



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor David Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Grenville Chamberlain	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Mark Robertson	Cambridge Regional College
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find attached a supplement to the meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**, held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 19 JULY 2017** at **1.00 p.m.**

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.

AGENDA

6. Questions from Members of the Public

PAGES
1 - 12

The questions with responses are attached.

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 6

APPENDIX A

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY – 19th JULY 2017 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSES

Agenda Item 9: Milton Road and Histon Road: Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements. Delivery Priorities, Local Liaison Forum and Design Principles

9a	Question from Erica McDonald
	<p>I have followed the progress of the City Deal and despair that it is devised by people who do not walk or cycle in this area. This un-needed road expansion will further divide the communities of Chesterton and Arbury. Most local journeys into town or to CB1 are by foot or bike across Milton Road and the river and across the various commons.</p> <p>What guarantee do we have that the plans will take into account the many requests already made for refuges and crossings at pedestrian desire lines, not at road junctions, and for safe crossings for cyclists who also mainly travel north-south into town?</p> <p>Has any member of the City Deal actually stood and observed what foot and bike movements are in this area?</p>
	Response <p>The 'Final Concept' proposals are based closely on the concepts developed by CamCycle and the Resident Associations. This has resulted in significant improvement in cycling provision with other 1700m of additional cycle lane provision.</p> <p>As set out in the report (Para 6) further workshops with the LLF are proposed to influence and inform the emerging detailed design with regard to bus stop location, pedestrian crossings, and trees / landscaping.</p> <p>Consultants WSP have recently undertaken surveys to record foot and cycle movements at various points along Milton Road to help inform the future detailed design.</p>
9b	Question from Nick Flynn
	<p>Over the last two years 116 new homes have been built on Lilywhite Drive (on the site of the former Cambridge City Football Ground) or Westbrook Drive. The junction with Milton Road at Westbrook Drive is the only access point to their homes for these 116 families, so it is vital that residents can safely leave and access Westbrook Drive when travelling in either direction along Milton Road.</p> <p>The 'Do Optimum' plans included an excellent crossing by Westbrook Drive to allow residents to safely access the south bound cycle lane, but this has unfortunately been removed in the Final Concept. How are residents in Lilywhite Drive and Westbrook Drive supposed to safely access the south bound cycle lane, without having to cross three lanes of traffic? Will officers reinstate this crossing?</p>
	Response <p>As set out the report (Para 6) further workshops with the LLF are proposed to influence and inform the emerging detailed design with regard to bus stop location, pedestrian crossings, and trees / landscaping.</p> <p>Therefore, with the odd exception crossing points are not shown in the concept plans but will be considered as part of the detailed design exercise.</p>

