

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Question</b>
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 9 – Quarterly Progress Report</b></p> <p>Camcycle would like to thank officers for the response to the questions on this topic we asked at the Joint Assembly. We have one more query on cycling projects.</p> <p>We know from the government’s Gear Change report that building up the active travel capabilities of local authorities will be an important focus of the new funding body and inspectorate, Active Travel England. With this in mind, why have the GCP chosen to relinquish the expertise of the county’s cycle projects team?</p> <p>In February 2020, you told us that the GCP was committed to employing the appropriate expertise with the local knowledge to deliver cycling projects. With an increased number of schemes planned for the future we believe it is essential to retain and build on this team of locally-based experts who have the everyday cycling experience to truly understand the needs of Cambridgeshire communities.</p>
<p>Lynda Warth County Access &amp; Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>We endorse the statement at 4.5 which highlights the need for leisure access for all active travel modes. The GCP must be congratulated on its forward thinking proposals within the CSETs project for a green bridleway alongside the bus route with links into the existing PROW network and for the Greenways proposals, if not their actual delivery thus far. Recognising the need for flexibility and the inclusion of provision for leisure journeys in its post pandemic approach, will the Board confirm its continued support of providing safe, appropriately surfaced, transport corridors for all active travellers in line with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan’s definition of Active Travel – walkers, cyclists and horse riders?</p> <p>Whilst we support the creation of safe space for walking and cycling referenced in paragraph 7.11, this must be extended to all Active Travellers including equestrians, particularly in semi urban and rural locations and on routes which link communities or the PROW network.</p> <p>This Board has previously been advised of the danger created for equestrians by on road cycle lanes and the consequences of extinguishing the right of equestrians to use safe verges when shared cycle / pedestrian paths are created.</p> <p>Will the Board please confirm that the safety of all active travellers (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) will be considered equally in the space reallocation proposals?</p>

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Sharon Dence Councillor, Rampton Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Looking at the current plan for bus services in the agenda papers I can see no plan to include Rampton in any of the proposed routes or even a recognition of its existence on the maps. Leaving the village with absolutely no public transport options is clearly unacceptable at a time when we are trying to reduce emissions, get people to leave cars at home and encourage people into the City.</p> <p>To that end I wonder whether the ambitions of the transport delivery programme for South Cambridgeshire considers smaller isolated villages? Can Rampton, and other smaller villages, have any confidence that there will be a bus service even with the public transport improvements being discussed. The vision will fail if the focus is solely on larger villages thereby condemning people living in villages like Rampton to be largely car dependent. Buses at peak times need to be offered making a viable service which will then be supported. Could some of these options be provided to improve the situation in line with the Mayor's position and the GCP's mission to increase use of public transport into the city?</p> <p>My question is how can smaller villages like Rampton be confident that they will benefit from the Public Transport vision in this agenda item if they are not even worthy of a dot on the map?</p> <p><i>See also supporting information Appendix 1</i></p>
<p align="center">Edward Leigh Smarter Cambridge Transport</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>With the exception of the recommendation to co-fund 30 electric buses (which, though desirable, will do nothing for modal shift), it seems that none of the officer recommendations will lead to change on the ground within the next twelve months. The proposals, which have been six years in the making, are still highly conceptual, with critically important foundation work still ongoing, even for measures that are uncontroversial, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing the future bus network</li> <li>• Revising the road network hierarchy</li> <li>• Developing an integrated parking strategy</li> <li>• Installing city-wide smart traffic signals and integrated control systems</li> <li>• Implementing an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone</li> <li>• Designing a complete in-city cycle network</li> <li>• Locating logistics hubs to promote efficient, low-emission deliveries</li> </ul> <p>The future bus network does not propose any changes to city-centre bus routes, even though it is clear that changes will be needed, both to reduce conflicts with people walking and cycling, and to create additional capacity for the planned expansion in bus services.</p>

