

9th September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Item

Question	
John Grant	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>The question refers to paragraph 13.2 on pp 52-53 of the Agenda Pack, and item 7 paragraphs 3.2 and 3.8 on pp 67-69.</p> <p>Following the success of the trial in west Cambridge, will GCP consider using Autonomous Vehicles in Waterbeach, to provide transport within the village and new town, including serving the railway station (whether or not it is relocated) and the various industrial and research sites?</p> <p>Will the team also consider the possibility of running the Vehicles at a higher speed (probably on dedicated tracks) to link into neighbouring settlements such as north Cambridge and Cottenham?</p>
Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Evidence published in July 2021 from the Cycle City Ambition Programme emphasises that there is significant potential to grow cycling in Cambridge: the sooner this is unlocked, the sooner benefits could be realised in terms of health, congestion, air quality and reduction of carbon emissions. Therefore Camcycle's questions on this agenda item seek to press for the rapid delivery of key active travel routes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has been no specific agenda item on the much-needed Greenways at any meeting this year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Can you provide detail on the progress on these schemes? o What are the 'early interventions' which have been allocated £1.75m for delivery this financial year? 2. We're pleased to see progress on the Chisholm Trail but seek reassurance that Phase 1 will open by the end of 2021. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What are the 'significant time risks' mentioned in point 10.13? o When will the bridge over Coldham's Brook and the railway underpass be addressed and will either require closure of the Coldham's Common path? 3. We'd also like to know more details on progress on the Madingley Road project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is the timeline for completion next year? o Will detailed designs be presented to the Executive Board in December? 4. The objectives of the Smart Signals project (13.7) are confusing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How are they prioritising those using sustainable transport (especially pedestrians or those wheeling cycles) when easing motor traffic congestion and reducing idling seems to be the main focus (item 7, 6.9)? o Are the GCP's traffic reduction targets built into junction designs? Junctions are a significant barrier to safe active travel routes and the reallocation of road space because 'traffic flow' at junctions consistently seems to be placed higher than space for people.
David Trippett (Resident of Coldhams Lane and officer of Coldham's Lane Resident's Association)	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>At the previous meeting of the GCP, members firmly agreed that Eastern Access schemes needed to alleviate private motor traffic on the Northern trunk of Coldhams Lane, described as "one of the very worst congested roads in Cambridge" (Cllr Herbert). Extensive free parking at the Beehive Centre, demonstrably inadequate bus services, and the GCP's works to ameliorate traffic on Newmarket Rd were all cited as continuing drivers of congestion for Coldhams Lane. Residents continue to suffer from heavily congested traffic, and are very hopeful that the GCP will follow its words with actions. What proposals are being brought forward as a result of last meeting's discussion, and how will this integrate with the extended vision for a 'future bus network' recently published as part of its City Access paper?</p>

**9th September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Item**

<p>Roger Turnbull Apt Planning Ltd acting for a Stapleford resident working at Addenbrookes Hospital.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 66 of the Agenda gives greater priority to shorter-term bus improvements to promote sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions. 2. In 2020, Systra Ltd produced the Cambridge Bus Network Report (page 73 of Agenda) to meet the GCP target to reduce traffic by 20% by 2031. It proposed 10 min. frequencies from rural villages to Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) which aligned with City Deal objectives. 3. Paragraph 2.1.24 of the Systra Report said that the rural bus network was unattractive because it was “circuitous & infrequent.” It proposed a new X7 service (4 buses p.hour) routed via the A1301, cutting journey times from Great Shelford by c.15 mins, Fig 32 & para 4.3.10. 4. My question is, will City Access programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet GCP objectives to reduce traffic by 20%, & reduce carbon emissions, - Identify that the rural bus network is unattractive due to circuitous routes & infrequent services, - Increase bus frequencies from 20 mins to 10 mins on the A1301 corridor (instead of bypassing Sawston, Stapleford & Great Shelford, as proposed in the CSET Study), <p>Does the City Access proposals make the £100m+ cost of the CSET proposals Poor Value for Money, with an under-estimated impact on the Green Belt/landscape?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With minimal modal shift (page 18 of the Outline Business Case Econ Case 2020), - Misleading travel benefits excluding 20-30 mins perceived walking/waiting times which are longer than cycling journey times, & by-passing the 14,000 pop. in Sawston, Stapleford & Great Shelford, (Shelford Rail Option report), - With a negative effect on existing bus services, losing 56% of their passengers (Table 4.3 & para 5.2.2 of Mott MacDonald Update May 2021). <p>Will the revised CSET Economic Case include the City Access measures in the GCP Do-Nothing case, against which the CSET proposals will be assessed?</p> <p>I therefore repeat my Freedom of Information request for the release of 2020/21 CSET transport modelling results & evidence of revised travel benefits.</p>
<p>David Stoughton Chair, Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The City Access Strategy makes constant references to promoting walking but has few proposals that address the barriers pedestrians face. Reducing congestion and pollution and closing some streets to cars would greatly improve the environment and potentially encourage walking. However, our survey and outreach at Living Streets Cambridge records an increasing number of negative factors that deter walkers and especially the disabled, the partially sighted and the blind.</p> <p>Notable among the factors deterring pedestrians are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant growth in pavement parking since lockdown, possibly encouraged by increases in deliveries and collections, but there have been noticeable increases in entirely residential areas too, o The growing multiplicity of alternative modes of transport, including private eScooters, motorised skateboards and spinning wheels, which are either illegal or unregulated but whose users assume that taking them on footways is permitted despite the alarm this causes for many pedestrians, o Further increases in unnecessary cycling on pavements. <p>Living Streets welcomes alternative modes that support active travel where they are segregated from footways and sees an opportunity to greatly improve first and last mile</p>