9c	Question from Lilian Runblad, Vice Chairperson of the Histon Road LLF
	<p>In a letter to Councillors Lewis Herbert and Roger Hickford on June 28th 2017, I expressed deep concern that the Histon Road LLF Resolutions adopted on January 30th 2017 had not yet appeared on the official website for the GC City Deal/Partnership (see attachment). No reply has been received to the letter and the Resolutions and Appendices have still not been published.</p> <p>The Joint Assembly has earlier questioned why full documentation has not been available in time for their meetings. In this case they may not even be aware that the Histon Road LLF Resolutions and Appendices exist and that they are the result of the hard work undertaken by the residents, associations, schools, small businesses, cycle groups, etc. which in some cases has produced alternative and preferable solutions to those of the officers and consultants. Their contribution should be appreciated and respected. The Chair of Histon Road LLF has several times reminded and urged the officers and staff to publish the documentation.</p> <p>My question is therefore: Why were the Histon Road LLF Resolutions and Appendices not published at the time they were adopted, together with the draft minutes of the January 30th LLF meeting, as in similar instances? I would like to have the answer in writing. I have a copy of the Resolution documents with me to gladly hand over to the Chair of the Joint Assembly meeting today.</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>Over the last few months officer resources have prioritised the assessment of the Milton Road LLF resolutions. As set out in the report to the Executive Board, attention will be given to an assessment of the Histon Road LLF resolutions during the summer and autumn period. The Histon Road LLF resolutions are now published on the Greater Cambridge Partnership website.</p>
9d	Question from Daphne Lott
	<p>When is the City centre access study going to yield some results and a concrete plan of action – particularly regarding traffic management?</p> <p>Without that how can Officers, residents and the Board make informed decisions which reflect on the development of Milton Road?</p> <p>Drummer Street cannot cope with any more buses. The Final Concept plans still aim to increase the number of buses per hour along Milton Road without a clear idea of their final destination and how they will be accommodated</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The Final Concept anticipates an increased number of buses per hour along Milton Road as a result of to the planned growth at both Northstowe and Waterbeach and as well as the new Cambridge North station.</p> <p>The City Access Team is currently reviewing the bus network in Cambridge with a view to determining locations outside of the Drummer Street area for additional capacity for bus interchange within the central area.</p>
9e	Question from Roxanne de Beaux on behalf of Camcycle
	<p>Members of the Joint Assembly,</p> <p>The 'Final Concept' design in the officer's report is based upon the Paramics modelling software that does not have the capability to model people walking and cycling, it only handles motor vehicles. We find this greatly concerning because observations show that people walking and cycling make up over a third of all the people present on Milton Road during the peak hour, and perhaps even more during the rest of the day. Furthermore, the extensive bus lanes in the 'Final Concept' report lead to narrow verges leaving no space for safe bus stops, loading bays,</p>

	<p>or decently sized trees. This means that, if the 'Final Concept' is built, the bus stops would force passengers to load and unload from the busy cycleway, causing a type of conflict that Camcycle have greatly sought to prevent by design in all new road schemes. And delivery vans will park upon what little grass verge there is and also encroach onto the cycleway. These two problems will lead to people being unable to ride safely in the cycleway and therefore be forced into the carriageway and the bus lanes with no other choice. Then the already limited validity of the Paramics modelling results will completely break down as people cycling are forced in greater numbers to be mixed in with cars and buses.</p> <p>What is the justification for extensive use of bus lanes given such flaws in the evidence and methodology?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The Paramics modelling provides an understanding of conditions for motor vehicles for different junction designs and road configurations which takes account of the impact that cycling movements would have on the operation of these key junctions.</p> <p>The Do Optimum design and consultation with the LLF has provided a strong basis for designing the pedestrian, cycling and landscaping aspects of the scheme. The Final Concept achieves significant improvements on the existing cycling facilities on Milton Road.</p> <p>This engagement will continue during the detailed design phase when consideration will be given to crossing, bus stop designs and locations and tree planting.</p> <p>The final concept scheme recognises the significant number of pedestrians and cyclists using Milton Road, and this is reflected in the amount of space and level of provision that is made for these modes in the typical cross section.</p> <p>The final concept delivers 1,700 metres of new segregated cycleway along Milton Road.</p>
9f	<p>Question from Anne Hamill</p> <p>My question concerns adhering to the commitment made in Cllr Lewis Herbert's letter of 14 September 2016, stating that the Board supports "...an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road, and also the provision of grass verges...".</p> <p>Yet in the 'Final Concept' this is not followed through. Appendix D, page 1, shows a partial, vestigial verge on the Herbert Street side of the road, which is too narrow for tree planting, and this is at variance with the commitment made in the letter. Based on this commitment – as a crucial part of the remodelling of the road – residents envision a continuous avenue of trees on both sides along the whole length of the road, while accepting that there must be access to the shops at Mitcham's Corner and close to Arbury Road.</p> <p>The challenge is that the width of Milton Road varies along its length. At its narrowest, by Herbert Street, it's about 17.5m wide, whereas the widest section measures about 21m (see Appendix E, page 4). So, to achieve an outcome that includes trees within verges along the whole length, it will be necessary to vary the widths of pavements and cycleways locally, as well as minimise the length of bus lanes – to ensure enough space for adequate verges with trees, too. If necessary, planting trees with a columnar rather than spreading habit could be an option.</p> <p>Another relevant factor is that verges need to be deep enough for bus stop 'platforms' where passengers wait to fit in between trees, with the minimum depth being 2.5 metres.</p> <p>So, my question is: Will the joint Assembly commit to supporting flexibility in determining the widths of the pavements and cycleways, and the length of the bus lanes, to achieve full-length healthy verges planted with mature trees?</p>

