

19<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

No	Questioner	Question
1	David Stoughton	<p><b>Agenda Item 6: Report of Citizens' Assembly</b></p> <p>Specifically I'd like to ask whether, in the light of recent research, the criteria informing decisions are incomplete and understate the urgency of reducing pollution to protect citizens' health. I attach a summary of recent research by Kings College London showing that hospital admissions increase during periods of peak pollution that, along with similar results shown in studies in the USA, demonstrate that it is the peaks in pollution not the mean that causes most damage to health.</p> <p>Link: <a href="#">Kings College Research</a></p>
2	Vincent Poole Arbury Road East Residents Association	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The question is being asked on behalf of the Arbury Road East Residents Association, which is constituted of households living on Arbury Road and its tributaries, between the Cambridge North Academy and Milton Road.</p> <p>We live along a neighbourhood road that has become a rat-run. Cars either sit and queue, poisoning the air, or they speed well in excess of the 20mph limit. The on-going Histon Road works are poised to make the situation much, much worse as inbound traffic ignores the signed diversion route and races down Arbury Road only to get stuck at the Milton Road traffic signals.</p> <p>We welcome the findings of the City Access Strategy and the Joint Assembly recommendations regarding it. In particular, paragraph 12.4 recommends "Piloting further road closures, both in the city centre and on local roads." and "A pilot community closure scheme could be developed to offer communities the opportunity to come forward with proposals for local roads, for example 'play streets', 'pocket parks' or closures around schools"</p> <p>Here we are! We know from the recent survey* conducted by the Arbury Road East Residents Association that those who live on the road are ready and willing to try pilot schemes, test ideas and participate in workshops to develop proposals that would stop the rat-running, reduce pollution and bring our community together once again. You will receive our eager support for exploring serious options. Will the Executive Board support part C of the recommendations, and then add Arbury Road (east) to the list of immediate intervention sites to address issues of congestion, air quality and carbon emissions?</p> <p>Link: <a href="https://arera.org.uk/2020-01-22-survery-results/">https://arera.org.uk/2020-01-22-survery-results/</a></p>
3	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p><b>Item 7: City Access</b></p> <p>We thank those involved for the research conducted on the City Access project. It's clear that both scientific evidence and public opinion support the goal of switching a significant number of journeys in and around Cambridge to walking, cycling and public transport. It's also clear that this needs to be done to address issues of congestion, air quality and climate change and to deliver an economically thriving region of healthy, happy people.</p> <p>We strongly support the cycling proposals included in the list of short-term interventions including plans to build more cycle infrastructure, improve junctions, trial car-free days, develop a lease scheme for e-bikes and cargo cycles, improve and increase cycle parking and work with schools and businesses to increase levels of cycling.</p> <p>We also strongly support the piloting of further modal filters and community streets; these measures are essential to the growth of cycling in the area for all ages and abilities. However,</p>

