

**15 February 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p>David Stoughton (Chair) Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 -Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal</p> <p>Living Streets welcomes GCP’s recognition, finally, that walking and wheeling is ‘the most common mode of transport in the city’. We now need a GCP strategy to translate that evidence into action.</p> <p>The National Walking Survey (2019) found that 31% of over 65s has stopped walking and 48% would walk more if pedestrian environments were safer. We find it offensive that GCP will fund expensive technological fixes, such as Starting crossings, but not invest in improving key walking routes across the city.</p> <p>Designating some ‘Key Walking Routes’ as ‘Investment Routes’ will enable GCP to resurface key sections of pavement as well as installing micro gardens and benches and remove pavement obstructions. This aligns with GCP investment work elsewhere that has included resurfacing roads in the course of developing new projects. It would not undermine the relationship between GCP as infrastructure and County Highways as maintenance.</p> <p>GCP could pioneer a response to National Living Streets research (2023) exposing economic costs of outdoor falls to the NHS and social care, costs difficult to assess because a defined ‘road traffic injury’ must include a vehicle. RTI statistics don’t include pedestrian accidents and they often go unreported to local authorities and in hospital admissions.</p> <p>Living Streets has existing case studies of need and benefit to contribute to a ‘quick wins’ programme and welcomes constructive discussion with GCP.</p> <p>Our question is whether GCP will take up the challenge to respond to what people struggling to walk in our city have clearly stated that they need: decent walking routes to stations, to workplaces, to shops and other amenities? And will you ensure that your ideas for ‘quick wins’ are grounded in people’s walking and wheeling lived experience, so that GCP becomes a champion and a model for transforming the pedestrian environment?</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Capturing Wider Benefits of the City Deal</p> <p>Agenda item 7 focuses on positioning the GCP favourably as it approaches the second gateway review. There are some positive aspects within this agenda item, and this holistic approach and is something Camcycle and others has been calling for all along. However, when reviewing progress, it must also review its failures. The GCP and the bodies it represents must examine what is not working and what can be improved. organisationally, there will be little room for growth without reflection and learning.</p>

**15 February 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Within this agenda item, we are surprised to see the inclusion of the Green and Blue Infrastructure strategy, with only two short paragraphs dedicated to explaining its purpose and content. Across the three documents seeking approval, there are nearly 200 pages of detail and very importantly a design code. This document is a critical document for how the Greenways will be delivered.</p> <p>Within it are meant to be greenway-specific requirements. Under design elements, there is section 3.6 on lighting. However, there is almost no meaningful guidance provided. It does not establish preferences for lighting, when it should or could be suitable, and it doesn't even mention solar studs, whose use in areas that will not be lit will be vital.</p> <p>The discussion around how the greenways will be lit has persisted for years. Now is the moment to resolve it, and this is the document that should address it.</p> <p>Does the Joint Assembly believe this guidance sets out a clear way for lighting to be designed on the greenway network?</p>
<p>Liz Walter Mill Road 4 People</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Mill Road 4 People is a campaigning organisation with over 1,000 signed-up supporters. Our question has two parts.</p> <p>1. Quick Wins</p> <p>Are you aware that the campaign group Mill Road 4 People has done a lot of work around suggestions for 'quick win' improvements to Mill Road?</p> <p>A document detailing our proposals was sent via email on 23 June 2023 to Cllrs Shailer and Howitt. (attached). Can you confirm that its contents have been or will be passed to the relevant officers and that its recommendations will be given serious consideration in any planning for Mill Road, bearing in mind that Mill Road 4 People now represents over 1,000 mainly local signed-up supporters?</p> <p>2. Pavement Parking</p> <p>Mill Road 4 People has also been conducting a hugely popular campaign called PaveMeant for People, aimed at tackling illegal pavement parking. We are calling for individual bike racks to be installed at the pavement edge, parallel to the road, in all places where the pavement width is sufficient. This would both create a barrier to pavement parking and provide much-needed extra bike parking. Could you confirm that at least one of your 'demonstrator projects' will be aimed at tackling pavement parking on Mill Road, and that our proposal will be given serious consideration?</p>

