

**8th September 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
Dr Rebecca Teague	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>What are the proposed charge rates for residents of the congestion charge area and how would they apply?</p>
Dorte Napthen	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>I am perplexed about the congestion charge you are proposing, could you please outline how you expect this to work for clubs and sporting activities within the City? I am particularly concerned how coaches and volunteers would transport equipment to sites commonly within the congestion zone or how participants would transport large and heavy equipment (think golf clubs, cricket bags or easels) to these locations. Commonly these activities have a start time which would require transport before the cut-off for the congestion charge.</p> <p>Please do me the curtesy of not suggesting that this equipment could be carried on a bus, I have seen football coaches making several trips to their car with balls, cones, kit, refreshments, this could not be carried on a bus so how exactly do you envisage this not impacting the provision of these activities for residents.</p>
Lilian Rundblad	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Point 5.27 Page 50 Disabled Tax Class Vehicles</p> <p>I cannot find any mention of Mobility scooters or powered wheelchairs anywhere in the documentation. Are they included in the above exemptions in point 5.27?</p> <p>Mobility scooters and powered wheelchairs The law calls these 'invalid carriages. They must have a maximum speed of 8mph on the road and be fitted with a device limiting them to 4mph on footways to be exempt. Highway Code.</p>
Noga Ganany	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>I am writing to object to the implementation of a car charge (road user charge) in the proposed <i>Sustainable Travel Zone</i> plan. I am a mother of twins and a university worker who lives in Histon. My toddler twins attend a workplace nursery in West Cambridge. I work on the Sidgwick Site in Cambridge. My husband commutes to work by train from Cambridge North. Commuting by car is the only form of commute that would allow us to reach the nursery and our workplaces.</p> <p>To illustrate: driving our twins from our home to nursery and then to the Sidgwick Site takes only 20 minutes at peak time. However, the route from our home to nursery takes approximately 80 minutes with public transportation, which includes using two buses and more than 40 minutes of walking on foot (with toddler twins!). Using public transportation to get from nursery to my work would add another 15-25 minutes, bringing the total time of my daily commute up to four hours. If the car charge is implemented, we would be facing payments of more than a thousand pounds a year solely for my commute to work and nursery. This is not sustainable.</p> <p>Our community in Histon relies on services and amenities in Cambridge that are only accessible by car. The proposed road charge would be detrimental to the social fabric of our local community, harming those of us who would not qualify for exemptions, who are already struggling with financial difficulties but are nonetheless reliant on personal vehicles to access our workplaces, medical services, schools, and care centres. How will this plan benefit young families and the elderly?</p>

<p>Councillor Neil Harris Willingham Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Your details show:</p> <p>5.7 In keeping with the GCP's commitment that public transport must be improved...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From mid-2023, priority service improvements would be made including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Address existing deficits in access to the bus network from small towns and large villages (e.g. Willingham, Cottenham, Chatteris) <p>The proposals do not provide any improvement, replacing the existing (admittedly lengthy) direct service to Cambridge with a new circular route between Willingham and Papworth requiring changes to get to any of the destinations wanted by most residents, also costing more for multiple journeys.</p> <p>To achieve the aims of this consultation, it is essential that a village the size of Willingham has a direct bus link to Cambridge. Document '26082022 Making Connections - Bus Proposition Design recognises that the proposed rural loop deprives Willingham of the existing direct link to Cambridge, and makes two other suggestions: a dedicated service for Fenstanton, Swavesey, Over and Willingham that joins the busway to Cambridge at Longstanton; and extending Citi 6 serving Oakington to Swavesey via Willingham and Over. The first has merit - in our response to the Making Connections consultation Willingham Parish Council proposed that buses should leave the Busway to take in Willingham. Regarding the second, extending a route from Cottenham rather than Oakington would make more sense as Cottenham offers a range of facilities including educational - the Village College where most Willingham children go and also adult education – plus ongoing services to other locations such as Ely, Chatteris and March, which would open access without needing to travel into Cambridge</p> <p>These plans appear to be for the benefit of the operators and do not take account the transport user's actual needs. Can we be assured that these points will be taken seriously when the final plans are drawn up?</p>
