

**10th December 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	Questioner	Question
1	Mal Schofield	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Paragraph 1.12 states "The scheme has been developed in accordance with the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG)." *</p> <p>* TAG Page 9 states "1.8 The uncertainty around future travel behaviour and needs brought about by the coronavirus disease pandemic, amongst other sources of deep uncertainty, also provide a significant challenge to assessing which investment options may suit those needs and provide the best returns for the taxpayer. There is a need to consider how best to accommodate this uncertainty in appraisal and provide consistency across the local, regional and national portfolios. This highlights the need and importance of <i>collecting, evaluation evidence to better inform these considerations over time.</i>"</p> <p>Question. Bus patronage in England was on the decline before the first Covid outbreak in the UK." The number of local bus passenger journeys in England fell by 238 million or 5.5% to 4.07 billion in the year ending March 2020 [Source. DfT. Annual Bus Statistics].</p> <p>A meaningful update on travel behaviour will be available with the publication of the UK 2021 census.</p> <p>Would the Board please consider deferring further expenditure on this contentious project until the insightful 2021 Census information is available?</p>
2	James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge PPF	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Cambridge Past Present and Future (PPF) has been pressing for an independent review of this scheme for some time and we would encourage the Board to support this. In order to try and restore some trust it is essential that the community and stakeholders have confidence that the review is genuinely independent. To achieve this will mean ensuring the brief for the work and the process for appointing the independent reviewer is transparent. Please can the Board provide reassurance on this and some detail on the process?</p>
3	James Littlewood Chief Executive Cambridge PPF	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Mark Carney is delivering the Reith Lectures on BBC Radio 4 this winter and considering "How We Get What We Value". Carney argues that society has come to embody Oscar Wilde's old aphorism: "knowing the price of everything but the value of nothing".</p>

		<p>We see this in the report discussing the northern option for this scheme (p56 para 1.18), which is dismissed on the basis that it would be more expensive and performs less favourably. No consideration is given as to whether such a scheme might better protect the landscape that is valued by the community. Please can the GCP ensure that decisions are made that take into account the value we place on our landscape and environment?</p>
4	Dr.Marilyn Treacy	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>To date, consultants the GCP have used on this project have been interwoven in its DNA and far from independent. Please can you provide evidence that an independent audit will indeed be independent? Will the LLF be able to review and input into the selection of consultants, terms of reference and input information to be reviewed?</p>
5	Terry Spencer	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p><i>An all-ways junction at the Girton Interchange</i></p> <p>Until the Covid-19 pandemic, the A1303 Madingley Hill was often heavily congested with inbound traffic at Junction 13 of the M11, especially at morning peak times.</p> <p>If congestion does revert to the pre-lockdown levels, then one obvious long-term solution would be to provide an all-ways junction at the Girton Interchange, to connect the A428 directly to the M11 in both directions, so as to reduce traffic along the A1303 and bypass Junction 13.</p> <p>An upgrade of the Girton Interchange, where the A14, M11 and A428 converge, has been suggested many times in the last few years. It would be the perfect location for a Park and Ride facility serving traffic from the north-west and north of Cambridge, and for a coach station and a CAM station. It would encourage modal shift away from cars onto public transport, with potentially-huge economic benefits. An all-ways junction will also be required if the proposed Oxford to Cambridge expressway is built.</p> <p>The GCP has not lobbied actively for an all-ways junction at Girton, which would solve the congestion problem at Junction 13. This was suggested in an open letter to the GCP in January 2020 from a group of twelve prominent local politicians, including Antony Browne MP.</p> <p>My questions are:</p> <p>1. Why hasn't the GCP looked seriously at a northern route for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway via the Girton Interchange as a way of solving the problem of congestion at Junction 13?</p>

