

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

No.	Questioner	Question(s)
1	Jake Arnold-Forster	<p>Agenda item 9: GCP Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>With reference to the Abbey Chesterton Bridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the cycle/foot bridge be open? • When will riverside access under the existing railway bridge be restored?
2	Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>The Outline Business Case states that the travel hub must be a ‘multi-modal interchange’, yet the proposal presented to the GCP Executive Board is for a 750 space car park with little consideration given to integrating with other travel modes such as bus and cycling. This does not contribute to the scheme’s objective of maximising the potential for all journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport and The Board’s stated aim to develop public transport, walking and cycling improvements in the A10 corridor.</p> <p>Counter to these aims, the number of proposed parking spaces has more than doubled in size during the project thereby seeking to encourage rather than restrict car use.</p> <p>Given the aim to increase use of sustainable transport, create a multi-modal interchange, and the significant changes to travel patterns caused by the Coronavirus pandemic, will the GCP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review the long-term demand and need for car parking? b) Re-design the travel hub to create a fully multi-modal interchange with less emphasis on parking and more on sustainable travel modes, in line with the GCP’s objectives? c) Delay making any decisions on this proposal until such work has been completed?
3	Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>Foxton Parish Council would support a fully integrated, multi-modal travel hub as part of a strategic approach that includes bypassing Foxton level crossing. Moreover, in its response to the consultation, Network Rail stated that the creation of a large parking facility and resulting increases in vehicle and pedestrian movements would increase risks associated with the level crossing. The Outline Business Case also recognises that the level crossing is a key cause of congestion on the A10 in the Foxton area.</p> <p>Section 2.7 of the Outline Business case clearly shows that the proposal presented to the GCP Executive Board would stand in the way of any future level crossing bypass.</p> <p>What engagement has the GCP had with the Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority and Network Rail to seek a strategic solution that includes the problems caused by the Foxton level crossing?</p>

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

<p align="center">4</p>	<p align="center">Annabel Wright, Foxton Parish Clerk</p>	<p>Agenda Item 16: Foxton Travel Hub</p> <p>One of the scheme objectives is to “contribute to enhanced quality of life for those living and working in Greater Cambridge”. In the proposal presented to the Board, the emphasis is on improving access to employment and economic opportunities in Cambridge and offers no benefit to residents of Foxton and surrounding villages - all part of Greater Cambridge. In fact the increase air and noise pollution will have a detrimental impact on those living and working in Foxton.</p> <p>42 per cent of respondents to the 2019 consultation stated that they preferred neither the North or South option yet a ‘do nothing’ option was not included in the Outline Business Case. In addition, many respondents made specific comments on the negative impacts of the proposals.</p> <p>What account has been taken of:</p> <p>a) Those that supported neither option; and</p> <p>b) The negative impacts on Foxton raised by respondents to the consultation, particularly those in response to questions 2 and 4?</p>
<p align="center">5</p>	<p align="center">J. O'Dwyer</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>At the recent Joint Assembly Board meeting a question was asked if disability organisations were consulted. It was answered along the lines of, "It's rather difficult at the moment but we'll let them know".</p> <p>Public body you have duties under the Equality Act 2010 -The Equality Duty has three aims. It requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate unlawful discrimination, • advance equality of opportunity, • foster good relations. <p>Due regard means consciously thinking about the three aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making. This means that consideration of equality issues must influence the decisions reached by public bodies.</p> <p>An efficient transport system is essential for a society to function. For disabled people to fully participate in society, a fully accessible transport system is vital.</p> <p>If you accept that the best people to represent disabled people's interests are disabled people, then I would like to know who you are consulting with from the disabled community to fulfil your Equality Act duties?</p> <p>On viewing your website, I was unable to find any information on equal opportunities or disability except for knowledge on website accessibility. If it is there, it should be easier to locate.</p> <p>Just as important are the areas of housing and employment. I found no reference to 'Lifetime Homes' or 'Lifetime Neighbourhoods' or information about skills training for young disabled people in your website documents.</p>