<p>Anna Williams on behalf of CAMCYCLE</p>	<p>Agenda Item No: 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle supports proposals for a Sustainable Travel Zone in Cambridge, but any road charging must be implemented equitably with the proceeds going to public transport and active travel improvements that are put in place at speed. Reducing motor traffic by 50% would be transformative for cycling within the city and a positive step towards a greener, more people-focused region.</p> <p>Many of Camcycle's members and supporters have strongly welcomed these proposals. However, it is clear from other conversations we've had that there is some lack of trust in the alternatives being good enough before road charging is implemented. National Active Travel Commissioner Chris Boardman often talks about making cycling an "enticing and accessible alternative" to the car. The active travel and behaviour change aspects of the scheme have not been defined in any detail in the Strategic Outline Business Case but will be critical to the scheme's success. As well as options mentioned including active travel improvements, enhanced maintenance, and schemes to expand access to specialist and adapted cycles, the GCP must invest in a detailed communications and behaviour change plan. This needs to include PR, cycle training, travel planning, employer engagement and other measures designed to build a positive vision for the future and support people to make the transition to sustainable transport. Camcycle would also like to see the simpler and easier-to-achieve Workplace Parking Levy remain on the table as an important step towards a more sustainable city and a vital source of funding to help transform our streets.</p> <p>Our question is:</p> <p>What plans and timetables are in place to ensure the walking, cycling and bus networks delivered in the next few years will be enticing and accessible for those switching from driving and to provide</p>

	appropriate support to Cambridgeshire residents as they transition to more sustainable journeys?
Mahoney Goodman	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>In the 2019 Commons report on <i>Tackling inequalities faced by Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities</i>, the government acknowledged: "Gypsies, Travellers and Roma are among the most disadvantaged people in the country and have poor outcomes in key areas such as health and education."</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers have transited through Cambridge for centuries; finding work, visiting family, using hospital facilities, and playing an integral role throughout the history of cultural landmarks including the Midsummer Fair.</p> <p>Despite this, the EqIA for the Sustainable Travel Zone fails to mention potential adverse impacts on transiting Gypsies and Travellers, and the summary of proposed charge levels contains no specific reference to caravans. It's therefore unclear whether they will be eligible for low income and health discounts, which are disproportionately likely to apply.</p> <p>In any case, the stated need for input from vehicle users in assessing eligibility ignores the Cambridgeshire local authorities' failure to build trust with transiting Gypsies and Travellers, evidenced by lack of engagement with Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments.</p> <p>Furthermore, the implication that discounts will be provided via reimbursement begs the question: how? By definition, transiting Gypsies and Travellers have no fixed abode. Their stays in Cambridge are short, often ending in forcible eviction due to inadequate local authority provision of legal stopping places. Reliable access to internet and electricity are not guaranteed, and the education system's systemic failure to accommodate their needs means many are illiterate.</p> <p>Romani Gypsies and Irish Travellers have protected status under the 2010 Equality Act. Section 149 requires that public authorities "advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not". The barriers to accessing discounts and reimbursements are in clear violation of this objective.</p> <p>Will the GCP commit to a congestion charge exemption for transiting Gypsies and Travellers?</p>
East Cambridgeshire Councillor John Trapp	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>What is the 'East Cambridge Interchange' marked on the 'future bus network concept' between Cambridge City Centre and Newmarket? Is it simply the Newmarket Road Park and Ride or something more ambitious and radical? Will there be buses not only to the City centre?</p>
Wendy Blythe, on behalf of the FeCRA Committee	<p>Agenda Item No: 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>There are residents who are not registered as disabled who have mobility problems and cannot walk very far or carry heavy shopping. They need to drive sometimes. How will they be exempted? Has the GCP looked at other examples of time restriction as well as charging structures?</p> <p>The Combined Authority has funded a project for the City Portrait a piece of work proposed by the Councils covering the whole city which will provide a baseline, outcome and metrics-based approach to supporting a future City vision. Do the Greater Cambridge Partnership plan to use the evidence from the City Portrait project in relation to the congestion charge?</p>