		<p>2. What actions is the GCP taking or planning to take to persuade the government to upgrade the Girton interchange as suggested?</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Carolyn Postgate</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Agenda item 8 paras 1.1-1.3 are all inaccurate, based on 2015 data when it was predicted peak traffic would stretch the length of Madingley Road onto the A428 dual carriageway. Current conditions are that Madingley Road is running freely with no delays, due to different working patterns during the Covid crisis. No one is able to predict future travel patterns or if confidence in public transport will ever return and basing assumptions on 2015 data is not acceptable.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Research Group's report on Agenda pages 135ff, (albeit with a small sample of employers), suggests that in 3-5 years' time working from home will increase (Question 14), travel in rush hour will reduce (Question 10), and changes in mode of travel show increase in cycling or not much change, (therefore no modal shift to public transport) (Question 17).</p> <p>Furthermore the National Travel Attitudes Study (NTAS) - Wave 4, Page 5 (footnote on Agenda Page 104) states: "The lack of confidence in the use of public transport looks likely to remain after travel restrictions and social distancing measures have been removed."</p> <p>In addition, Agenda item 9 para 4.16 (page 104) states: "With government deferring big spending and policy decisions until next year, the regulatory, operational and funding environment for public transport remains very uncertain."</p> <p>Therefore I ask</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What evidence is there to support the statement "schemes such as C2C will be stronger as a result of Covid-19?" (ref Agenda item 8 para 1.13). 2. Should the scheme not be halted until the Cambridge University Centre for Business Research 'GCP Quarterly Progress Report' findings are published in February and June 2021? (ref Agenda item 7 Para 15.3). 3. If the existing dire economic situation and new work patterns continue, what effect will it have upon the already unacceptably low initial BCR of 0.43? (ref Agenda item 8 para 10.6).

7	Jane Renwick	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>It is hard to understand how, after all this time, we are now left with only one C2C route option on the table. We are told that to reconsider an alternative route at this stage would be a deviation from the “proscribed process “. Is this the process that has failed to take seriously or follow up on any alternative routes suggested in numerous consultations, local meetings, local forums, focus groups, residents groups and environmental groups? The summary dismissal of other ideas has suggested an idea of pre-determination concerning the whole matter. We are now left with one route, the Preferred Route, reached apparently through this “proscribed process”.</p> <p>Are the GCP, by arranging for an independent audit of their Preferred Route, just following another step along the “proscribed process” to reach their pre-determined goal?</p>
8	Pauline Joslin	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>When planning the route of the C2C Busway/Autonomous Metro it is obvious that the GCP have not taken into account the concerns voiced by as many as 900 Hardwick residents who are opposed to the removal of the 2 miles of trees and vegetation on St Neots Rd and replace them with Tarmac. This visual barrier of approx. 3000 trees along St Neots Rd absorbs between 500 and 3000 tons of CO2 and its removal would double the pollution in our village. Is the GCP listening to the residents of Hardwick?</p>
9	Alistair Burford	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cambourne-Cambridge – Better Public Transport Project</p> <p>Two years ago, the Board pack contained an Interim Report prepared by Mott MacDonald entitled ‘Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project’ (November 2018) which detailed ‘Environmental Constraints’ within the proposed route from Madingley Mulch to the Rifle Range (Phase 1). This report was subsequent to the Options Appraisal Report referred to in today’s Board papers (page 60 clause 4.8)</p> <p>On page 41 of the November ‘18 report, 3 significant constraints are highlighted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ‘Buried Archaeology’ at the Waterworks site; ii) The wooded area on St Neots Road in front of the waterworks is a ‘Tree Preservation Order block & Bat Roost potential’; iii) An area extending from the waterworks to beyond Crome Lea is marked as ‘Brown Hare Activity’.

		<p>In 2018/2019, further Ecology surveys were conducted and have confirmed bat activity at the waterworks site and a significant presence of Brown Hares between the waterworks and Crome Lea yet despite the hundreds and thousands spent on the surveys to make 'informed decisions' the preferred route alignment still runs straight through the middle of each of these significant areas.</p> <p>1: Can the Board explain why, given the constraints that have already been identified between the Waterworks and Crome Lea, that the route has not been revised to avoid these significant constraints so that we have a more accurate version of the proposed route?</p> <p>2: Before any further surveys are commissioned, should the Board not ensure that the surveys that have already been conducted have been actioned?</p> <p>3: If the Board is minded to approve the request for the EIA survey, will they also instruct the officers to make any necessary amendments to the route before returning the scheme to the Board and does the Board undertake to fully consult on any new proposed route alignment?</p>
10	Edward Leigh on behalf of Smarter Cambridge Transport	<p>Agenda Item 9: Future Investment Strategy</p> <p><i>Why is GCP in the business of building roads and car parks?</i></p> <p>Neither of these is consistent with the Paris Climate agreement nor the UK's Climate Change Act. The future scenario GCP is <i>still</i> planning for is one in which the planet will be hostile not only to economic growth, but to life itself.</p> <p>Busways are supposedly needed to let buses bypass congestion. Yet, until all energy supplies are zero-carbon, the only effective policy to reduce carbon emissions from transport is for citizens and businesses to reduce vehicle-miles.</p> <p>Page 81 of the agenda pack shows a Proposed Bus Network for the Cambourne busway. Nothing about it depends on there being a busway. The same would be true of the South East and Waterbeach busways. Using the Bus Services Act, the Combined Authority is empowered to design and commission exactly the bus services the county needs.</p> <p>All that is missing is a revenue stream to subsidise those services. But busways won't generate a revenue; quite the reverse: they will create a substantial additional management and maintenance cost for users and the highway authority.</p> <p>HM Treasury is now actively looking at road pricing. So, I urge Board members <i>not</i> to waste precious money on unnecessary busways, but to invest in what <i>is</i> needed to start the transition to a zero-carbon economy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Build out the cycle Greenways <i>and keep going</i>. 2) Build travel hubs – <i>not huge car parks</i> – to give people

