

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

| From   | Question   |
|--|--|
| <p>William Bannell</p>   | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>I have read through the document pack for this meeting and would like to draw everyone's attention to and highlight section 9.8 on page 113 : "Doing nothing remains an option", and to put forward that this would be by far the most beneficial option for Cambridge moving forward, given all the reasons which have been made plain by businesses large and small, charities, employers and residents during the past 6 months or so.</p> <p>I am asking the GCP board to seriously consider using this option and to re-open the examination of alternate funding models, of which there are many, and I have written a short report detailing the various hypothetical means of raising revenue for the transport network which are simple, logical and fair, and would be preferable for everyone involved, including all of you on the GCP.</p> <p>The STZ is an unworkable, impossible prospect. Will you please drop the idea and allow me to submit my paper onto the public record for yours and everyone's consideration?</p>   |
| <p>David Stoughton<br/>on behalf of<br/>Living Streets<br/>Cambridge</p> | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>As politicians you will be aware of the concerns of young people about climate change. Many feel fearful about the future and it's a major source of stress that they don't feel enough is being done about it. So you are perhaps not surprised that approaching two-thirds of UNDER 24 year olds (61%) who responded to the GCP Making Connections consultation supported the introduction of a Sustainable Travel Zone and over three-quarters supported bus improvements and measures to support walking and cycling.</p> <p>What does this signify in political and environmental terms?</p> <p>First, the level of support for change among young people is very high, even though they were under-represented in the GCP consultation and the voices of most under 18 year olds were not heard at all.</p> <p>Second, young people voted decisively for a greener transport future, limiting the congestion and pollution that car use creates and expanding more sustainable forms of transport. Since they are your future workforce and council tax payers to ignore them seems unwise.</p> <p>Third, young people want safe, independent modes of travel - walking, cycling and taking the bus or train - not being ferried around in cars or stuck at home. However, freedom to walk has deteriorated sharply over recent decades, as car travel has grown and investment in walking has all but disappeared.</p> <p>Finally, have you considered future physical and mental health costs for children and young people of continuing car dependence? Motor traffic has eaten up open space, made playing out on streets too risky and severed</p> |

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>communities. Whereas 62% of children were allowed to walk to school and cross roads independently in 1971, twenty years later only 23% could do so[i].</p> <p>Living Streets urges politicians to support young people's independent mobility and endorse the shift to a greener travel future.<br/>(299 words)</p> <p>[i] Hillman et al, 1991</p>   |
| <p>Richard Wood<br/>on behalf of<br/>Cambridge Area Bus<br/>Users</p> | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>I note that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is considering (Agenda pack 4.10)</p> <p>Free Days for Account Holders – there was a lot of interest in this and members were of the opinion it should be looked at in more detail.</p> <p>Whilst this should, indeed, be looked at in more detail, and could well improve the acceptability of the Making Connections proposals, it could reduce the funding available for the envisaged radical bus service improvements, thereby undermining the opportunities for modal shift.</p> <p>However, a road charge on every day of the week (with, perhaps, shorter hours on Sunday) would allow for 'any two days in seven' exemptions and discounts, and would be more equitable in removing discrimination against people who are unable to shift their journey patterns. It would also avoid the potential for optional car journeys being shifted to weekends, with the concomitant risk of significant increases to road traffic congestion on Saturdays and Sundays.</p> <p>This has important implications for car drivers considering sampling bus travel, quite probably initially experimenting with a weekend leisure journey by bus.</p> <p>With no road charge on Saturdays and Sundays, increased road traffic congestion would be likely to give rise to delays and unreliability in the envisaged improved weekend bus services. A poor passenger experience could trigger rejection of this crucial modal shift, not only for leisure journeys but for essential weekday journeys, too.</p> <p>Will Executive Board members commit to looking at the idea of 'Free days' and discounted days in the context of 7-day road charging?</p> |
| <p>Ian Black<br/>Burwell resident</p>                                 | <p><b>Agenda Item No.10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Given the number of warnings about the adverse effects of the proposed Cambridge Congestion Charge that were described in many of the 1,000 written responses submitted by Cambridge businesses as part of the congestion charge consultation process, and which were from esteemed organisations such as Royal Papworth, Abcam, Cambridge Consultants, John Lewis, M&amp;S and Deloitte, my question is what plans do the council have to</p>   |