David Stoughton Living Streets Cambridge	<p>Agenda Item No: 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Whilst we greatly welcome proposed reductions in traffic levels, encouragement of the use of public transport and the boost to active travel, expansion of the bus network will inevitably mean that the footways will be more heavily used. Footways in Cambridge are in a terrible condition, heavily rutted in many places and often flooded, access is often further impeded by badly placed A</p>

	<p>boards, pavement parking and wrongly sited street furniture.</p> <p>Will the proposed expansion of the bus network see an equivalent investment in footways so that walking is safe and pleasurable and not, as it often is at present, an ordeal?</p>
<p>Simon Webb on behalf of Martin Grant Homes</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project</p> <p>Martin Grant Homes (MGH) supports the principle of C2C. They wish to see a resilient, financially viable transport system that improves accessibility for all and reduces carbon emissions. The GCP has produced an extensive evidence base to inform its decisions on C2C. This evidence base should be followed.</p> <p>The justification for the proposed travel hub and 2000 space park and ride facility at Scotland Farm, is flawed. MGH has made consistent representations over a number of years to which they have had no written response.</p> <p>The GCP's own studies show that Scotland Farm is not the most favourable location. The consequence of their flawed two stage assessment is that Scotland Farm, with a multi-assessment criteria score of 0.49 was preferred to a site at North Cambourne with a corresponding score of 0.58. Using GCP's own rankings, a North Cambourne site is 18% better than GCP's preferred location. A site at North Cambourne is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well related to the existing settlement. • Well related to future development and infrastructure provision. • Not remote. • Not located on Green Belt land. • The highest ranked location using GCP's own assessment. <p>MGH submitted representations to the Better Bus Journeys Consultation 2017/18 based on work undertaken by WSP, the same consultant now advising GCP. That work concluded that the process was 'fundamentally flawed' and that a North Cambourne location should be reinstated. It is somewhat surprising that WSP can hold such contradictory views. More recent representations submitted by MGH in July 2022 based on work undertaken by i-Transport following a meeting with GCP officers, again demonstrated that GCP's decision process making is flawed.</p> <p>Our question is simple, on what basis is the GCP pursuing their main travel hub at a location that their own work shows is an inferior, less resilient, and less sustainable location than North Cambourne?</p>
<p>Carolyn Postgate</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project</p> <p>On pages 78 and 79 of the Agenda pack, paragraph 5 sets out C2C's Alignment with City Deal Objectives, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing a barrier to new homes and jobs • Providing better, greener transport • Unlocking Bourn Airfield site for development • Continuing the economic success of the area • Improving access and connectivity • Improving air quality • Reducing carbon emissions • Addressing social inequalities • Improving journeys to and from employment <p>Every single one of these objectives is satisfied by an on-road solution for the section of the C2C route from Madingley Mulch to Cambridge City. Keeping electric buses on Madingley Road ensures greater connectivity to areas of high employment such as Cambridge Biomedical Campus, the University's West Cambridge site, and meets carbon emissions targets at a fraction of the cost of an off-road route.</p>

	<p>Why, then, is the GCP still considering forging ahead with a tarmac road which renders productive farmland un-farmable, destroys irreplaceable orchard trees and blights the Cambridge Green Belt at a cost of upwards of 200 million pounds when a viable alternative on-road route exists?</p>
<p>Deborah Whitton Spriggs</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>In relation to the item on Cambridge to Cambourne Busway:</p> <p>You have specified various measures that will enable the scheme to achieve a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. But that calculation is only valid within the context of adhering to the principles of the industry-standard tool, the Mitigation Hierarchy. The overarching principle of the Mitigation Hierarchy is that, first, everything possible must be done to avoid impacts on biodiversity. In the case of C2C, an on-road option is possible, and cheaper, and would avoid tarmacking over Green Belt land, wildlife corridors, a City Wildlife site and a Traditional Orchard which is a designated priority habitat. Given that avoidance is entirely possible, how can you claim to be adhering to the Mitigation Hierarchy or claim any Biodiversity Net Gains?</p> <p>I am working and unable to attend to ask this question in person, but nominate Carolyn Postgate to ask on my behalf.</p>