		<p>everywhere in Greater Cambridge convenient, safe and secure access to bus and rail services.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Intervene tactically in the road network to prioritise buses. 4) Prepare <i>now</i> to spend the allocated £75m to commission new bus services as we emerge from the pandemic. 5) Implement a Workplace Parking Levy. 6) Work with Government to design a road pricing scheme that serves local as well as national needs.
11	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 9: Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is pleased to see that the Future Investment Strategy report recognises the important role that cycling can play in addressing local issues and contributing to GCP goals. It's clear that people want to cycle more, the government wants people to cycle more, businesses expect their employees to cycle more, and public feedback from consultations and the Citizens' Assembly recognise cycling's role in tackling air pollution, congestion and climate change.</p> <p>We therefore strongly welcome the proposal for targeted investment to close gaps and establish important links in the cycling network. We also welcome the new criteria assessing whether transport schemes support the delivery of net-zero carbon objectives across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>How will this investment be coordinated with other schemes which have a bearing on the cycling infrastructure network, such as the GCP Eastern Access Project, or the Combined Authority project to improve Coldham's Lane roundabout (which still requires additional funding for a properly 'cycle-proof' design.)?</p> <p>How will these cycling projects tie in with Covid-19 tranche 2 schemes like modal filters on Arbury Road and junction improvements at the Barnwell/Newmarket Road roundabout? Testing these interventions can speed up the process and have immediate benefits to the local community and commuters.</p> <p>The National Audit Office (NAO) made it clear last week that if we are to achieve the goal of net-zero by 2050 we must make drastic changes to how we live and travel. Do the GCP plans go far enough to enable Greater Cambridge to reach net-zero?</p> <p>If the GCP is serious about net-zero carbon objectives then they must heed the advice from the Citizens' Assembly to be bold! We urge the GCP to be ambitious with the locations and solutions chosen for this project.</p>

12	Windsor Road Residents' Association	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>We are concerned about the process and timing of decisions on permanency of the ETROs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will decisions about the permanency of schemes be made? What is the role of the current consultations? What else will be taken into account? 2. How are the effects of the ETROs to be assessed? Will the results of the consultations be binding and, if so, how can “other representations” and longer term effects be taken into consideration (see Agenda page 182, section 4.8)? 3. Is it sensible to make permanent decisions while conditions are atypical? 4. Would it not be wise to wait until a more stable situation appears to have been reached, when the social effects of the COVID-19 virus have diminished and travel patterns have stabilised? <p>We are glad the GCP is monitoring traffic. The data presented are for September-November 2020; presumably comparative figures are available for the time before ETROs were introduced, and monitoring will continue. The current situation is abnormal. Many people are still working from home and limiting their shopping and leisure activities. In addition there are roadworks on major routes into and out of Cambridge. It is hard to be sure of cause and effect when multiple factors change simultaneously.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What will be the criteria for selecting particular roads for ETROs in future? <p>It seems to us that not all the current ETROs improve the cycling or walking experience, although they do affect motor traffic which usually has to take a longer route, directly causing inconvenience. Traffic already using this route is also inconvenienced indirectly by worsened congestion and air pollution. Pollution will also adversely affect active travellers.</p>
13	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes more detail on the city access strategy and supports the short-term measures being implemented to encourage more people to walk and cycle. More secure cycle parking at workplaces and in the city centre is very important to address issues of cycle theft, particularly when seeking to increase uptake in the use of e-bikes. We also strongly support the city centre freight pilot with increased use of cycle logistics.</p>