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>respond to the accurate data and real concerns expressed in those submissions, i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Will those written submissions be responded to individually or as a group?</li> <li>2 When will your response be forthcoming?</li> <li>3 What data can the council provide to dispute some of the claims in those letters, which suggest many small and large businesses will be forced to leave Cambridge altogether because of the adverse effect of the congestion charge costs impacting customers, employees and goods deliveries?</li> </ol>  |
| <p>Sarah Hughes on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p> | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The GCP has put forward three alternative road charge scenarios as potential ways to respond to the consultation survey.</p> <p>Scenario 1 would nearly halve the funds available to spend on bus services and improvements to walking, wheeling and cycling (2031 figures) and Scenario 3 would reduce them even further. Scenario 2 maintains funding for sustainable transport, but does this because it is potentially the same as the consultation proposal in its steady state.</p> <p>The Making Connections 2022 consultation brochure stated that the project would “give people a realistic and reliable alternative to the car” and the improvements to buses, walking, wheeling and cycling set out in the consultation proposal were supported by 70% or more of consultation respondents. Many people we have spoken to would like to see even better buses (particularly in rural areas) and further investment in active travel.</p> <p>It is hard to see how the Making Connections future transport vision, which a large majority would like to see, could be achieved, however, if funding from the road charge reduces by half or more. Any new scenario must also respond to the concerns raised in the consultation; the GCP has said it will listen.</p> <p>We would like to encourage further discussion of scenarios that could produce levels of funding for public and active transport that are at, near or above those in the consultation proposal, yet also respond to the concerns raised in the consultation survey. An example scenario might be if the Sustainable Travel Zone applied 7 days a week and account holders were allocated a certain number of free days a year (for example 104) for use whenever they saw fit.</p> <p>Could the GCP commit to modelling this and other scenarios that do not reduce funding for sustainable transport but also respond to consultation feedback?</p> |
| <p>Miranda Fyfe on behalf of Parents for the Sustainable Travel Zone</p>        | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Your bus improvement proposals list “fare subsidies” first, stating that £1/£2 singles would cost £16-£20 million. However, consultation responses show</p>   |

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>that frequency and reliability of services is a bigger concern than cost. Your report talks of “ensuring the bus is a more attractive financial option than the car” as being only possible when a £5 STZ charge is imposed. But for many journeys that people do right now it is already the case that existing, unsubsidised bus fares are cheaper than equivalent journeys by car.</p> <p>For example, my journey to Cambourne is a round-trip of 29 miles; using the recommended figure of 45p per mile, that’s £13 in car running costs; whereas, the DayriderPlus bus fare is only £7. Better than that, Stagecoach offer discounted Flexi tickets, sold as bundles of 5 or 10 valid for 12 months – so even infrequent bus users can benefit – costing just £4.75 each for those who will use 10 DayriderPlus tickets in a year. And if I were travelling from Haverhill, it’d be that same price on the bus, though double the car costs; even at 60mpg, the fuel alone would be £7. Yet your proposed, expensively subsidised £1/£2 singles fare structure would nearly double that Haverhill to Cambourne return fare from £4.75 to £8.</p> <p>Using this realistic comparison between car running costs and bus fares, existing bus services are NOT “totally unaffordable”. Within the smaller Dayrider zone Flexi10 tickets are only £3 for all-day travel. If only more people knew about them! And the all-day nature of these tickets addresses trip-chaining issues too.</p> <p>Instead of £1/£2 single fares, please will the Board prioritise in their bus package:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- widely publicising existing Flexi ticket options</li> <li>- expanding the Dayrider fare zone</li> <li>- promoting realistic comparisons between bus fares and car running costs?</li> </ul> |
| <p>Dr Mike More, Chair<br/>of Cambridge<br/>University Hospitals<br/>NHS Foundation<br/>Trust</p> | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>We know the challenges which congestion in Cambridge causes. Many staff and patients tell me how their journeys to and from hospital are made more difficult by being stuck in traffic or not being able to rely on public transport to get them home.</p> <p>As NHS hospitals on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, we support the move to more sustainable transport options and welcome the interventions already being made to improve journeys – such as the Cambridge South station, a new park and ride site, new busway and new cycleways. But these interventions alone will not be enough.</p> <p>In this context, finding the right travel solution for patients, staff and visitors to NHS organisations on the Campus is critically important. For example, many patients and their visitors are unfamiliar with coming to Cambridge; staff are concerned about the impact of a potential road user charge and whether there will be reliable alternatives; and all at a time when as NHS hospitals we face significant recruitment and retention challenges. To meet these challenges, something needs to be done to reduce congestion while providing reassurance that any proposed measures improve the situation for everyone and are fair.</p>   |

