



4 July 2018

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find attached a supplement for the next meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which will be held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER, GUILDHALL, CAMBRIDGE** on **WEDNESDAY, 4 JULY 2018** at **4.00 p.m.**

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

AGENDA

7. Questions from Members of the Public

**PAGES
1 - 4**

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 7

Public Questions to the GCP Executive Board 4 July 2018

No	Questioner	Question
For Agenda Item 9: GCP Transport Strategy		
9	Antony Carpen	<p>On the issue of the transport strategy, & the delay/pause request from The Mayor of Cambs, & the Q to the Assembly from Edward Leigh, what scope is there for a programme of pavement widening in Cambridge where parts of front gardens of properties can be purchased to widen pavements of main walking routes into town? Will the Board commission an outline feasibility study or consultation to ask the public which walking routes might be suitable for such a programme of pavement widening?</p>
For Agenda Item 11 Milton Road		
11a	Erik de Visser	<p>How many of you travel by bus along Milton Road? If you do, you will know that the majority of buses do not travel in the bus lanes.</p> <p>Like most people living in Cambridge my main mode of travel is by bike. It is quicker than any other mode of transport. I know exactly how long it will take me to get to work in the centre of town and to any other place I wish to visit. A car or bus is very unpredictable and I have to allow much more time.</p> <p>The latest plans for Milton Road show three lanes reserved for motorised vehicles, two which will be used just for cars and lorries. I just cannot understand how this is going to reduce congestion, get people out of their cars and improve air quality.</p> <p>Previous City Deal modelling showed that with two bus lanes along the residential stretch of Milton Road, bus journeys would only be reduced by 99 seconds. The problem does not lie here but at the A14 roundabout, the Science Park Area and the centre of the city.</p> <p>What the residential part of MR needs is not bus lanes but improved cycling and walking which makes people feel safe and will encourage people out of their cars to use it</p> <p>Could the Executive Board discuss why we need a bus lane the length of Milton Road when it is rarely used even at peak times and is virtually unused at all during other times except when three or four cars distance from a junction? It is a waste of space. Take them away and we could have two slightly wider traffic lanes and smart signals for buses. This would allow improvements for cyclists and pedestrians which could at last become world class.</p>
11b	Barbara Taylor	<p>My question concerns all the grass verges shown in the final concept design but I refer to one area as an example. I refer to Appendix A showing the final concept design and the cross section E-E, near Downham's Lane. Please see the two attachments.</p> <p>In the final concept design a tree lined avenue in grass verges is shown. At E-E: a grass verge width of 1.7 meters on the outbound side (the current grass verge here is 2.3m, a loss of 0.6m) and a grass verge width of 1.5 meters on the inbound side (the current</p>

Public Questions to the GCP Executive Board 4 July 2018

		<p>grass verge width is 2.7m, a loss of 1.2m). According to TDAG's guidance (see item 5.18 under Landscape and Environment quoted below), these grass verge widths if less than 1.5 meters, means that the promised tree-lined avenue of trees will be in hard landscape and not grass verges. "Whilst the final concept design indicates areas of verge, some narrow areas may be hard landscaped where their width is less than 1.5 metre, in line with TDAG Guidance" According to these drawings, the width of grass verge on both sides of the road at E-E is just about viable. However, my concern is that the carriageway at E-E given here is 21 metres which is inconsistent with the 20.35 metres we have measured. This means 0.65 metres needs to be taken from somewhere.</p> <p>QUESTION Please can you confirm that there will be grass verges at the scheme's completion, as shown in this final concept design? It is important that when the public come to complete the Milton Road consultation questionnaire, that the visual and environmentally green image illustrated is accurate.</p>
11c	Anne Hamill	<p>In September 2016, in a letter to Cllrs Jocelyne Scutt and Roger Hickford, the Executive Board gave its '... support to an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road, and also the provision of grass verges and planting ...' However, there seems to be a contrary recommendation in the paper, 'Milton Road: Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements Preferred Option Design' that accompanies item 11 of today's agenda. Under 'Landscape and the Environment' at point 5.18, the text says: 'As previously reported, it is planned to replant with semi-mature trees with a girth no larger than 16-18cm, which in size equates to 3-5m high.' The words 'no larger than' offer a hostage to fortune as the actual girth would be at the discretion of the contractor appointed to carry out the work, and could be considerably less than that circumference, and still fulfil any contractual stipulation. So my question is: Will the Executive Board please stipulate that the girth of the trees is at least 16-18cm, so this will be the minimum rather than the maximum circumference size?</p>
11d	Maureen Mace	<p>The residents of Milton Road first heard of the plans to update Milton Road in November 2015. The engineering works may be finished in 2022, so for approximately seven years we have watched the plans change.</p> <p>Now they are coming close to the final design I would like to see some kind of artwork or artworks on Milton Road to celebrate the new designs paid for from the original budget of £23 million.</p> <p>This artwork should be chosen by the locals and appropriate advisors and could take the form of a sculpture where the residential area starts and/or could be in the form of some kind of</p>

