

No	Questioner	Question
1.	Stacey Weiser on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 8: City Access and Public Transport Improvements</b></p> <p>The Board paper for Agenda 8 stresses the increasing urgency of tackling the effect of air pollution in Cambridge. Paragraph 3.7 contains the alarming statistic that each year air pollution contributes to 106 premature deaths in Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>In response to one of our previous questions, the GCP Executive has said that any potential road charging, including a pollution charge, would be introduced only when improved alternatives to the car were in place. We can see from the various GCP project updates that such alternatives will not be in place until 4 or 5 years' time at the earliest. We are assuming that this is why the GCP Assembly discussion on 6 June concluded that "we need to move very cautiously and slowly" over the introduction of demand management.</p> <p>It would be grossly irresponsible to wait 4 or 5 years to tackle air pollution, so what CambridgePPF wants to know is what the GCP intends to do in the interim? For example, we note that nearly 50% of air pollution is caused by diesel buses, when we know that electric buses are a viable alternative. Surely the Board must recognise the urgency of starting now to plan the introduction of a Low Emission Zone covering the central area of the city?</p>
2.	Niall O'Byrne, Chair Harston Parish Council.	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 9: West of Cambridge Package – Cambridge South West Travel Hub</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At £24,500 per parking place, this project is poor value for money. Had the decision been taken to provide on-site parking for the workers at the new Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus, firms moving there would have been obliged to fund construction of on-site parking for their workforce – perhaps multi-storey parking as at Addenbrookes Hospital. Instead, publicly funded parking at the new Hauxton P &amp; R is to be provided for corporate, well financed firms such as AstraZeneca. How can this major subvention from the 'public purse' for private industry be justified?</li> <li>2. Is this new P &amp; R to be permanent? Or is it, as the Mayor seems to have directed, a temporary infrastructure?</li> <li>3. If it is to be temporary, please answer the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When will it be decommissioned?</li> <li>b. How much will the decommissioning cost?</li> <li>c. Will the land be returned to its present Green Belt condition?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Hauxton P &amp; R will require additional traffic lights on the A10. Northbound traffic on the M11, exiting at Junction 11, will enter the new P &amp; R by crossing the north bound flow of traffic on the A10 at a traffic lights controlled crossing point. What measures are therefore planned to prevent tailbacks on the A10 into Hauxton and Harston? How will the traffic lights be sequenced to avoid queuing on the M11?</li> </ol> <p>It should be noted that, currently, the A10 north from from the junction of London Road and the High Street in Harston has a traffic flow of over 20,000 vehicles on an average 24 hour working day. This is forecast to increase by 30-40% in the period out to the end of the current Local Plan in 2031.</p>

27<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2019 GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY – PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3.	Tim Arnold	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</b></p> <p>The Park &amp; Ride site at Hauxton will not come on stream until at least 2021 - somehow down from the 2023 figure stated in earlier rounds of proposals - and, at £55M, is significantly more expensive than the figures quoted in the 2018 public consultation (£4-12M). And, as high-profile cases such as the Ely Bypass and King's Dyke crossing show, these projects usually overrun and overspend significantly.</p> <p>Given that a 'temporary' Cambridge South Station is likely to appear in a similar timeframe - and with travel hubs at places like Foxton and Whittlesford now in the frame - isn't a Park &amp; Ride at Hauxton a colossal waste of time and money which has been shown to be a disbenefit to both commuters and local communities?</p>
4.	Edward Leigh (will not be attending the meeting but someone will ask on his behalf TBC)	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</b></p> <p>Why are officers recommending the Board support a proposal which the Outline Business Case clearly and unambiguously demonstrates is "very poor value for money" (Treasury/DfT) and will intensify congestion "throughout the [road] network" (Mott MacDonald)?</p> <p>A supplementary letter has been sent to the Board with background to the question.</p>
5.	Peter Hayde on behalf of Harston Residents Group	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 9: Cambridge South West Travel Hub</b></p> <p>At the GCP Executive Board Meeting of 21<sup>st</sup> March 2018 Harston Residents Group expressed concern about the impact of a new Park and Ride site on traffic volume and air pollution in Harston.</p> <p>The decision of the Board was that further analysis should be undertaken for the Outline Business Case, including ; Traffic modelling along the A10 and M11 including air and noise pollution.</p> <p>It is disappointing to note in the Outline Business Case that none of this analysis has been undertaken in Harston.</p> <p>The Park &amp; Ride option selected will include 2 additional signalized junctions, for access and egress control, which will exacerbate congestion on the A10 back to and through Harston causing additional air pollution.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case does not include Harston in the impact area of the Park and Ride site.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case Environmental Appraisal is based on incomplete 2017 data gathered by South Cambs District Council inasmuch that there were no measurements recorded for July, October, November and December.</p> <p>Particulate and ozone levels are extrapolated from this incomplete data and generalized data for South Cambs area.</p> <p>The Executive Board has recommended that officers work with communities, the Joint Assembly commented on the potential impact on communities along the A10 and the need to mitigate that impact.</p> <p>The traffic volume has increased almost 20% in 3 years to 18800 daily in 2019 [GCP figure]. A further increase of 30-40% is forecast over the next years.</p> <p>The question is: What proposals are there for mitigation of the impact on communities along the A 10 ie Harston and when the proposals are being prepared will comprehensive monitoring of current air and noise pollution be undertaken?</p>

6.	Archie Garden on behalf of Stapleford Parish Council	<p><b>Agenda Item No. 10: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>We are disappointed to see that the papers provided to this meeting do not identify the fact that an alternative route for the proposed transit corridor for Strategy One needs to be properly assessed, and ask that this be formally instructed. The alternative makes further use of the former “Sawston - Haverhill Railway line” route (ref:Ordnance Survey Map of Sawston). A route via the old railway line would link naturally with the rail proposals for the East/West Railway Strategy, and deliver services to many more residents of Sawston, Stapleford and the Shelfords than the proposals in the documents presented (Page 183- Appendix “A” in the papers). Additionally, the Strategy One proposals as outlined would have a devastating impact on the green belt as well as wildlife habitats (ref:Cambridge Wildlife Trust). Representatives of the Parish Council have been assured that the alternative route is being properly assessed. Further robust representation has been made via the Stapleford and Shelford Neighbourhood planning process.”</p>
----	--	---