

**30<sup>th</sup> June 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

| Questioner   | Question   |
|--|--|
| <p>James Littlewood<br/>Chief Executive<br/>Cambridge<br/>Past, Present &amp;<br/>Future</p> | <p><b>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>There have been some significant changes in relation to CSET scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Option for Local Plan is to extend Biomedical Campus next to A1307. This won't be directly served by the CSET route, whereas it could be served by an option discounted in 2018. This will significantly increase the Benefit Cost Ratio of that option compared with the current route.</li> <li>2. A factor in the GCP Boards' 2018 decision to discount a route in the A1307 corridor was that it could not form part of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM). The CAM has been dropped. Given that CAM was a factor in reaching a decision on preferred routes, there is a requirement to review that decision.</li> <li>3. Now that the detailed route alignment is known, it will poorly serve the villages of Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford and in some cases could undermine bus services that serve village centres.</li> <li>4. Planning Inspector recently granted permission for a development, including creating a new country park. The Busway would run adjacent to this park having a negative impact on the park. In other words, the negative impact of the Busway has increased.</li> <li>5. Permission for Cambridge South Station will be granted ahead of the busway. The rail scheme will proceed first and therefore the busway construction works will have to fit around or be delayed by Network Rail. This creates a risk of further delay, compared to alternative options.</li> </ol> <p>An alternative busway within the A1307 corridor would deliver similar journey times and reliability at significantly less cost, more quickly and with less damage to the countryside. Due to the expansion plans of the Campus it would deliver better Benefit Cost Ratio. Please will the GCP review the decisions made in 2018 and 2021 against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?</p> <p>Option 2 of the proposed alignments around the retirement village would leave an area of land between the busway and Haverhill Road which was no longer viable for agriculture. The landowner has already indicated that they will not allow this land to be used for mitigation because they have development aspirations for it. It is therefore almost certain that if Option 2 went ahead that there would be a planning application submitted for housing on that land. Whilst the outcome of such an application cannot be known, there is clearly a risk that development could be granted in future. Especially as approval has been given for development on an adjacent site. Therefore, it is misleading to conclude that the impact on landscape, environment and green belt would be similar for both options; Option 2 carries a high risk of future harm whereas Option 1 does not. It is important that the consultation highlights the risk of future development associated with Option 2, so that people are fully aware of the implications of their choice. Please will you commit to providing information about this risk as part of the public consultation?</p> |
| <p>Cllr Howard Kettel<br/>Stapleford<br/>Parish Council</p>                                  | <p><b>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>Following a consultation on two on-road and one off-road route conducted February to April 2018, a decision to go ahead with the off-road route was made at the GCP Exec meeting 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018, with the Transport Director highlighting that 'the proposals were closely aligned with the development of the CAM' (item 7 in the Minutes). Indeed the submitted Paper at Appendix B-Business Case (B.39) states: 'The CAM proposals which form part of Strategy 1 contribute towards delivering the extended network envisaged within the LTTS' and furthermore at B.109: 'The proposed mass transit route is currently envisaged to form part of a wide CAM network'. However the Officer's report to GCP Exec Board 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.32 suggests that the CAM requirement was introduced after the Executive Board decision to adopt the off-road route which appears to be inconsistent with the facts.</p> <p>Given that CSET has been designed to be CAM compliant and this has now been dropped, will the GCP review the scheme against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?</p>  |

**30<sup>th</sup> June 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <p>Dr John Coppendale</p> | <p><b>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>The Officer's report to the GCP Executive Board meeting to be held on 30th June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.30 states: "Route options were consulted upon in 2017. The entirely off-road option was the public's preferred solution."</p> <p>Noting that the vote for the alternative A1307 was split by offering two options compared to only one-off road option (1702 people voted for the A1307 as opposed to 1064 for the off-road route) and you could in any event vote for all options, and the more recent Anthony Browne survey, with a considerably higher number of respondents, showed that 81% would definitely not, or probably not, support the GCP busway.</p> <p>In the light of this, will the GCP have regard to overwhelming public opinion and review their route?</p>   |
| <p>Jim Rickard</p>        | <p><b>Agenda item 9 – Cambridge South-East Transport Scheme</b></p> <p>Tracing the history of the CSET project through the WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Haverhill Corridor Study carried out for Cambridgeshire County Council, and your own agenda packs for October 2018 and June 2020, it's clear that the benefit to cost ratios of the different options have evolved. This is quite natural as more work is done on a project. However, the two strategies following the A1307 alignment have consistently shown better BCRs than the GCP's preferred route. Recent developments involving speed restrictions, an additional pedestrian crossing for the retirement village and the need to reposition the Haverhill Road stop and slew the route around the retirement village would appear to penalise your currently preferred route still further. Conversely the projected south-eastern expansion of the Biomedical Campus would appear to improve the business case for the two routes along the A1307, and strategy 2 in particular.</p> <p>Will the GCP therefore reassess the BCRs for all three strategies, and make public the outcome of that reassessment?</p>  |
| <p>Jane Williams</p>      | <p><b>Agenda item 11 - Waterbeach Station Relocation</b></p> <p>Why were RLWE unable to secure a commercial funding arrangement? Does this indicate the risk/terms are so difficult that no funder was prepared to commit? If so why is the GCP prepared to do so?</p> <p>Payback based on station car park <b>revenue</b> is not the same as profit. Revenue is total income pre deductions. If revenue is anticipated at only £200K per annum not all of this is likely to be available to pay off the GCP loan. This gives a loan payback period of at least 100 years. Is this a wise investment/use of City Deal? It is noted that this will only be a partial completion of the relocated station. What guarantees have been given that RLWE/GCP/DFT funding will be in place?</p> <p>Could the GCP confirm that the station car park will not be reduced in size to enable the developer to fund the station? This is key regarding anticipated revenue return from car parking fees and reducing traffic on the A10.</p> <p>What is Network Rail's position regarding the station being delivered by 2025? What stage of negotiation are RLWE/NR at? What is the cost of decommissioning the existing station? Who will fund it?</p> <p>What business model/ predicted numbers are the GCP using for the Waterbeach greenway, segregated busway, P&amp;R and relocated station? Policy SS/6 para 3.42 SCDC adopted LP states "The existing A10 is at capacity and road improvements will be required, including measures to address capacity at the Milton junction with the A14. Developers of Waterbeach New Town, U&amp;C and RLWE " have substantially underfunded transport plans" stated by Sharon Brown SCDC planning committee meeting on 29th January 2021.</p> <p align="center"><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0blfv3t_x6s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0blfv3t_x6s</a></p> <p>I conducted a quick straw poll to seek the views of community. 190 people responded. 94% voted against GCP funding the station. What sort of public consultation will GCP conduct regarding the station relocation?</p> |

30<sup>th</sup> June 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| John Grant | <p><b>Agenda item 11 - Waterbeach Station Relocation</b></p> <p>Has any modelling of likely destinations for journeys by residents of the new town been done, and if so what was the outcome? On January 2nd 2001 Waterbeach Parish Council passed a motion stating (inter alia) that "placing such a settlement on the main railway line to London will encourage those who work in London to move to such a settlement, thus reducing its effectiveness as a solution to the Cambridge housing problem." What proportion of the 4500 houses are likely to be occupied by people who work locally? And what proportion of local journeys are likely to be to destinations that are near a rail station?</p> <p>If rail will be an option for significant numbers of people, has there been any consideration of the detail of how the train service would be delivered? There is very little spare capacity on the railway, and it is not clear where a local shuttle service would be able to terminate, for instance there is not expected to be platform space for trains to turn round at Cambridge South.</p> |
|------------|---|