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>So, our questions to the board are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the GCP formally evaluate ideas proposed by Smarter Cambridge Transport, bus operators and any other groups for re-configuring city bus routes to increase capacity, facilitate interchange, and improve safety?</li> <li>2. From which budgets will local authorities fund the expansion in bus services (estimated at £40 million/year) until the proposed “flexible charge” produces sufficient surplus revenue to cover it?</li> </ol>
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 10 - Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Once again, we thank officers for the responses to our questions at the Joint Assembly. Given the many risks from a car-based recovery from Covid and the deepening climate crisis, we remain concerned about the slow timescale. Bath’s Clean Air Zone has been in operation since March this year, Oxford’s Zero Emission Zone will be implemented in February 2022 and the London Ultra Low Emission Zone will be expanded next month. Our city is way behind in its plans.</p> <p>We have been told that City Access plans will reduce traffic levels to the point where the roadspace could be used for something different e.g. space for pedestrians, cyclists and bus routes. However, Camcycle believes that action on safe streets cannot wait for a flexible charge to be in place. Measures that will help as many people as possible switch from driving to active travel must be prioritised now to support the overall goals of the City Access Scheme and the proposed bus improvements.</p> <p>Therefore, our questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Point 4.4 talks about integrating a Residents’ Parking strategy with a Liveable Neighbourhoods approach. What is the timescale for this work and does the Combined Authority’s expression of interest for Mini-Holland funding include any areas in Greater Cambridge?</li> <li>2) We still don’t have a clear answer on what the ‘revised network hierarchy’ mentioned in point 7.9 refers to – previous papers have suggested it was scheduled for adoption in 2022. When will this hierarchy be published?</li> <li>3) What progress has been made on the workplace travel scheme and city centre freight pilot referred to in the baseline package?</li> <li>4) We’ve seen the benefit of experimental schemes from the Active Travel ETROs (agenda item 10) – what happened to the idea of car-free days proposed as part of the baseline interventions in February 2020?</li> </ol>

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Steven Hollis</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Newtown Road Closure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Why has no consideration been given to the effect on traffic and pollution caused by residents and visitors having to drive around the closure areas in order to access the area from the other side. I now spend 10 minutes or more on Lensfield Road and Hills Road that I would not otherwise enter. This will become worse in winter and as more people stop WFH?</li> <li>2 Why has no consideration been given to the effect on businesses in the area by the disruption caused to customers visiting their premises? The current traffic issues are discouraging a lot of trade</li> <li>3 Why has no proper consideration been given to emergency vehicles becoming stuck in gridlocked traffic? No ambulance would be able to exit Newtown along Union Road from 4pm to 6pm. The gridlocked traffic in front of it would not be able to get out of the way.</li> </ol>
<p align="center">Linny Purr</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Data shows longer delays on side roads from displaced traffic from GCP modal filters.</p> <p>Is it your duty to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• secure the “expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network” (Traffic Management Bill Clause 16[1])?</li> <li>• respond to the climate crisis and Britain’s targets of reducing emissions - 68% by 2030, 78% by 2035 and net zero emissions by 2050?</li> <li>• safeguard people with protected characteristics and their important services?</li> <li>• ‘build back fairer’ and contribute to ‘levelling up’?</li> <li>• protect businesses and the local economy?</li> <li>• listen to citizens harmed rather than the politically organised vocal minority of the seemingly fanatical cycling lobby and self-interested residents’ associations?</li> <li>• oppose this crude government policy to enforce behaviour change that comes with the threat of risking losing central funding if not implemented?</li> </ul> <p>Closing roads is wonderful for improved air quality, Active Travel and increasing house prices within the private enclaves created for the privileged few who get quieter roads for themselves and their children. Families and children, who live, cycle, walk, work, go to school and wait for buses along roads that take the displaced traffic are expendable for their ‘greater good’. So too are the elderly, disabled and those with mobility issues.</p> <p>Higher time and transport costs harm businesses, deliverers, doctors, district nurses, carers, social services transport, taxis etc.</p>

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Even if some journeys ‘evaporate’, longer journeys and increased traffic in fewer roads, creates congestion and more emissions than previously.</p> <p>Will the GCP re-examine road closures and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Stop modal filters, improve public transport and offer incentives to encourage more cycling and walking instead?</li> <li>2) Ensure free-flowing traffic (enabling necessary journeys to get to, through, and round, Cambridge) to cut emissions and aid the economy?</li> <li>3) Say, “No” to government coercion?</li> <li>4) Give us justice and ‘Healthy and Safe Streets for ALL Not Just the Few’?</li> </ol>
<p>Robert Rawlinson *</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Luard Road ETRO</p> <p>The GCP Joint Assembly meeting on Thursday 9th September unanimously agreed to recommend keeping the road closure permanent ‘The GCP Joint Assembly supports making permanent the Luard Road closure but to mitigate impacts on other roads, requests work is undertaken on traffic signals in the area.’</p> <p>The question below is being jointly raised by the residents and non-residents listed below, and are presented as a single request for the convenience of the Executive Board.</p> <p>On the basis the officers report states no negative evidence to support the proposal to rescind the current experimental order, and furthermore, there is clear evidence the objectives have been met, as well as the proven popularity of the scheme with residents and non-residents alike, what would be the justification for re-opening the road and going against the unanimous decision made at the GCP meeting of September 9th?</p> <p>On ‘whether it should be retained’, the Luard/Sedley Taylor scheme scored more highly in responses from non-residents than it did from residents - both groups were overwhelmingly in favour, i.e. the consultation results were not skewed by any sort of neighbourhood campaign.</p> <p>We urge the Executive Board to support the recommendation to make the Luard Road closure permanent which received unanimous support at the Joint Assembly. Not to do this would make the roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians. The officers report states the scheme has been ‘successful in improving walking and cycling and making the area safer’ with this view based on 700 cycle trips per day.</p> <p><i>See also supporting information Appendix 1</i></p> <p>* Questions presented on behalf of the following residents and non-residents: Aldo Marion, Alethea Ato, Alex Robson, Angus &amp; Nicky Runciman, Ayesha Ahmed, Chris Fox, Clare Martinson, Daphne Fowler,</p>