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

		<p>Disabled people's needs should be mainstreamed at the design stage and not bolted on at the end, which is invariably more expensive and far less 'fit for purpose'.</p> <p>How many disabled people work in your organisation, this will indicate how serious you take the concept of 'equal opportunities'.</p> <p>I welcome your comments on the above.</p>
6	Wayne Boucher	<p>Agenda Item 8: Impact of and Response to Covid-19</p> <p>Covid-19 should have caused a re-analysis of all GCP projects, in particular the traffic projections for both cars and buses. Has the GCP done this for the Histon Road project? The bus lane as it stood was only going to give a couple of minutes saving during the rush hour on the inbound side, and none on the outbound side. What do the projections say now?</p>
7	Sam Davies	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The GCP's commitment to providing an NMU-compatible underpass between Wandlebury Country Park and Magog Down has been part of the CSET Phase 1 project definition since 2017. It therefore came as a surprise to learn at June's LLF that this commitment had been dropped by project officers without adequate consultation or exploration of satisfactory alternatives.</p> <p>The A1307 in this location severs local people's ability to access south Cambridge's two major outdoor recreation destinations. It is a 60mph road on a steep incline and includes sections of dual carriageway. Officers have proposed a small traffic island between the carriageways as a substitute for the underpass, which suggests that they are either ignorant of, or have no interest in, the needs of cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. They have attempted to justify this on the grounds that, because there are no safe crossings elsewhere along the A1307, none is required here – but there is no site elsewhere on the A1307 with two major outdoor attractions and such a potentially high density of NMUs.</p> <p>Officers apologised for the breach of trust at both the LLF and the Joint Assembly meeting and have set a date for a stakeholder workshop in late July – but in the meantime they have already submitted a planning application for the inadequate traffic island I describe above.</p> <p>Given the stated ambitions of all three Councils represented on the GCP to support sustainable transport, and the GCP's own commitment to improving quality of life for residents, I ask Board Members to affirm that it is reasonable to expect delivery of a means of crossing the A1307 in this location which is both safe and useful; and to request that officers withdraw the current planning application and resume meaningful discussion with relevant stakeholders about how this will be achieved.</p>

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

8	Dr. Charlotte Vacogne	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>Will you re-examine the proposal to change the guided busway route to make it go through the old railway as suggested in this plan?</p> <p>https://www.cambridgeppf.org/south-east-cambridge-busway</p> <p>Can the local residents consider legal/other ways to fight this proposal, until when?</p> <p>Cutting through the Stapleford and Great Shelford green belt will damage the environment, the view, cut through pedestrian paths used by joggers, families, to relax, walk around. I further reduce the green space that is so precious and becoming increasingly rare around Cambridge.</p> <p>The cheaper and easier option doesn't have to be the go-to option.</p>
9	Sarah (Rosie) Brown	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The GCP proposed route for the south-east busway boxes-in the village of Stapleford with three level crossings (existing railway plus two more for the busway). Given that the existing railway crossing already results in significant vehicle tailbacks down Hinton way / Station road, the addition of up to 16 buses per hour on the busway will increase this traffic significantly. In this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is the proposed route and additional road crossings considered acceptable by GCP, given that emergency vehicles will inevitably be delayed accessing houses, in particular those located between crossings (e.g. Leeway Ave)? This route will impede fire, police and ambulance access to residents and result in significant negative health and safety impacts. - What is the impact to local resident health from the increased NOx and particulates from increased static vehicle traffic at these multiple crossings? Will local air quality standards be exceeded? A 2018 report from Public Health England notes that air pollution is the leading cause of early death. - Would the costs of tunnelling under the roads (in place of road crossings) make the cost of this route on a par with / more than the old Cambridge - Haverhill railway route? - Is concern over this topic (and possibly others) the reason why there has been no stakeholder consultation on the alternative route options in recent months? If not, what was and how is it fair to local residents to move ahead with a scheme that will have negative health impacts and decrease quality of life? <p>Given the lack of consultation with local communities in the past months regarding the south east transport busway, and the fact that questions asked in the previous GCP meeting were deferred until later in the agenda <i>and then not answered</i>, please answer this question now.</p>