Public Questions to the GCP Executive Board 4 July 2018

		<p>seating areas, perhaps with metal figures (example below), at strategic points along the road such as at the Kings Hedges junction, outside the row of shops near Arbury Road and close to the library. Not only would this give a sense of continuity along the length of the road but would also be a place for locals to sit and talk.</p> <p>I have no idea how much something like this would cost but I do know it would bring a lot of pleasure to those who live, work and go about their daily business in the area.</p> <p>So my question is: Could a sum of money be allocated to artwork in the budget for Milton Road?</p>
11e	Richard Cushing	<p>We have been informed that a benefit : cost analysis has been prepared for the Milton Road project, showing a very high figure. In July 2017, I asked at the GCP Assembly that reports of this nature should provide up-to-date information for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – The origin and destination of people who travel along the route; 2 – Present measured journey times correlated with modeled journey times throughout the day, for all days of the week, for motor vehicles, cyclists, and walkers; 3 – Pollution levels presently and according to the model; 4 – A prediction of the immediate effect of implementing the changes, together with the prediction of the effect in 2031. <p>The response was that information would be available following an ANPR survey. The survey lasted for only eight days, the sites chosen did not relate to any other survey, and analysis appears incomplete.</p> <p>The County used to publish monthly traffic data, but this ceased almost two years ago, in September 2016.</p> <p>In the past I have found information upon which the Milton Road project is based to be misleading and incomplete. Please will you supply the raw data, the assumptions upon which the analysis is based, and the complete computation of this benefit : cost analysis, relating it to earlier analyses?</p>
For Agenda Item 13: Greenways		
13	James Littlewood of Cambridge Past, Present and Future	<p>Through correspondence with Mike Davies, we understand that proposals for Greenway “quick wins” include widening of paths, which will result in the loss of green verges. We would expect that a “greenway” project would mitigate for this loss of “green” by creating compensatory green habitats either on site or at a nearby location. This would inevitably increase the costs of the project. Can the Board or relevant officers confirm whether their cost estimates for the quick wins include sufficient funding to pay for this mitigation and whether the intention is to provide such mitigation given that planning permission will not be required in most cases? If this work</p>

Public Questions to the GCP Executive Board 4 July 2018

		<p>is NOT included in these figures, Cambridge Past, Present & Future would urge that this is done before any approval is given. In principle we support the concept of Greenways, but they should be genuinely green and we would expect them to result in net benefits of greenspace and biodiversity, not a loss.</p>
<p>For Agenda Item 15 – Quarterly Progress Report</p>		
<p>15.</p>	<p>Wendy Blythe, Chair, FeCRA (Federation of Cambridge Residents Association)</p>	<p>Almost a year ago now (July 2017) the GCP Board received the following letter from over fifty community groups, including small businesses, across Greater Cambridge</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'. 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> <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>We also submitted a document summarising the ways in which we would like to see the process improved to ensure that it is fair, transparent and democratic (attached below).</p> <p>We are dismayed that none of these unanimously agreed proposals for basic good practice (attached) has yet been adopted, and that the 'consultations' carried out on GCP projects to date have all been deeply flawed.</p> <p>Will you now ensure that these improvements are fully considered and implemented as soon as possible to ensure fairness, transparency, and genuine community involvement at all stages of the process?</p> <p>(Note: The above question was not accepted for the meeting as it had previously been asked and responded to by the Greater Cambridge Partnership)</p>