	<p>Response</p> <p>As highlighted, the Board letter to the LLF in August 2016, gave support for an avenue of trees as a core design element. The letter also set out other core design objectives relating to bus, cycling and walking trips and high quality public realm.</p> <p>In developing the Final Design Concept, the varying width of the public highway has required some compromises to be made to balance the design objectives set by the Executive Board. Whilst an avenue of trees has been achieved on the majority of the length of Milton Road, it has resulted in the provision of trees on one side only in the vicinity of Herbert Street.</p> <p>As part of the detailed design we will continue to work with all parties in an attempt to retain trees on both sides of the road in this area.</p> <p>As set out in the report (para. 6) further workshops with the LLF are proposed to influence and inform the emerging detailed design with regard to bus stops, pedestrian crossing and trees/landscaping.</p>
<p>9g</p>	<p>Question from Gerry Rose</p> <p>Preamble: It seems that there is insufficient space to meet everyone's requirements. There is a trade-off between commuter convenience, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and environmental beauty. In all of these, it is generally agreed that safety must come first.</p> <p>From Diagrams (I) and (II) it is clearly evident that if one adds in the vehicle wing mirrors, then 3m-wide lands would <u>not be wide enough</u> to support 3 vehicles of bus-width passing alongside each other. To avoid an accident there is a danger in Diagram (II) of a bus veering into the cycle lane (easily mounting the curb[sic]) and fatally injuring a cyclist, or forcing a cyclist to veer into pedestrian walkway and injuring a pedestrian.</p> <p>Observation: A tree/verge barrier as in Diagram (I) separating traffic from cyclists <u>is essential for the safety</u> of both cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>QUESTION: What measure are being priorities to ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians? If it is decided that the road-space is inadequate to support 3 motorised lanes, will the design team either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REMOVE the bus lane from the design <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RESTRICT THE WIDTH of vehicles using Milton Road, effectively banning use by wide lorries.
	<p>Response</p> <p>Where possible a tree/landscape area has been used to segregate cyclists from motorised vehicles which will enhance road safety.</p> <p>Where space constraints require, the design also provides greater space for cyclists where cycle lanes run alongside bus lanes which again will enhance safety.</p> <p>The design concept accords with the current design guidance given in Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 and will be subject to a full safety audit process</p>
<p>9h</p>	<p>Question from Richard Taylor</p> <p>Would the assembly please consider recommending that the safety assessments for transport project designs get regularly published and used to inform the board and assembly's deliberations?</p> <p>I expect if detailed safety assessments of, for example, the Milton Road and the Green End Road proposals had been presented showing the expected impact on injuries and deaths the recommendations could well have been different.</p>