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

10	Stuart Newman	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I am a resident on Granhams Road, Great Shelford.</p> <p>The Great Shelford village council concluded that they could find little to recommend the plan as it goes past Shelford without providing a suitable stop for residents of Shelford to use. I can't see this on the list of public responses.</p> <p>This, however, must surely be a material objection where one of the key objectives of the plan is to improve links between the villages. How is the plan achieving this stated objective?</p> <p>Can I ask that further consideration is given to Granhams Road and Hinton Way. Both have railway crossings which disrupt them and the proposed new busway will cross these roads within a few hundred yards of the railway crossings. This has potential safety concerns as well as likely severely reducing access for residents on these roads.</p>
11	Howard Kettel	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>The Mott MacDonald 'CSET Phase 2 Shelford Railway Alignment: Design Development & Feasibility Assessment' report (May 2020) confirms that the alternative railway route is technically feasible, and with realistic performance assumptions performs at least as well as the chosen route.</p> <p>The alternative Shelford Railway Alignment would avoid unnecessary damage to the unique, relatively unspoiled and historically important landscape adjacent to the Gog Magog Hills. It would avoid damage to Green Belt lands which are very important to the setting, and to nearby communities for recreation and amenity, and are of economic value for farming. The alternative would also bring considerable economic benefits to local communities by connecting them directly into the public transport network.</p> <p>Will the GCP pause the scheme and submit the alternative Shelford Railway Alignment to public consultation?</p>
12	Lilian Rundblad, Chair, HRARA	<p>Agenda Items 8, 9, and 10: Comments relating to Histon Road Scheme</p> <p>Histon Road Area Residents' Association wishes to raise the question of whether the plans as currently drawn up for the restructuring of Histon Road require fundamental reappraisal in the light of the radically different circumstances now affecting traffic flow in the area. Our world has changed and will probably never be the same again. Far fewer cars are using the road; more people are cycling and walking.</p> <p>In 4 days the closures enabling construction of an obsolete plan will start. New cycling and walking proposals adopted 16/6/20 within the Covid19 Temporary cycling proposals ETRO by Highways (Space to Breathe) affects the Histon Road outbound lane. Key elements of the programme (Item 7, 2.5).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of car parking along the road is already planned (no signs posted)

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Reallocation of traffic lanes to accommodate bidirectional or contraflow cycle lanes – there are presently no cycle lanes in southern area; present cycle lane northern area is 0.91m wide! - photo Victoria Junction 22/6 3. Removal of railings – photo Victoria Road Junction 22/6 4. Installation of cycle parking – additional sites required <p>Item 8 – 6.2 Only tree/hedge clearing and replanting in north and unfinished Victoria Junction. No preparations for closures.</p> <p>Item 9 – The Histon Road project in the Government’s Report was a major reason for the additional £400m to be released. 24.11 - HRARA expects that the additional costs for the urgent ETRO necessary during the construction period will be adhered to.</p> <p>Item 10 – No mention of Histon Road in this report. Perhaps included in Maintenance page 108.</p> <p>HRARA asks the GCP EB to direct the officers to ascertain that the safety for cyclists and pedestrians will be available on 29th June on Histon Road outbound lane when closure starts, following the Highways Key Elements’ programme ETRO.</p> <p>[See also Appendix One]</p>
13	Clare Arthurs	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>In relation to the proposed level crossings on Hinton Way, Granham’s Road and Haverhill Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What traffic modelling/research has been done to analyse the impact of these crossings on traffic flow on these routes, particularly during peak times? 2. What measures are proposed to prevent the villages being disadvantaged in terms of access by emergency vehicles? 3. What modelling/analysis has been done to establish the impact of idling traffic and increased congestion on air quality and noise pollution for local residents? 4. What measures are proposed to reduce/manage the impact of increased roadside parking along these streets? <p>More generally:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What evidence do you have regarding likely levels of use of this busway? In particular, what are the projections of use from villages such as Stapleford, Shelford and Sawston (which are disproportionately affected) as compared with those from further away? 6. Will the cost/benefit analysis be revisited to take into account the financial impact of Covid and Brexit? 7. Will GCP revisit this project to take into account reduced levels of employment and/or increased numbers of people working from home post Covid? 8. How are you going to make GCP communicate effectively with and be accountable to local stakeholders in this project?