**30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board  
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>David Clary, Elizabeth Hart, Emma &amp; Fergus Duncan, Gail Jenner, Hakon Martinsen, Henry Howarth, Janet Edwards, Chris Parkins, Susan Hegarty, Doreen Hodgson, Braden Howarth, Jim Metcalf, Heather Warwick, Juliet Barclay, Jumbo Jenner, Martin Rowland, Michelle Pearl, Paul Rudin, Peggy Maxwell, Pete Fox, Peter Hewkin, Polly Holme, Richard Ogden, Rob Foale, Rosie Bridge, Sandrine &amp; Chris Parkins, Susan Rushton, Heather Clary, Peter Hewkin, Rory Powe, Don Broom, Sally Broom, Vivien Perutz, Emma Duncan, Tim Dodkin, Tim Palmer, Yolande Orr, Anne Lyon, Richard Lyon, Robert Rawlinson, Militza Callinan, Nick Flynn.</p>
<p>Martin Lucas-Smith on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p><b>Agenda item 11 - Active Travel: Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders</b></p> <p>Camcycle would like to reiterate our support for this report and we welcome the Joint Assembly's recommendation to add Luard Road to the list of schemes to be made permanent.</p> <p>The data shows that all the GCP's experimental active travel schemes have been successful with routes rebalancing transport in favour of walking and cycling and the majority of respondents to the consultation agreeing that the areas are safer and more pleasant in terms of noise/pollution and general ambience. We support further work by the GCP and its partners to improve the schemes where necessary and design and implement permanent layouts.</p> <p>Our question is: given the success of these experimental schemes, what work is the GCP doing to build on and extend this project? The county council's consultation website on the second phase of Active Travel Schemes says that 'that projects relating to initial ideas for Cambridge Historic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Grange Road and Sidgwick Avenue are being considered separately by the Greater Cambridge Partnership'. What is the status of this work?</p>

**Supporting information to the Question from Sharon Dence**

A little creative thinking could unlock real benefits. The Citi 8 pauses in Cottenham on Lambs Lane, instead of idling there could it not use that time to circle down to Rampton, round the green and back up to collect Rampton residents. Could some of the guided buses come off the busway at Longstanton, pick up through Willingham, Rampton and Cottenham returning onto the busway at Oakington, thereby providing access to the busway for all three parishes? Could a request bus stop & cycle racking be provided at the end of Reynolds Drove in Rampton like the one at Fen Drayton Lakes, this would cause minimal disruption to the expressway but be of huge benefit to the residents of Rampton. Currently Rampton has no public service and no amenities in the village so parishioners have no option but to resort to using multiple cars and taxis. The very limited and sporadic provision of a bus service over the years has led to a lack of trust so when parishioners are planning access to employment, education, healthcare and other essential activities such as shopping and socialising they inevitably buy a car. In a time when it is essential we reduce emissions and increase the use of public transport these issues need to be addressed in our smaller villages.

**Supporting information to the Question from Robert Rawlinson**

The Luard Road ETRO achieves the KEY BENEFITS/objectives stated by the council for introducing the road closure. Namely:

- a. Fewer motor vehicles can help make cycling and walking safer and more pleasant.
- b. Residential areas no longer used by through traffic.
- c. There is less noise and pollution on residential streets
- d. The measures are part of the City Access project, helping to make travel into and around Cambridge more sustainable.

Furthermore, a recent survey carried out by residents showed this daily number of cycle trips had increased by 97% to 1,380 and pedestrians numbers recorded at 2,291, measured between 7am-7pm. This data surely supports the view that Luard and Sedley Taylor roads are simply not suitable nor safe to allow cars, vans and HGV's to use the road as a 'cut through'. Furthermore, could it not be surmised that the ETRO was indeed encouraging more pedestrians and cyclists to use the route as they feel safer in doing so now there are no motor vehicles.