19<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

		<p>we believe the implementation of these should not depend on the resources of local communities and would like to ask the GCP to develop a coordinated plan of modal filters that makes transport work for the whole city and could be supported by additional demand management measures if needed.</p> <p>Finally, we call for bold and timely action. Around us, other UK cities are taking the lead. London, York, Bristol, Birmingham, Brighton and Oxford: when will Cambridge join the list? In Europe, Paris has grown cycling by 54% in just one year and Ghent’s circulation plan led to 25% of residents switching away from driving.</p> <p>So, we’d like to ask the Greater Cambridge Executive Board when they will begin to improve city access and how they will communicate the plans in a way that engages people in a city-wide transformation rather than focusing on street-by-street changes?</p>
4	Edward Leigh	<p><b>Agenda Item 7: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The summary from the Joint Assembly’s deliberations neatly encapsulates where we are at: <i>“The evidence presented to members provided a compelling case to do something, although it was not yet clear what that something was.” [p.24].</i></p> <p>GCP is trapped in a vicious circle: it requires a recurring revenue stream to support a large expansion of bus services, but lacks the political consensus and popular trust to introduce a congestion charge to raise that revenue. There is a way out though. Officers have concluded that a Workplace Parking Levy is insufficiently effective to consider implementing, yet it has only been appraised as a stand-alone intervention or in combination with increased public parking charges in the city.</p> <p>Why not instead consider it as a first step towards introducing a flexible road charging scheme? It can be introduced more quickly than road charging, as the scale of engagement and negotiation required is more manageable; it can be phased in gradually as the overheads are low; any businesses likely to be adversely affected can be offered a rebate, reviewable annually; and the revenue generated can be used to start the process of augmenting bus services. This will help rebuild trust and confidence in the GCP.</p> <p>Will the Board undertake to re-appraise a Workplace Parking Levy in this light?</p>
5	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p><b>Item 8: Greenways</b></p> <p>We're pleased to see the proposals for the Greenways and the request for additional funding, and we hope the Executive Board will support these plans as the Greenways cannot arrive a minute too soon.</p> <p>Q1: In light of the climate emergency, we ask the Executive Board to consider what steps could be taken to speed up delivery of the Greenways sooner than the proposed date of late 2024?</p> <p>Q2: In another project, the GCP has proposed removing all car parking along Adams Road. Given that this is a desirable safety feature on its own, may we ask for the removal of parking and addition of cycling-friendly traffic-calming on Adams Road to be included as another 'quick win' project that can be implemented straight away to increase cycling safety on one of the busiest and most important cycle routes in Cambridge?</p> <p>Q3: With the relocation of the County Council offices and the Cycling Projects Team (and some members of the team leaving) what specific plans does the GCP have in place to ensure the Greenways and other cycling projects will be staffed by officers with experience in cycling projects and with the local knowledge required to design them?</p>

19<sup>th</sup> February 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions

6	Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p><b>Item 9: Quarterly Progress Report</b></p> <p>We notice that, on the transport delivery overview, the 'Links to Cambridge North Station and Science Park project' is marked as completed when on the ground this route is unfinished because the issues of Nuffield Road have not yet been addressed. Similarly, although we welcomed the improvements to Arbury Road last year, we note that this is not yet a safe cycle route because the southeastern end of the road is still very dangerous for people cycling.</p> <p>Q1: Can the Executive Board confirm that there will be investment in a second phase of cross-city cycling projects to complete unfinished routes and link up safe sections of existing or proposed cycle routes? For example, addressing the gap in safe provision between the new section of Arbury Road and the proposed Milton Road cycleways?</p> <p>Q2: What were the results of the surveys that were undertaken in the areas of cross-city cycling schemes? Was there an uptake in people cycling? Do people feel that these routes are now safer to cycle on?</p> <p>Q3: Are all these schemes connected to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) process and a comprehensive plan for cycling networks across Greater Cambridge? When is the LCWIP consultation going to be launched?</p>
7	Sam Davies	<p><b>Item 9: Quarterly Progress Report (Section 22)</b></p> <p>As the Board will be aware, there is already significant public scepticism about the Biomedical Campus's ability to manage its growth without significant further detrimental impacts on the residential communities in the south of the city.</p> <p>In March 2019, I asked this Board how the GCP proposed to convert the 47 short term interventions identified in the Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review into "distinct funded actions, with identified accountability and appropriate monitoring processes, delivered within an acceptable timeframe."</p> <p>I note the statement in item 22.3 in today's Board papers that work has only been undertaken on "around half" of the potential so-called 'quick win' measures; and the statement in 22.5 that CUHP will not even have finalised the plan for delivery of appropriate Campus-wide governance structures before March 2020.</p> <p>Hence, I am here today to ask this Board whether it is content with the progress that has been made in the intervening year; and whether it sympathises with residents' frustration as they experience the intensifying negative externalities of the Campus's growth.</p>