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>This leads me to my questions. We understand that the Making Connections proposals are likely to change in response to feedback. Could you please explain how the benefits outlined last year can still be delivered if the proposals are significantly reduced? How do you ensure the commitments to provide 20 hour-a-day bus services, subsidised fares, and more services to more places can still be achieved if the plans change? I ask this so I am able to reassure NHS staff and patients, who have genuine concerns about the impact of a Sustainable Travel Zone, that the scheme will help them travelling for work and treatment.</p>   |
| Roxanne De Beaux<br>on behalf of<br>Camcycle | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 10 - Making Connections Consultation Feedback and the City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>There was a strong call in the Making Connections consultation for walking, wheeling and cycling improvements. 80% of respondents supported making the city more accessible for disabled people, 75% supported more secure cycle parking, 73% supported more cycling and walking connections and 72% supported additional funding for maintenance and improvements to footways and cycleways. GCP modelling suggests that if a Sustainable Travel Zone was implemented, it would result in over 50,000 additional daily walking and cycling trips.</p> <p>However, there is no need to wait until then to make improvements to enable more people to choose active travel. While Camcycle believes it is vital to ringfence 20% of STZ revenue for walking and cycling, there is also an urgent need to deliver quick wins. The GCP recognises the importance of preparing the bus network before STZ implementation, and should do the same for active travel.</p> <p>This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resurfacing of damaged footways and cycleways</li> <li>• Widening of paths to meet national guidance and reduce pedestrian-cycle conflict</li> <li>• Removal of exclusionary barriers and pinch-points including the redesign of the barrier on King's Parade</li> <li>• Improvement of junctions through measures such as the installation of continuous footways and the adjustment of signals to make sure they prioritise people walking and cycling</li> <li>• Installation of more secure cycle parking in public spaces and on residential streets</li> <li>• Behaviour change support such as free or low-cost cycle training, cargo bike hire and e-bike loan schemes.</li> </ul> <p>Will the Board commit to selecting STZ options that deliver an equal or greater income for active travel than the consultation proposal, that ringfence 20% for walking and cycling, and that begin in 2023/24 with a package of active travel quick wins?</p> |
| Roxanne De Beaux<br>on behalf of<br>Camcycle | <p><b>Agenda Item No. 9 - Greater Cambridge Greenways: Bottisham, Saffham and St Ives</b></p> <p>Camcycle believes that, overall, there are just too many sections of the Greenway designs that are not just poor quality, but inappropriate for people</p>   |

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board**  
**Public Questions Listed in Order of Presentation**

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>of all ages and abilities and potentially dangerous. The Ditton Lane junction, the route through Swaffham Bulbeck, High Ditch Road, the Quay hotel access road, the Stow Road and Anglesey Abbey crossings, and the narrow, shared-use path on Riverside will not meet the objectives of the Greenways and fail to meet national design standards.</p> <p>On Riverside, the previous improvements to the western section should be used as a template for the eastern section. These provided additional space for people walking, a quiet street for cycling and rationalised parking. The current GCP proposals fail to recognise the huge opportunity to improve facilities for pedestrians and reduce conflict in this residential area. By not designing suitable networks for people walking, it is also compromising the quality of the cycle routes. The GCP have responded to many of the concerns raised by dismissively stating that 'This would be outside of the scope of the route'. The GCP should look at rationalising parking on Riverside (as it has done elsewhere on the Greenway schemes) to meet the project's objectives of better walking, wheeling and cycling routes for all.</p> <p>Regrettably, given the long delay on these much-needed schemes, we ask the Board to refuse to endorse the current proposals, and instruct officers to start engaging properly with parish councils, local communities and other key stakeholders to co-create high-quality schemes that deliver for everyone and meet the Greenways objectives.</p> |
|--|--|