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

		<p>9. What consideration has been given to building a large Park and Ride on the proposed site, and running fleets of (Electric) buses to the Genome, Babraham and Biomedical Campuses, and on into town? This would reduce traffic to very local traffic, which could be further reduced by the provision of regular bus services.</p> <p>10. What consideration has been given to introducing a congestion charge, in isolation or in combination with an extended P&R scheme as set out above?</p>
<p align="center">14</p>	<p align="center">Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>Reallocation of Road Space Projects</p> <p>5.5 “The aim is to create a network of safe routes on key corridors, that will encourage cycling within the city but also from Park&Ride sites and nearby towns and villages.”</p> <p>The definition of Active Travel in the new Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan includes equestrians. There are nine references to ‘Active Travel’ in the report yet no reference to equestrians nor any reference as to what space has been allocated for their use.</p> <p>The 25,500 horses in Cambridgeshire have the right to be ridden on every highway in the county (except motorways). They must be actively provided for and protected in the reallocation of road space schemes and not simply forgotten and left in the traffic flow on a reduced carriageway with fast moving cyclists tight up to their left hand side and vehicles on their right.</p> <p>Where highway signage currently excludes equestrians, a county wide policy needs to be adopted. Unless the GCP / Road Safety Audit deems the safest place for horse-riders to be is on the carriageway with the traffic and accepts the consequences of that decision, we propose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A blanket policy giving horse riders the legal right to use all routes including those marked with the blue “pedestrian / cycle only” or cycle stencil sign <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All restrictive signs must be replaced with "pedestrian, cycle AND horse riders only” sign and used in future projects <p>The Board has a duty of care to all lawful road users therefore will the Board agree that approval for these projects will include a caveat that safe provision for equestrians must be included and identified?</p>
<p align="center">15</p>	<p align="center">Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>6.12 ‘ the main objective of the Cambridge South East Transport Phase 2 project ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve active travel infrastructure and public transport provision for South East Cambridge. • Improve Road Safety for all users of the A1307 Corridor

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

		<p>The LTP states the Greenways will deliver new and improved segregated links from Cambridge for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The Linton Greenway forms part of the CSETS project. The LTP also specifically states that equestrians will be included on the non-motorised user path alongside the A1307.</p> <p>The inclusion of equestrians on other transport projects is embedded within the LTP therefore the GCP must not exclude us as is proposed on the A1307 crossing schemes at Magog Farm and Hildersham cross roads and has already occurred on the Sawston Greenway.</p> <p>The Board has a duty of care to all residents therefore will the Board agreed that any approval for these projects includes a caveat that equestrians must be included in any provision for other non-motorised user groups?</p>
16	<p align="center">Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 17: Greenways</p> <p>The Board is being asked to approve the scheme proposals for three Greenways. These include proposals to cover with tarmac, over the majority of their width, several bridleways which are currently rural, grassed paths e.g. the Whitwell Way. The amenity of a bridleway includes being able to chat whilst riding side by side with a friend, so path width is important for equestrians.</p> <p>Since 1968, horse riders have willingly shared their bridleways with cyclists but we oppose the roadification of the Public Bridleway Network as has recently occurred at Reynolds Drove. We also oppose allowing the soft surface preferred by many users to be reduced or removed. There are many alternative surfaces on the market suitable for all users and far more appropriate for the countryside than tarmac.</p> <p>Will the Board agree to prohibit the use of tarmac for these Greenways on existing bridleways, field edges and rural locations and require a more sympathetic and suitable material be used instead? Will the Board also agree that their approval includes the protection and preservation of the bridleway amenity for horse riders?</p>
17	<p align="center">David Wrathmall</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>The changes to road access in Cambridge City are being forced onto the population without consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either with local residents. • & it appears without involvement with their elected representatives. <p>Many specific safety and practical concerns have been raised by residents about the individual schemes but have not been addressed.</p> <p>For example, it is doubted whether GCP have consulted with the emergency services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutting these access roads will force emergency vehicles onto roads that are already at breaking point. • Putting at risk the 8-minute emergency response time.