	<p>Response</p> <p>The final detailed design will be subjected to a full safety audit process. The safety audit documents will be made available on the website once completed.</p>
<p>9i</p>	<p>Question from Matthew Danish</p> <p>The 'Do Optimum' proposal I helped develop contains safe footways and cycleways, protected by an avenue of trees and verges with ample space for good bus stops.</p> <p>But the officer's 'Final Concept' scheme is predicted by the computer model to be a major improvement in all motor vehicle journey times, even more so in 2031, over both 'Do Nothing' and 'Do Optimum'. It predicts every junction will have shorter queues.</p> <p>Quote from the report:</p> <p>"The 2016 AM Peak 'Final Concept' bus reliability results shows improved bus reliability for both directions of travel, maintaining average bus journey times inbound (even with a reduction of bus lanes on this side of the road in comparison to 'Do Nothing')"</p> <p>The report says that bus lane length reduction is compatible with improved bus journeys.</p> <p>The predicted bus improvements seem to have little to do with bus lanes and almost all to do with the clever designs for the major junctions. Shorter queues at junctions mean that bus lanes don't do much. And all this while bus priority refinements to junctions have yet to be added.</p> <p>I have a compromise proposal. Please amend Milton Road recommendation (c) to:</p> <p>"Take the 'Do Optimum' design as provided by the Local Liaison Forum resolutions; with its lesser length of bus lane; with its trees, verges and good bus stops; with its attractive walking and cycling facilities; and apply the following modification: that the major junction designs from 'Final Concept' are incorporated in place of the 'Do Optimum' junction designs where there is an improvement. Agree this new 'Final Optimum' hybrid conceptual design as a basis for detailed design work and the preparation of an interim business case to facilitate further public and statutory consultation."</p> <p>Although officers have said they will consider reducing the bus lane length from 'Final Concept', that promise is too weak. The process should instead be designed to meet the objectives with no more bus lane than strictly necessary.</p> <p>Bus lanes are a heavy-handed measure that obviate themselves if successful. You are in danger of building a 20th-century-style white elephant. In contrast, bus priority via smart junction design doesn't suffer from that problem, and is a distinctly modern approach that leaves room for good trees, verges, bus stops, cycleways and footways.</p> <p>Instead of a strip of tarmac, your legacy would be a world-class street that works for everyone, one which you are proud to show to the next generation.</p> <p>Will the Assembly agree to propose to the Executive Board an amendment to recommendation (c) as described here creating the 'Final Optimum' hybrid conceptual design?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The report recognises the Do Optimum option as a strong basis for the Final Concept design, particularly the footways and cycle ways elements.</p> <p>However, the modelling assessment of the Do Optimum shows that it fails to deliver sufficient</p>

	<p>priority for bus movements and additional bus lanes are required to respond to this key project objective. The report recognises that the smarter operation of junctions helps reduce delays but queuing can still be expected at all the major junctions on Milton Road, requiring bus lanes to allow buses to bypass these queues.</p> <p>The final concept therefore aims to place bus lanes where they are most needed; this includes adding some outbound bus lanes, and shortening some of the current inbound lanes.</p>
9j	Question from Michael Page
	<p>I am interested in understanding what constitutes success for the Milton Road project. I imagine that for the transport delivery team it means completing the engineering works to specification, on time and on budget – all of which can be measured and evaluated.</p> <p>But what does success mean for the GCP/City Deal Board and the citizens of Cambridge?</p> <p>The project needs to deliver outcomes that we can all understand and that can be measured.</p> <p>It seems to me that one such measurable outcome could be modal shift. It should be possible to monitor the proportion of journeys made along Milton Road by people in motor cars, on buses, on cycles and on foot. In that way we could judge over time how successful the scheme had been in encouraging the change to more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Question: Does GCP/City Deal have plans in place to carry out such monitoring and will targets of achievement be set so that we can all judge the value of the project after its completion?</p>
	Response
	<p>Modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport (bus, rail, cycling, walking) is a key outcome for the Great Cambridge Partnership infrastructure programme. This will be monitored for all GCP transport schemes.</p>
9k	Question 9k: from Richard Cushing
	<p>'A considerable number of graphs, tables and words have been produced by consultants and officers regarding the proposals for Milton Road. I find the combination to be confusing, and in attempting to understand them went back to basics, firstly to try to establish what the situation is at the moment. I failed. I was not able to find published information against which the Milton Road project has been designed.</p> <p>Milton Road is seen as a 'corridor' to traffic planners, but the road and surrounding area are 'home' to hundreds of families. My children attended local schools. Around the corner are a variety of shops which serve both residents and commuters: the area is to us like a village high street.</p> <p>Information has only been produced for 'peak hours', generally 8:00 – 9:00am, and 5:00 – 6:00pm on just five days of the week: ten hours per week in total. Although some of the proposals may cut a minute or two off peak-time bus journeys for commuters, this is apparently at the expense of increasing queuing during the rest of the day. Queuing of course brings pollution – a major cause of premature death in this country.</p> <p>The reports are confused by presenting information differently at different stages of the project, and more recently by the removal from public access of relevant documents, following the change of website from Greater Cambridge City Deal to Greater Cambridge Partnership.</p> <p>Against this background, I would like to ask the Assembly to require, and to recommend to the Board that it also require, that all reports of this nature should publish, with sources, the following up-to-date information for the route in question:</p> <p>1 – The origin and destination at hourly intervals of people who travel along the route (in this</p>

