity exists: Fulbourn, across the Gog Magogs, Wandlebury, Trumpington Meadows and Coton.</p> <p>Pressure for recreational space close to our homes has risen. We need to create more practical opportunities to generate and reinforce our physical and mental wellbeing. We need to link our overview of these individual issues in a longer-term vision - one to avoid compounding historic planning failures.</p> <p>Where is the joined-up thinking in Cambridge area transport strategy?</p>
<p>Colin Greenhalgh</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>Given the current poor business case for CSET, why is the new economic model not being made available for public scrutiny and does this not undermine the credibility of the methodology and the resulting projections?</p>
<p>Lynda Warth County Access &amp; Bridleways Officer – Cambs British Horse Society</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>Issues for Consideration:</p> <p>2.2 Wherever possible, feedback received has been incorporated into the scheme's design. The following key refinements have been made to the scheme's design following recommendations and preferences raised in the consultation. A number of design refinements have been made following the EIA consultation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian and cycle access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve subject to landowner agreement;</li> </ul> <p>This should include equestrian access – these routes have been used on a permissive basis by equestrians for over 25 years. Please could the Joint Assembly confirm that any permissive access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve will be negotiated for all non motorised users and not just pedestrians and cyclists?</p>
<p>Gavin Flynn</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>The CSET as planned bypasses existing centres of population and carves a swathe of destruction across our local greenbelt. Moreover, a tarmac road is carbon-intensive, as is the 2,000-space carpark needed at Babraham to support CSET. The latter will undermine local bus services by attracting people into their cars.</p> <p>Given all three Council's stated support for sustainability, doubling nature and preserving green spaces as part of their strategy for climate change, and the recent Cambridge Nature Network with its emphasis on the Magog Hills, will the GCP listen to public demands for an open and transparent reassessment of alternatives to their proposal?</p>
<p>Jenny Coe</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>An integrated transport strategy for Cambridge and beyond would bring CSET together with East West Rail, existing rail lines, greenways, expanded on-road bus services, pedestrian routes and restrictions on car access to the city centre in a strategic, joined up manner, rather than hoping that they will all somehow magically come together to solve congestion and pollution and serve an expanding city over the coming decades: given that</p>

	<p>the new Mayor proposes to review the Cambridge Autonomous Metro, can the GCP justify why it does not appear to be pausing and reviewing its CSET plans to avoid developing a key part of Cambridgeshire transport infrastructure as a silo?</p>
<p>Barbara Kettel and Tom Robinson *</p> <p>* Duplicate questions being combined</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>With the CSET busway operating at capacity on opening (i-Transport Report commissioned by Gt Shelford and Stapleford Parish Councils) how will the vision for growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus be accommodated, and with the limited road capacity in central Cambridge preventing the implied exponential increase in the number of buses, should a more scalable system and future-proofed infrastructure be planned such as light rail?</p>
<p>Colin Harris Cambridge Connect</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>Given it has been demonstrated that a technically feasible alternative CSET route via the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford is possible, and that this has been accepted by the GCP consultants Mott MacDonald and Atkins, and that a full appraisal of this alternative as put forward by the Great Shelford and Stapleford Parish Councils in the independent i-Transport report has never been carried out, will the GCP undertake to make a full comparative appraisal of this alternative, including full consideration of the environmental, landscape, social and heritage aspects as well as transport benefits, and please provide a full justification for the answer?</p>
<p>Miranda Fyfe</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <p>The village Great Abington already has a bus service with a journey time of just 13 minutes into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). The only real problem with this existing service is its infrequency (only two buses per hour, reducing to just one per hour after 7pm) and its excessive cost (return fare for an adult is £7, and £4.85 for a child). Similarly, Sawston has an existing service that's only 21 minutes to CBC (three per hour, reducing to one per hour after 6pm; same prices).</p> <p>In London's huge "Transport for London" area, equivalent bus journeys would only cost £1.55 one way for an adult (including a change of services in Cambridge to go on elsewhere within an hour), with a daily fare cap of £4.65; and the buses would be completely free for children up to age 16.</p> <p>The difference between London and Cambridgeshire is of course that in London the buses are not run for profit by private companies. Cambridgeshire could use this model. Running many extra buses along the existing road routes would also have none of the huge environmental impact that all of your proposed new construction of tarmac route, parking provision, concrete flyovers, etc. will have: all that excessive production of CO2 in the construction process is counter to the national aim to reduce carbon emissions in order to combat the climate emergency, and it is simply not necessary if the ultimate goal is just to provide extra bus services. And Park&amp;Ride just "bakes in" reliance on the private car, rather than helping people to move away from car ownership.</p> <p>My question is: Will the GCP now work with the Mayor to direct its funds towards franchised bus services on existing roads, and abandon this environmentally damaging and unnecessary new infrastructure?</p>
<p>Peter and Susan Ray</p>	<p><b>Agenda Item 12 – CSETS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Can you please confirm that there will be a Public Inquiry for this project and if there is not to be a PI, why not?</li> <li>2) Was a public inquiry part of the original or previous project plan, particularly any plans that were included in any of the public consultations and exhibitions?</li> <li>3) Is there an option for the planning application or equivalent to be "called in" for the Secretary of State to determine, particularly in view of the huge Covid impacts and need to spend public money very wisely?</li> </ol>

	<p>4) I understand that the GCP has cited increased costs as one reason not to pursue the alternative route using the old railway line. In view of concern about costs and in light of the events of 2020/2021 and their potential wider impacts on the future, has the GCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Seriously re-considered either of the original cheaper A1307 options for the SE Transport project? If not why not?</li><li>b) Seriously considered, or considering in view of representations, an appropriate pause in the project? If not why not?</li></ul> <p>5) To whom (Cambridge City Council, Cambridge County Council, Secretary of State or someone else?) would one have to make representations for a Public Inquiry to be held on the South East Transport mass transport project, and by what date, if any? Who should one contact in those organisations please?</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------