<p>Combined questions from Allan Treacy and James Littlewood on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present & Future Question being asked by Allan Treacy</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>When this scheme was discussed by the GCP Executive in July 2021 they noted that the Independent Auditor said that “the environmental impact of the scheme is mixed”. He went on to say that the validity of the assumptions will need further investigation as part of the EIA that has yet to be conducted for the scheme. I was present at that meeting and the Executive were all very clear that they wanted the EIA to be undertaken so that they could understand the impacts of the scheme before they decided whether it should proceed.</p> <p>The report that has been submitted to the Assembly makes clear that the EIA is still underway and that surveys are still being carried out, for example para 2.5.2 “In advance of the full assessment findings, the likely significant effects of the scheme are yet to be determined.” There is almost no information provided in the officer reports regarding the significance of the impacts of the scheme and how such impacts are to be avoided or mitigated. This report is mostly about the EIA consultation and therefore it is clearly premature for the Assembly and Board to be making a decision to proceed to the next stage without knowing what the significant impacts will be. We don’t understand why you are being asked to discuss this now rather than in November, when it is likely that such information would be available. A report in November would not hold up the progression of the scheme in any way. Please will you request that a report comes back to you in November which includes information about the significant impacts of the scheme and the plans to avoid and mitigate them?</p>
<p>Dr. Marilyn Treacy</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Confidence in the GCP is at an all-time low in Coton, not only because of the environmental destruction that results from the off-road route, but because facts are being misrepresented. The EIA consultation brochure describes the off-road route as “North of Coton”. It isn’t North of Coton where it crosses Cambridge Road in the village. This misrepresentation of the facts was put to Jo Baker at a village meeting. He would not accept it and added in response to the next question that the GCP could put the route down the middle of the High Street if they wanted to. As chair of the GCP you may not witness these behaviours from the officers but residents do.</p> <p>We were dismayed to see that C.P.C. and CBAG’s input into the consultation had been misrepresented in the WSP report (GCP C2C EIA Report Public v2 5). I pointed this out to our Councillor on 29.09.22. He approached GCP to be informed that the relevant P.C. points were included incorrectly in the Coton Orchard section this had now been corrected and a new version issued. Comments made by CBAG and Coton Loves Pollinators were also altered but</p>

	<p>remain incorrect attributing some wrong comments to wrong groups. The explanation given to the councillor was incorrect. There is now a note on the C.C. site saying the “summary of stakeholder views was incomplete” This is a misinterpretation of fact, it is not just omissions it is editing. It is unclear if these errors are a result of incompetence or deliberate editing but it is disappointing that the GCP is presenting incorrect information and differing explanations.</p> <p>My question, chair, is: How can you have confidence in the factual material that you are being presented with in this EIA report? Should it not be withdrawn?</p>
David Cairns	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>The Joint Assembly has two important items on its September agenda: the C2C busway and a future bus concept and charge zone The purpose of the busway is to provide regular bus services from Cambourne, and the current proposal is to build an offroad busway to avoid traffic congestion. It is due to begin operations sometime after 2025 and may cost £200m. The bus concept and charge zone will begin introducing extra bus services from 2023/4. The charge zone will lead to a “50% reduction in car trips” (p.52 of the assembly papers). Please will the GCP Joint Assembly give an assurance that it will review both the journey times of the new bus services, and the reduction of traffic congestion into Cambridge with the new charging zone, before irrevocably committing to spending £200m on a busway that may not be needed?</p> <p>I am afraid I will not be able to attend in person as I am in London for work, but Terry Spencer (copied in) will ask the question on my behalf.</p>
Gabriel Fox	<p>Agenda Item No. 7: Cambourne to Cambridge</p> <p>Data recently provided by the Combined Authority show that the existing Citi 4 bus service between Cambourne and Cambridge runs freely at all times, including morning and evening rush hours during school term. The average journey time from Cambourne to Cambridge City Centre is 28 minutes, including up to 21 bus stops typically requiring 3-4 minutes of stopping time; the average in the 7-9 am peak period is 31 minutes. Outbound journey times are slightly shorter. More significantly, the average journey time down Madingley hill and over the M11 bridge to JJ Thomson Ave is less than 6 minutes, again with no significant rush hour delay. These timings are no different from what is being proposed by GCP with their “off-road” C2C busway scheme.</p> <p>Given that congestion on the A428/A1303 corridor was the principal reason for developing the bus-only-road scheme and that there is no evidence that new homes west of Cambridge will lead to future congestion in the post-COVID era, what is the justification for spending £200M of taxpayers’ money and destroying sensitive Green Belt landscapes to implement the proposed scheme? Why would a simple bus lane wherever feasible on the existing roads not be a perfectly adequate and future-proofed solution for post-COVID commuting needs? If the answer relates to future transport needs, can we please see data to support such future demands?</p>