	<p>case Milton Road).</p> <p>2 – Present measured journey times correlated with modelled journey times <i>throughout the day</i> and for all days of the week, for buses, general vehicles, cycles, and walkers.</p> <p>3 – An indication of pollution levels presently and according to the model.</p> <p>Any proposed project should then carry a prediction of the immediate effect of implementing the changes, together with the prediction of the effect in 2031.'</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The Paramics model has been validated against current journey conditions.</p> <p>The modelling process concentrates on the peak periods when delays and queues are at their greatest. Extending the modelling exercise outside the peak periods is not considered necessary or cost effective.</p> <p>The recently undertaken ANPR survey in Cambridge will provide further information on journey along Milton Road which will further inform detailed design work.</p> <p>There is an Air Quality Management Area in Cambridge, with pollution levels regularly monitored – there is an update in the City Access Strategy report later on the agenda.</p> <p>All schemes are and will be considered and designed with a view to tackling pollution levels.</p>
91	<p>Question from Maureen Mace</p>
	<p>Watching the recording from the first GCP meeting, I was delighted to hear that an ANPR survey has taken place. However, I understand a cycling and walking survey has not been undertaken. Soon 280,000 residents of the South Cambridgeshire area will be asked to complete a form of travel diary but surely direct evidence is better than a series of questions which many will not return?</p> <p>To try and understand all the different forms of transport flowing along Milton Road, Matt Danish and I undertook 2 surveys. One, counting cyclists on 21 June between Arbury Road and Highworth Avenue and another the following day at a point between Kendal Way and Woodhead Drive.</p> <p>At the first survey we counted 534 cyclists and 185 pedestrians between 8-9am which is generally believed to be the busiest time of the day. The total of 719 using a non-motorised method of transport far exceeded any guess I made beforehand.</p> <p>On 22 June we set up a video on Milton Road close to the toucan crossing between Kings Hedges and Arbury Road. There was a combined total of 507 cyclists and pedestrians here, more than half the total of 955 motorised vehicles.</p> <p>The attached video evidence and counts have been sent to the Assembly prior to today's meeting to ensure they have been read.</p> <p>The GCP want to understand what the issues are about transport. ANPR is just about motorised vehicles and doesn't include the experience of cyclists and pedestrians. For a truly evidence based study of what is actually happening, is the GCP prepared to adopt the method of video-based evidence and to make a truly proper analysis which is informed to provide really safe cycle use and walking?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>A number of options exist for surveying travel choices – both current and future.</p> <p>Analysis of ANPR survey data will reveal and quantify current motorised traffic trends, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Route choices;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Journey time; ○ Journey time reliability (i.e. congestion / delays); ○ Percentages of cars / lorries / buses / taxis; and ○ Understanding walking / cycling journeys across a network is more difficult: ○ Larger, more complex network ○ No registration / number plates (so cannot capture and analyse routing choices, etc.) <p>Video surveys are a useful tool for understanding network user flows and behaviour at key locations of interest, and for identifying potential and existing issues.</p> <p>We have around 30 fixed cycle counters, more than any other location in the country, and we supplement this with ad hoc and annual counts both by visual count and video.</p> <p>However understanding the reasons and motivations behind current travel choices is not possible from ANPR, fixed or video surveys.</p> <p>The forthcoming Travel Diary survey and extensive consultation exercise ('the big conversation') this autumn is expected to capture data from a wide cross-section of Greater Cambridge residents.</p> <p>The survey will improve understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Network users' experiences; ○ Why people travel the way they do now; and ○ What they need to travel (more sustainably) in the future. <p>The quantitative (ANPR) and qualitative (Travel Diary) data together with the consultation exercise will complement each other and enable analysis of trends and issues, which will inform the ongoing development of the City Access Strategy.</p>
9m	<p>Question from Barbara Taylor</p> <p>At the 13 June LLF meeting the Interim Director of Transport stated "people will not get out of their cars just to sit in a bus in the same queue of traffic. They prefer to drive past the Park&Ride and get started down Milton Road to avoid the time lost by parking up, paying and waiting for the bus to arrive. That's why we're putting in bus-lanes to encourage people to see that buses are faster and more reliable than sitting in a car."</p> <p>But the traveller's preference for car use over buses is due to other factors as well – such as cost, convenience, multiple destinations, and flexibility to return from the city late in the evening when P&R buses aren't running. Building bus-lanes won't have any impact on these factors, and any time savings made on the Milton Road segment of the journey is not guaranteed to compensate for the cost currently charged by bus operators and for P&R fees.</p> <p>So my question is:</p> <p>"Has City Deal carried out any research with car drivers and bus users to assess what motivates their travel choices and what incentives might be needed to effect a shift to public transport or cycling and walking, before deciding to build more bus-lanes on Milton Road?"</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>Every travel mode has trade-offs that will be considered by individuals when making decisions about where, when and how to travel.</p> <p>The Travel Diary survey that will form part of 'The Big Conversation' later this year will seek to understand these decisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ People's current travel needs and choices; and ○ What people want and need to travel (more sustainably) in the future. <p>Bus priority measures improve the journey time reliability of passenger transport services.</p>

