

15 February 2018

**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 the public questions and answers for the meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which was held at the **COUNCIL CHAMBER - SOUTH CAMBS HALL** on **THURSDAY, 8 FEBRUARY 2018** at **4.00 p.m.**

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

---

**AGENDA**

**5. Questions from Members of the Public**

**PAGES  
1 - 6**

This page is left blank intentionally.

| No.                      | Questioner      | Question   | Responder | Response  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------|---|
| <b>For Agenda Item 7</b> |                 |  |           |   |
| 1                        | Roger Tomlinson | <p>Context: The Mayor of the Combined Authority has confirmed to the Cambridge News that his office leaked the Steer Davies Gleave report in December, and quotes were obtained from County transport officers and some Executive Board members to accompany press reports; and the chairman has written pieces extolling the potential of the schemes to parish community newsletters. However, the consultation on Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys: Phase One was still running, and the Mayor confirms he intended effectively to disrupt this process by advising the public that there were more options; we can confirm that some residents did find the new proposals very confusing.</p> <p>However, no route has yet been decided upon by the Executive Board formally, though it looks increasingly, as officers have repeatedly suggested, that the decision is pre-determined. Now Chris Tunstall, GCP Interim Transport Director, in his report to you points out that the Cambridge Area Metro scheme is predicated on an off-road guided busway, and indeed the comparison of costs for metro options assumes for the preferred bus option that the busway will be built and paid for outside the preferred bus scheme. He reports that legal discussions are under way on how to progress this, with the potential to assist early delivery. The relevant two paragraphs are 3.18 and 3.19.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">• 3.18 Existing schemes, such as Cambourne</p> |           | <p>The timetable for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme was set out and approved by the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board in a report presented on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017. This report also confirmed the basis for public consultation on the scheme. The consultation is now complete and is currently being analysed with the outcomes being used to inform the business case being presented to the Board in July 2018. This business case will consider the full range of issues which amount to the widest evaluation of the public benefit of each option and provide a recommendation to the Board on the preferred scheme for Phase 1 of the project.</p> <p>At this time the Board will be updated re the implications of Cambridge Area Metro and any potential impact on the options and any decision by the Board will take this into consideration. The decision will only be taken by the Board at this time based on the information presented to it.</p> <p>The specific ‘approval mechanism’ for any scheme proposal will to some extent depend on what scheme is taken forward. In the case of an ‘off road’ scheme it is likely that a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application is made to the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of a road based scheme it may be that local highway powers are needed although again this depends on the elements of that scheme. Should a TWAO be sought then at the point at which this application is made, the proposed transport mode will have to be set out and been subject to prior public consultation. As such</p> |

|  |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
|  |  | <p><i>to Cambridge and the Cambridge South East Corridor Transport Study, create the opportunity to transition in the future to provide key parts of the CAM infrastructure. The SDG integrated network proposition is predicated on these planned interventions being part of the solution.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• 3.19. Discussions are currently being undertaken with our legal advisors as to the most appropriate way of transitioning the existing schemes and subsequently procuring the necessary approvals/orders. The implications will be dealt with in future reports in respect of the individual schemes, subject to the Combined Authority progressing the detailed feasibility work for CAM. At this time it is not envisaged that this will delay the current programmes, but could potentially assist with early delivery of parts of a CAM network.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>(quoting of paragraphs to be removed in publication)</i></p> <p>Question: What exactly are the Transport Officers trying to achieve by these legal discussions and how does this impact on the Executive Board decision-taking timetable and process for Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys: Phase One?</p> |  | <p>engagement with the Department for Transport is underway in terms of the wider implications of CAM under the current regulatory regime for approval of guided transport systems.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

| For Agenda Item 9 |              |  |  |
|-------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 2                 | Maureen Mace | <p>The widening of the A10 is by its nature a road orientated approach. At the present time 60% of people working at the Science Park arrive by car and the new widened road will encourage more. How will parking be restricted at the Science Park and in the North of Cambridge and how will you get the modal shift onto other forms of transport especially to the train as the relocated station will not be near the A10 and is situated to the north east of Waterbeach?</p> | <p>The dualling of the A10 was one of the headline recommendations from the study. However, it was also clear that to provide additional travel capacity, demand on the highway network created by the new developments would need to be managed using policy, planning and regulatory tools. To complement this and to encourage a shift away from the private car, public transport, pedestrian and cycling enhancements should be delivered ahead of any major new highway capacity.</p> <p>Considering the Science Park specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levels of parking at the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe will be critical to determining the scale of development that can be accommodated on the transport network in the future.</li> <li>• Car mode share at the Science Park is particularly high, primarily due to the availability of unrestrained parking on the site, much of which is underutilised.</li> <li>• Much lower car mode shares have been achieved elsewhere in the City through tighter restrictions on parking levels</li> </ul> <p>Parking can be restricted at the Science Park and Northern Fringe through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning process as planning applications are determined. Parking levels can be established as a planning condition.</li> <li>• The use of existing highway powers to create Controlled Parking Zones around the sites, to discourage people from parking off site. This is</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>consistent with one of the eight points of the City Access project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting a site-wide approach to car parking management and using ambitious travel planning to encourage a shift to non-car modes.</li> </ul> <p>In conjunction with active parking restraint and the relocation of Waterbeach Railway Station, to promote mode shift away from the private car the study recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early implementation of the cycle measures</li> <li>• Early progression of the segregated public transport corridor from Waterbeach to the Northern Fringe, together with Park and Ride facility provision at Waterbeach just off the A10.</li> <li>• The precise location of the Park &amp; Ride site will be determined through the master planning process, however to intercept vehicles from the A10 the site will need to be located as close to the highway as possible.</li> <li>• The relocated railway station will need to be highly accessible by cycle and foot to enable maximum use by people living or working in the new development and the existing village. The exact detail of this and level of any associated parking at the station will be developed through the masterplanning process.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

For Agenda Item 10

|   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3 | James Littlewood<br>CEO<br>Cambridge<br>Past, Present<br>& Future | <p>One of the more encouraging findings of the Big Conversation is the apparent willingness of commuters to ditch their cars in favour of public transport, provided a high quality public transport service was made available. The report sets out the improvements in public transport that would be needed – more bus routes, reliability to timetable, cheaper fares, frequency of service, free parking at P&amp;R etc.</p> <p>We know what needs to be done to encourage modal shift – but herein lies the problem for all these measures will greatly increase operating costs. So where is this additional operating revenue going to come from? If substantial long-term funding to subsidise an improved public transport system cannot be secured, then all these ideas will just remain dreams.</p> <p>The only realistic source for sustainable long-term funding is for drivers to pay if they chose to drive rather than use an upgraded high quality public transport system. In the light of the Big Conversation, is it not now time that the GCP Board faced up to realism and commissioned the research to devise a fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory charging system, possibly in combination with a pollution charge to improve air quality, which could then be the subject of a public consultation? And for those who still believe that charging would be unfair, divisive and unpopular, it is interesting to note that some form of road charging system scored the highest of the demand management measures proposed in the</p> | 1 | <p>Work is currently ongoing in respect of potential demand management options. There will be a Report on the progress of this work coming to the February Joint Assembly and the March Executive Board.</p> |
|---|---|--|---|--|

**Executive Board Questions and Responses 8<sup>th</sup> February 2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>survey.</p> <p>Without a secure long-term source of revenue, the ideas for modal shift expressed by the public will just remain wishful thinking. The inertia of the GCP will then condemn Cambridge to worse and worse gridlock.</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|