Combined Question from David Trippett and Mark Rison	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Better Public Transport: Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>The stated aim of the Eastern Access project is to improve access to the city by ‘public transport, walking or cycling’. The Phase A work to Newmarket Rd will achieve this for that road, and should in principle be supported.</p> <p>However, as the GCP’s Executive Board noted publicly in 2021, the Phase A changes to Newmarket Rd will divert 1000s of motor vehicles onto nearby unrestricted roads. Most at risk is Coldham’s Lane in Romsey, where not a single item of traffic calming exists.</p> <p>This is a family-orientated community. It has a play area, primary school, allotments, green Common, and elderly persons home. It is also a deprived community and has arguably been neglected for decades.</p>

	<p>Surveys show that over 14,000 vehicles speed per week; traffic jams snake the length of the road by day, and cars and motorbikes speed over 70mph by night. Ugly behaviour from HGVs makes the advisory cycle lanes particularly dangerous.</p> <p>In terms of active travel, it is the very definition of a failure.</p> <p>In the short term, residents overwhelmingly support and need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 20mph speed limit (ii) Night-time HGV ban <p>But the only real solution to prevent rat-running is a modal filter (as proposed for Mill Road and Vinery Road, both of which will otherwise direct more traffic onto Coldham’s Lane).</p> <p>Item 7.1 states ‘estimates of the costs of Phase A and B proposals are in excess of the identified budget of £50M. ... The GCP are deliberately over-planning to ensure there are sufficient schemes available for prioritization’.</p> <p>Our question is: what guarantees will this committee give today to the people of Coldham’s Lane that the Phase A works will not be isolated, and that Phase B works will include meaningful and significant restrictions for motor vehicles on Coldham’s Lane in Romsey?</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of CAMCYCLE</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 8: Better Public Transport - Cambridge Eastern Access Project</p> <p>Improvements to Newmarket Road are long overdue, particularly as it is a place where people have been seriously injured and killed while walking and cycling. There is huge potential for improvements to people’s everyday journeys as well as to break down the barrier the road presents to residents in surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Camcycle strongly supports the point from the Outline Business Case (paragraph 2.6.31) that the overarching approach for the Newmarket Road scheme should be “to deliver consistent, coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive pedestrian and cycling infrastructure as a minimum” and we are pleased to see plans for segregated cycleways along the length of the road and CYCLOPS junctions at Elizabeth Way and Barnwell Road roundabouts.</p> <p>However, our members have highlighted several remaining concerns with the scheme designs as set out in the Outline Business Case. For example, considering just the very western end of the scheme, we are concerned that there are still two eastbound carriageway lanes coming from Elizabeth Way junction onto Newmarket Road when all feeder approaches are single lane. Removing this unnecessary part of the design would reduce conflict and free up space for better active travel infrastructure or much-needed greenery. We also believe that the Abbey Road crossing should be retained – despite improvements to the Elizabeth Way roundabout this will remain an important north-south route, particularly for pedestrians. (Using Strava to provide existing active travel desire lines will miss many key routes.)</p> <p>The benefits of this scheme focus on, and depend on, cycling and walking, so we believe it is important that Camcycle and Living Streets are consulted as designs are developed further.</p> <p>Why are neither of these groups listed as key stakeholders on pages 35-6 of the Outline Business Case and can this be rectified for the next stage of the project?</p>
<p>James Littlewood on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present & Future</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 9: Greenways</p> <p>At the inception of Greenways there was broad political and stakeholder agreement that the design of the routes should not be a “one-size fits all” because the routes would traverse through urban, rural and village landscapes including areas that were sensitive for heritage, landscape and ecology. However, after several years of asking for examples of design in sensitive areas we still have nothing more than promises. Recent consultation documents showing proposed designs have included the use of materials and signage that are not sensitive to their location and to which Cambridge Past, Present & Future has objected.</p> <p>We want to bring to your attention that, despite national guidance on cycle infrastructure and design, and Historic England’s “Streets for All” advice, stating that specific colours are not a</p>