9th September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Item

	<p>travel for longer journeys and those involving public transport. Availability of eScooters at bus stops might, for instance, increase bus occupancy.</p> <p>However, if walking is to increase significantly, these negative factors need to be addressed and, while control of them is split between different councils and agencies and may require legislation, collaborative action is essential.</p> <p>Will this assembly undertake to coordinate policies to segregate modes of travel and return the footways to the use of pedestrians as intended? Further, will it work with appropriate bodies to ensure that footways are properly regulated and abuses controlled?</p> <p>Finally, will the Greater Cambridge Partnership explore the potential benefits of integrating legal alternative modes such as licensed eScooters with public transport?</p>
Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The City Access project is vitally important, but this report raises more questions than it answers. Given the risk of a car-based recovery from Covid and the county's limited carbon budget, the plans and timelines are unambitious. There is no holistic vision pulling together work from local authorities (e.g. Making Space for People, LCWIP) to deliver a sustainable transport network with integration between public transport and active travel.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new bus strategy will see up to 1,150 buses entering Cambridge per day (Systra) which requires space for their movements and will create additional conflict with people walking and cycling. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What will be done to mitigate this? o What's happened to the plan to extend the Core Traffic scheme with additional bus gates? 2. The paper states that measures to discourage car use must follow the implementation of alternatives; however both reliable bus journeys and safe cycle routes depend on traffic reduction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Steer report suggests 'an incremental approach...that ratchets up incentives and disincentives in tandem'. Is this being explored? 3. Point 6.9 talks about bringing forward a programme of roadspace reallocation to deliver 'a revised network hierarchy ... that prioritises sustainable modes of transport' building on Active Travel Fund schemes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How does this fit into City Access? o Does the 'roadspace management scheme' scheduled for 2023 at the earliest (6.25) just apply to charging elements? o The February report suggested that the draft network hierarchy would be consulted on this year – is it due to be part of the City Access consultation? 4. It's unclear why two further consultations are needed following Choices for Better Journeys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What will they involve? o Will options be set in context of the GCP's traffic reduction targets and partners' climate commitments (3.3) so residents can make properly informed responses?
Linny Purr **	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>This question is an appeal to the GCP to carry out its science from a 'systems' perspective and see road closures as being about justice, not chiefly about transport.</p> <p>Closing a road to through traffic is a socially divisive act. This is a moral issue and it is immoral to use people as collateral damage.</p> <p>In the meeting notes, for each closure that is recommended, it states, "It is inevitable that some traffic would be displaced."</p>