**25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt**

		<p>Although 'rat-running' is an issue, in the absence of public transport, roads to be closed are used daily by many residents, including those with mobility issues, to reach medical, educational and retail infrastructures.</p> <p>A recent petition to Peter Blake, received 300 objections to one particular road closure (Nightingale Avenue).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that GCP understand that the same residents that object to these road closures in their petition ALSO support improved cycling safety in their communities. • Residents understand their local environment very well and & believe that 2-way car traffic and safe cycling schemes can <u>co-exist side by side</u>. • Residents understand these road closures will go-ahead for a trial period of 6 months. • Residents are <u>now</u> waking up to the fact that decisions that have a serious impact on their lives are made without any communication let alone consultation. • These road closure trials will <u>now</u> be monitored very carefully by residents. <p>In order to bring residents into the consultation process over the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could GCP explain to residents the evaluation criteria that resulted in the decision to impose these road closures? • How will the GPC appraise the success or failure of each trial to determine if the changes should be made permanent or reversed?
18	Dr. Charlotte Vacogne	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>I live in Haverhill Road and the busway cuts in the fields right behind my backyard. This will produces a small 'triangle' of field stuck between the back of all Haverhill Roads houses to the east, the busway and a section of the footpath to the south.</p> <p>There are deep worries that this will open the door to 'develop' and build on this triangle of land. This will defeat the purpose of us having bought the house (the main reason was the open wheat fields at the end of the garden). I would like to have reassurance of some sort that this won't be the case.</p>
19	Eleanor Clark	<p>Agenda Item 13: Cambridge South East Transport Scheme</p> <p>What research has been done and what evidence do you have regarding likely levels of use of this busway? In particular, what are the projections of use from villages such as Stapleford, Shelford and Sawston (Which are disproportionately affected)?</p> <p>How does the cost / benefit analysis stack up now post Covid and Brexit? It is widely expected that both employment and working patterns will fundamentally change after these events?</p>

25th June 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed in Order of Receipt

20	Ericka Jacobs	<p>Agenda Item 10: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy: Update and Support for Covid-19 Recovery</p> <p>As a resident of Bateman Street in Newtown, I was interested to read about the proposed Temporary cycle/pedestrian scheme proposals in my area. We have a huge number students walking and cycling to and from school, combined with buses, taxis and private motor vehicles ‘rat running’ down Bateman Street, along with school parents dropping off and collecting students. This leads to frequent conflicts on the road, occasionally dangerous situations and not a few near-misses and actual accidents, particularly involving cyclists. I see the need to improve not only the existing conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, but also to increase space for social distancing given the need to encourage more people to walk and cycle during the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>However, I note that some of the proposed changes, including in Newtown, indicate that there is an intention to “prohibit motor vehicles at all times on the following short sections of road:....” There is no language indicating that access will be maintained, for instance, for emergency vehicles, buses or indeed residents.</p> <p>Please can you confirm whether such access will be maintained, and if so, change the wording to reflect this?”</p>
----	---------------	--

Background Information to Question 12