	<p>requirement, in 2020 Cambridgeshire County Council decided to implement a policy that red (two shades thereof) are the only colours that should be used on new cycle tracks for consistency. This is opposed by Historic England and is clearly at odds with the intention of the Greenways programme and the statements set out in the report. Please can you confirm that Greenways will not be subject to the County Council policy?</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of CAMCYCLE</p>	<p>Agenda Item No: 9: Greater Cambridge Greenways</p> <p>Camcycle is constantly asked about Greenways progress – people living in villages surrounding Cambridge are desperate for safe, pleasant cycle routes to their everyday destinations. The GCP website states that “they will also help to make local journeys such as school and nursery runs safer and easier”.</p> <p>Given this objective, we are particularly concerned about two aspects of the scheme as set out in this report – the status of the Waterbeach Greenway and the approach to rural surfacing.</p> <p>1) The decision to postpone construction of the Waterbeach Greenway is hugely disappointing, particularly to residents of Milton and Waterbeach, and it is unclear why this has happened. Paragraph 2.10 cites changes including Mere Way proposals and the A10 footpath widening, but these routes do not meet LTN 1/20 guidance or the requirements for all types of cycling. Reasons include lack of sufficient separation, lack of lighting, compromised width (A10) and inadequate Butt Lane crossing, lack of lighting (Mere Way). The Waterbeach Greenway MUST be built to a better standard.</p> <p>2) We are surprised to see the Reynolds Drove resurfacing listed as a Greenway ‘quick win’ when the new surface material is loose, rough, uneven, and cannot be ridden easily by all types of cycle throughout the year and in all weathers, which will deter many users. According to LTN 1/20, cycle routes should be surfaced in smooth bound materials to meet the ‘comfortable’ core principle (see details in Table 4-1 and section 14 of the Summary Principles).</p> <p>How is the GCP going to ensure that the Greenways, including Waterbeach, and other rural links, including Mere Way, are delivered on time and designed in line with LTN 1/20 to provide routes that do provide realistic choices for cyclists of all ages and abilities all year round, including those travelling to school and nursery?</p>

**8th September 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Partner Body Representative Questions and Representations Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p align="center">South Cambridgeshire Councillor Carla Hofman - also on behalf of Carla Farrar who submitted similar question</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Question 1: Some villages including Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Stow Cum Quy have residents who use the “East Barnwell Health Centre” on Ditton Lane which is in the proposed congestion zone. In addition, the current proposed extent of the zone means some residents commuting out of the zone to work in remote areas will be charged daily and roads like High Ditch road and even Fulbourn village will become rat runs to avoid the charge to access other areas of Cambridge. So can the GCP consider removing the whole of Fen Ditton from inside the congestion zone?</p> <p>Question 2: The six supermarkets on Newmarket Road and petrol stations used by many in Fen Ditton and nearby villages are now proposed to be in the congestion zone. How can the GCP amend the zone to make these facilities accessible without paying the congestion charge?</p> <p>Question 3: How does the GCP propose to stop nearby roads and villages outside the congestion zone from becoming parking places for those trying to avoid the charge at no expense to the villagers?</p>
<p align="center">South Cambridgeshire Councillor Dan Lentell</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <p>(i) Why has the site of Addenbrooke’s Hospital been included in the proposed congestion charge / sustainable travel zone when no reasonable public transport alternatives are available to my constituents in Over & Willingham?</p> <p>(ii) Why are the purpose-built access roads to the hospitals from the M11, which are not open to through traffic, included in this proposal when they play no part in the wider problem of congestion in the city?</p> <p>(iii) Why should residents have to pay the GCP £5 (or go through some ramshackle online rigmarole - good luck with that Nana) every time they want to see their doctor, visit a poorly loved one, or greet a bonny new arrival at the Rosie?</p> <p>(iv) Where is our over-stretched NHS to find the administrative bandwidth to manage the proposed list of exemptions? Have they even been consulted?</p> <p>Without wishing to comment on the wider merits or demerits of this ambitious yet problematic congestion charge scheme, it is simply immoral to construct a paywall between residents and their NHS when zero alternatives are currently available. Such a paywall, a flat rate Poll Tax paid equally by dukes and dustmen, will hit the poorest and the sickest hardest while the rich man in his Tesla drives on unaffected. It will punish those heroic frontline medical and service staff who put themselves on the line during the darkest days of COVID and kept our healthcare service alive.</p> <p>The access roads from the M11 to the Addenbrooke’s site were purpose-built to prevent hospital traffic from outside the city becoming a part of the congestion problem. There is no oath registered in heaven, or practical argument, for including them in the scheme at this time.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will hear and heed the voices raised on behalf of the faces you cannot see. Of the parents whose child is undergoing regular chemo; of the elderly widow and her family who practically have to drag her in to see the specialists she needs because ‘she doesn’t want to be a burden’; of the grief stricken and the infirm who just don’t have the bandwidth for some dodgy online portal.</p>