9th September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Item

	<p>This means that while some get to live in a cul-de-sac, 'green' and great with enhanced active travel, virtually no traffic past their doors and increased value of their homes, others, inevitably, are forced to take their traffic, congestion, emissions, and danger as well as their own.</p> <p>Road closures also harm the local economy; commuters who live beyond cycling distance; the elderly and disabled, and all those with mobility problems; all users of the road for necessary journeys; and locals forced to take lengthy detours round the barrier. The environment will suffer as alternative journeys are much longer.</p> <p>When all the rhetoric round, 'It's for COVID, cycling, speeding, lorries, climate-crisis, 'trial only'', is done, you are still left with the policy being either fair or unfair.</p> <p>National evidence (Ealing et al) proved that road closures and cycle lanes are not all you need to change travelling behaviour. Traffic evaporation was a false claim. Other equitable solutions and incentives are available.</p> <p>Please govern by consent from a holistic perspective and manage interdependency. Put justice and the environment, at the heart of transport policies.</p> <p>If not, children in the 'side roads' will be forced to live in 'High Traffic Neighbourhoods'. One question will be, "Who is it who will go and explain to these children why their lungs are not as important as the ones that you gave a 'Low Traffic Neighbourhood' to?</p> <p>** Representing the vast majority of residents in Havenfield Retirement Flats, Arbury Road, for whom she is the spokesperson (04.09.20 Survey of 57 occupied flats - 44 opposed to modal filter, 5 supported, 1 abstention).</p>
<p>Nick Flynn and Robert Rawlinson *</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>1. Given the officers report states no negative evidence to support the proposal to rescind the experimental order, and there is clear evidence the objectives have been met, as well as the proven popularity of the scheme with residents and non-residents, what is the justification for re-opening the road?</p> <p>On 'whether it should be retained', the Luard/Sedley Taylor scheme scored more highly in responses from non-residents than it did from residents - 61% of all respondents feeling that the restriction should be retained and made permanent, more than for the schemes in Newtown, Nightingale Avenue or Storey's Way.</p> <p>2. What would be the council's reason for re-opening the road when this would make the roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians? Both the council and central government have stated objectives to encourage people out of their cars and to use other more environmentally friendly modes of transport. The GCP report states it was used by over 700 cyclists per day.</p> <p>The report states consultation responses show it has been 'successful in improving walking and cycling and making the area safer'. Also, there is clear evidence previously provided to the Council on the frequency of accidents before the closure of the road.</p> <p>According to the GCP's own report, there were 2 serious and 6 slight injuries on Luard Road or Sedley Taylor Road including their junctions with Hills Road or Long Road from 2017 to the start of the trial period in 2020. No collisions were recorded during the ETRO trial period.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding the intended impact of the road closure to displace traffic on to Long Road, away from Luard/Sedley Taylor roads that have become a classic residential 'rat-run', what evidence is there to show a net increase in traffic and/or pollution levels that could be used as a justification to remove the road closure?</p> <p>The officers' report states 'there is no data to support that the displacement has been any worse than for any road closure sites', there is NO proposal to rescind any of those 5 ETRO schemes. In addition, the officers' report states that there is 'no air quality</p>

9th September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Item

	<p>data' to support or disagree that any traffic displacement has negatively affected pollution levels.</p> <p>4. Given the justification for rescinding the order is an alleged increase in complaints to the signals team regarding the Hills Road/Long Road junction, where is the evidence on changes in journey times and what consideration has been given to the impact of the reopening of the nearby Fendon Road roundabout in July 2020? This change, shortly before the Luard Road Experimental Traffic Order came into effect, would also have been expected to increase traffic volumes on Long Road independently of the Luard Road scheme.</p> <p><i>Note: the above represents a combination of questions submitted by Nick Flynn and Robert Rawlinson * to avoid duplication.</i></p> <p><i>* Mr Rawlinson's questions were put forward by the following list of residents on Luard Road and Sedley Taylor Road and presented as a single request for the convenience of the Joint Assembly:</i></p> <p><i>Chris Parkins, Susan Hegarty, Doreen Hodgson, Braden Howarth, Jim Metcalf, Heather Warwick, David Clary, Heather Clary, Peter Hewkin, Rory Powe, Don Broom, Sally Broom, Vivien Perutz, Michelle Pearl, Emma Duncan, Anne Lyon, Richard Lyon, Robert Rawlinson, Callinan and Pete Fox.</i></p>
Anna Williams on behalf of Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes this report; it's good to see detailed data on traffic flows, journey time, speed, collisions and air quality, in addition to consultation responses.</p> <p>As the report says, these schemes included the long-term goal to create a better environment for active travel and support the government's target of half of urban journeys being walked or cycled by 2030. Key metrics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people who used these routes as a pedestrian or cyclist • The improvement in actual and perceived safety (the main barrier to active travel) • A reduction in motor traffic which may create a route suitable for all ages and abilities without the need for protected infrastructure. <p>The report shows that all schemes were successful, with routes rebalancing transport in favour of walking and cycling. Over 80% of those travelling in Carlyle Road, Silver Street and Luard Road are doing so actively, and daily levels of cycling in Carlyle Road are approaching those on popular routes such as the Riverside bridge. According to LTN 1/20, the level of motor traffic on Bateman Street now makes it an appropriate route for all types of cyclist, whereas the 4000+ vehicle movements before (2018) created a barrier to many.</p> <p>Camcycle would like to see all these schemes retained and improved. It is completely unacceptable that Luard Road has been recommended for removal when it has achieved its aims.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are high levels of cycling on this route. 2. A majority (61%) support the retention of the filter. 3. 63% of respondents say the road is safer. 4. Collisions (and, anecdotally, non-reported 'near misses') have been reduced. <p>How can the GCP claim one of its transport aims is to 'prioritise greener and active travel' when here it is placing motor traffic flow and driver convenience above safer walking and cycling?</p>