**15 February 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Sarah Hughes Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance Officer</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance is deeply disappointed that the GCP is recommending setting aside the road reclassification project, substantially reducing the budget for the City Access programme and reorienting City Access away from the transformation of transport infrastructure the City Deal was established to bring about.</p> <p>Changing the way Cambridge's roads are classified could have transformed the city for the better. It could have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allowed buses to run on time - over half of bus users we interviewed in Cambridge thought non Park&Ride services were late or unreliable • made walking, wheeling and cycling much easier, safer and more pleasant • given us cleaner air to breathe • made the city a much more attractive place. <p>If the road reclassification project is cancelled as well as the Sustainable Travel Zone road charge, and there are no plans by the GCP or others to pursue a workplace parking levy or other transformative options, in 2030 - the year in which Cambridge City aims to reach net zero - Cambridge will still largely have its 1980s road system that on the whole prioritises motorised transport over sustainable travel.</p> <p>In contrast, many other UK cities are planning or have taken bold steps to transform transport - Edinburgh will experiment with restricting traffic through its city centre, Oxford is going ahead with traffic filters and LTNs, Bristol has a Clean Air Zone, London has an effective congestion charge and recently brought in ULEZ, and Nottingham has a Workplace Parking Levy.</p> <p>Page 103 of the agenda pack references the GCP objective to reduce traffic by 15% compared to the 2011 baseline. To what extent does the GCP think it will meet this objective with neither a transformational transport plan like a road charge, nor a reclassification of Cambridge's roads?</p>
<p align="center">Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Political indecision continues stifle Cambridge, affecting business, residents, health, and the environment. Eighteen months after the consultation on the road hierarchy, this paper does nothing but reflect the statistical facts of the consultation response; and passing off of responsibilities to the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy at an unknown date in the future.</p> <p>Many will speculate this procrastination reflects an inability to reduce congestion, and downgrading roads is indeed more difficult</p>

**15 February 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>without first reducing traffic. However, it is definitely not impossible, and as proposed, the road hierarchy was never intended to be a scheme to be implemented all at once.</p> <p>Our 18-page response, compiled with the help of our 1,700 members, questioned the car-centric approach, starkly highlighted by the fundamental misunderstanding of the word "road", when in fact what was being discussed were streets.</p> <p>We set out a user approach and looked to the content for inspiration. We drew attention to how other cities manage circulation, taking specific inspiration from those that do it without a road charging scheme.</p> <p>One of the best examples of this, in a small city is Ghent, Belgium, which controls the vehicle movements of its 300,000 residents through a circulation plan. Introduced in 2017, it was delivered in under three years for less than €5 million. Results have included a 60% increase in cycling, 55% increase in public transport use, 35% decrease in road collisions and a 15% increase in greenery, replacing previously paved areas. 71% of inner-city residents say that it is a more pleasant place to live.</p> <p>While it's important to have a quick wins package, it could be described as a band-aid on a bullet wound. We've always needed a bigger scheme too.</p> <p>Why doesn't the GCP believe that such a scheme could be delivered as part of the City Access Programme?</p>
<p align="center">Richard Wood Secretary, Cambridge Area Bus Users</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - City Access Programme Update</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has recently engaged extensively with a wide range of stakeholders as part of its 'Bus Network Review', in order to assess local needs and identify new opportunities.</p> <p>Stakeholders included community groups – several Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance member organisations took part – as well as businesses, local leaders and councillors, parish councils, educational institutions and healthcare providers. The engagement not only enabled CPCA to review the existing tendered services it supports; it also generated ideas for many new services CPCA could support, some of which will in all probability go ahead due to the increase in the mayoral precept.</p> <p>While Cambridge Area Bus Users is disappointed that the potentially most impactful City Access projects will likely not proceed, we believe that localised improvements can still be made through a programme of 'seeding' quick wins and demonstrator projects, coupled with a behaviour change programme.</p>

**15 February 2024 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>How is the GCP planning to engage with stakeholders, including Residents' Associations and community groups such as ours, to identify quick wins and demonstrator projects to which the GCP could commit 'seed-corn' funding enabling them to be delivered within the lifetime of the City Deal?</p>
--	---

Supplementary information referred to in question from Mill Road 4 People

Mill Road Quick Wins - Cambs County Council June 2023

- Zebra crossings combined with speed humps to facilitate crossing Mill Road and to slow traffic speeds
- Humped crossings: Humped crossings to make Mill Road pavements continuous across side roads – with appropriate give-way road markings – would slow traffic and make the area less attractive as a cut-through
- Change pelican crossings to zebra crossings OR alter priorities on existing pelicans to default to red signal for road users, only turning green when vehicle is waiting
- We understand that speed indicators may be erected on existing poles without the administration necessary for speed cameras. We request that this provision should be considered.
- Community funded and resourced parklets, which occupy 2/3 of one lane of the existing highway (as the Mill Road Summer parklet erected previously). Start with one in Petersfield and one in Romsey - councillors already have an action to confirm how this can be facilitated in terms of existing County guidance on parklets.
- Provision of signage to advertise that the Chisholm trail phase 2 is coming soon at appropriate points on either side of Mill Road bridge
- The next phases of the Chisholm Trail will bring extra north-south traffic to the junctions at each end of the railway bridge. We believe that changing priority by installing stop-, or give-way, lines

for the limited amount of traffic coming off the bridge in both directions would limit vehicle speeds and enhance safety at the Great Eastern and Headley or Kingston Street junctions

- Removal of loading time restrictions: Mill Road will no longer be a through route and removing this restrictive legacy will assist businesses
- Effectively enforce pavement parking restrictions; combined with the last point, this will improve safety for pedestrians and help to slow traffic speeds by keeping vehicles in the road.