	<p>How can it possibly be right to add to the burdens of our fellow citizens when they are at their lowest ebb and in need of the healthcare they have already paid for?</p>
<p>County Councillor Lorna Dupré</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 6: Public Transport and City Access Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Much of the research and consultation for these proposals was undertaken before the Covid pandemic of early 2020. How confident is the Greater Cambridge Partnership that the data and assumptions underlying the formation of these proposals then, stack up now when so much has changed? 2. It is obvious that there are a significant number of large holes in the data on journeys into and within Cambridge which have been used in formulating this proposal. Does the Greater Cambridge Partnership have access to fuller and better data to augment its understanding of travel patterns in Cambridge in the last five years? 3. <i>Choices for Better Journeys: Summary Report of Engagement Findings (May 2019)</i> states that 4,854 respondents provided a postcode for both the start location and finish location of their most frequent journey, and that of these journeys 55 per cent began outside the CB1-CB5 postcode areas and finished within it. This indicates that the Greater Cambridge Partnership holds postcode-to-postcode data on up to 2,670 frequent journeys from outside the proposed charging zone into the zone. Have those journeys been plotted against the 'future bus network concept' diagram in the papers for the 8 September 2022 Assembly meeting, and if so what were the findings about the likely cost, time and convenience of replacing those journeys with those indicated on the diagram? 4. How does the modelling show the 50 per cent reduction in motor vehicles is achieved? Specifically how many journeys will instead be made by walking, by cycling, by regular bus service, by park and ride bus service, and how many will no longer be made? 5. Improvement in air quality is one of the key ambitions of this proposal. To achieve this, what is the current mix of diesel, battery, hybrid and alternative fuelled buses on roads in the zone, and the expected mix when the congestion charge is introduced and in the longer term? 6. Which other cities have introduced congestion charging zones that encompass the whole of a city, rather than just a central core? 7. What provision is envisaged for rural residents who might want to considerably shorten their proposed public transport journey by driving to the start of the 'key bus corridors' where the more frequent public transport options begin and parking there (for example Cottenham and Fulbourn)? 8. Why does the 'future bus network concept' rely so much on public transport into the centre of the city of Cambridge, with so few options for rural residents to access the major and growing facilities on the periphery of the city without multiple interchanges? 9. Why is a doubling of frequency of the Ely to Cambridge bus service expected to be more effective than facilitating additional use of rail to travel on that route, given the latter is much faster and generally less polluting? 10. What is the 'East Cambridge' interchange marked on the 'future bus network concept' between Cambridge city centre and Newmarket? Is it simply the Newmarket Road Park and Ride, or something more radical? 11. What discussions has the Greater Cambridge Partnership held with partners about opportunities for painless reductions in congestion in Cambridge, including (but not limited to) (a) moving medical appointments from Addenbrookes out into communities, and (b)

encouraging more home working where possible through provision of better broadband and changing employer attitudes to home working?

12. How will the Greater Cambridge Partnership convince residents that the proposed bus routes and their frequency will be a permanent and reliable feature of the proposed new transport system, rather than being subject to the frequent changes and withdrawals which are an ongoing issue for residents particularly in rural areas?
13. What targeted programme of consultation and engagement about these proposals will the Greater Cambridge Partnership hold with residents across East Cambridgeshire?
14. What tools will the Greater Cambridge Partnership be using to enable people to understand their proposed new journeys in terms of cost, time, and convenience?
15. What potential is there for the transformation of the 'future bus network concept' into something more permanent such as a tram or light rail system? What conversations has the Greater Cambridge Partnership had with the Combined Authority or with central government about such options?