		<p>Camcycle also supports a more widescale programme of roadspace reallocation to create safe and attractive active travel routes and agrees that if this is coordinated with a review of car parking and the city road network hierarchy, and communicated well as a whole scheme, it is more likely to achieve high levels of modal shift and public support. However, we believe that the recommendations underestimate the impact that could be achieved by fast, ambitious action. For example, Leicester’s pop-up cycle network (11 miles in 10 weeks) has already increased cycling by 45% and school street schemes in London have had a huge impact on modal shift.</p> <p>We'd like to again emphasise that the GCP must heed the advice of the Citizens Assembly and be much bolder with your approach.</p> <p>Why have we not yet seen progress or pre-consultation on the Active Travel Fund Tranche Two schemes?</p> <p>Will the GCP work with the County Council, Combined Authority and City Council to produce an overarching strategy for the current and proposed schemes so they can be considered in context for achieving short and long term ambitious aims of traffic reduction and increasing active travel rather than being decided by piecemeal consultations?</p>
14	<p>Lesley Sherratt, Chair Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 12: Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p>Grantchester Parish Council welcomes the principles of the Greenways project and understands the need to provide for cyclists from Haslingfield having an off-road route to get to Cambridge safely. We have welcomed the Barton Greenway and are grateful for the constructive consultation carried out so far with the Greenways team that has been responsive to the particular needs of Grantchester’s largely older population (the oldest in South Cambs) and need to keep the Grantchester Road open.</p> <p>Unfortunately the proposed route for the Haslingfield Greenway still raises safety concerns once it reaches the village of Grantchester, for residents where it comes past the sheltered housing, for pedestrians through the very narrow parts and for cyclists themselves where visibility is poor, and where the Highway has to be crossed three times.</p> <p>Our Question is: with the link to the Barton Greenway after the M11 is crossed, and with the adoption of the ‘Baulk’ route as part of the Barton Greenway, is the substantial disruption to Grantchester village, especially given its conservation status, its demographic and the difficult safety issues, worth the cost of having the option of coming through the village when a safer, simple and more fully off-road route across the Baulk is already budgeted for?</p>

15	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda Item 14: Chisholm Trail</p> <p>It has been a long time since I first wrote about a cycling route that could enable more to cycle both for work and utility trips in and around Cambridge. At that time I suggested that building such a route would be of Economic Benefit, and that money invested in cycleways would produce bigger savings for those using roads than money spent directly on roads. Non-user benefits are far better recognised now.</p> <p>I made no reference to ‘Health & Wellbeing’, nor to the connections to ‘Green Spaces’ and the value for ‘Walking’. The developments of Cambridge North station, the NE Fringe, the Southern Fringe and the Biomedical Campus were not then even under consideration.</p> <p>The route has had increasing support from all quarters and the significance of such provision will be all the more valuable in the new ‘Normal’ when active travel must be promoted and CO2 and other pollutants vastly reduced.</p> <p>Planning Permission was granted in July 2017. It should have not taken three and a half years to build, yet no section has even been completed.</p> <p>I ask that the Board recognises the value of this project to all in and around Cambridge by continuing to fund it. I also ask that the governance of similar future schemes be such that an integrated plan can enable completion in a more reasonable timescale.</p>
16	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 14: Chisholm Trail</p> <p>The Chisholm Trail is perhaps the most widely welcomed and popular GCP project and will help more local people to walk and cycle for everyday journeys and open up access to the city’s precious green spaces. Research from active travel charity Sustrans estimates that the current level of cycling in Greater Cambridge saves the region over £100 million a year in healthcare costs and delivers additional benefits in terms of reducing congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>We support calls for a clear understanding of how local authorities manage transport projects and fuller public disclosure of what has caused the cost overruns. There seems to be a pattern of cost overruns on all transport projects. The continual delays for this project long since passed unacceptable. The whole Chisholm Trail should be finished as soon as possible and to the highest possible standard so that local residents can make use of this new sustainable route, unlocking city-wide benefits for all.</p> <p>Camcycle must question the slow progress and the additional risks that come from these delays, particularly the work on Coldham’s Common which must be started by 15 January Commons consent deadline. To miss this deadline would be a huge waste of the efforts</p>

		<p>of officers to get permission to do this work on the Common and further delays and costs will be added if permission must be sought again.</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm that work on Coldham's Common will begin before the required 15 January deadline?</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm when the work on the Coldham's Lane crossing will begin?</p> <p>Will the GCP confirm when the Newmarket Road underpass work will commence?</p> <p>Please can the GCP explain why work on these sections has not yet been started?</p>
--	--	---