	<p>Such work to develop and deliver improved bus priority in the city aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase the attractiveness of public transport as a reliable and swift mode of transport to key destinations; ○ Increase its usage; ○ Reduce the use of private vehicles; ○ Reduce congestion and emissions; and ○ Enable economic growth and vitality. <p>Milton Road bus facilities will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Form part of the wider sustainable transport network; ○ Help reduce general traffic now and in the future; ○ Increase the capacity of the transport network; and ○ Enable economic and housing growth to take place without an associated, equivalent growth in traffic.
--	---

Agenda Item 11: A428/A1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme: further scheme development

11a	Question from Carolyn Postgate
	<p>1. Given the prevailing North West wind and the location of Crome Lea, does a P&R site at Crome Lea not have the potential to be more damaging to the SSSI wood and on that basis should it not have a higher negative mark than Site 2 under the Biodiversity heading?</p> <p>2. Can the officers explain why Crome Lea and the Waterworks have lost a negative mark for engineering issues (impact on local road during construction) when all four sites around the Madingley Mulch roundabout would have a similar impact on the road during construction of any park and ride site at that location?</p> <p>3. I also note that the report states that Crome Lea has overhead for future expansion. Given that last September the Officers agreed that it should be reduced to its current size so as not to impose on Coton village, where would it expand to?</p> <p>4. Given that so much weight was applied to size in the last selection process that identified Crome Lea as the preferred site, why has size not been used as a criterion in the Park and Ride Study, especially as future proofing should be at the helm of the Partnership's thinking?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>Question 1</p> <p>Were the prevailing wind to be from the North-West then this would reduce any possible impact of Crome Lea on the SSSI. Typically in the UK, including East Anglia, the prevailing wind is often from the South-West, in which case there might be some tendency to increase the impacts of noise and air pollution.</p> <p>That said, whilst the Stage 1 report reflects the potential impacts of the park and ride, the level of traffic within a park and ride is much lower than the level of traffic on the existing A1303 which runs between the site and the SSSI.</p> <p>As such any cumulative impact on the SSSI is likely to be modest, and may well be fully mitigated once the site layout has been refined and mitigation measures such as bunds put in place, and detailed modelling undertaken.</p> <p>In terms of biodiversity we are mindful of concerns with regards to Bats. Bats will be primarily affected by lighting, but this is not related to wind direction.</p> <p>Question 2</p> <p>Site 2 is located north of the A428 and, as such, there is a risk that additional bridgeworks will</p>

	<p>be needed to ensure the necessary capacity. Network access to and from Site 1 is constrained by the SSSI on one side and the A428 to the other and, as such we expect safe access/egress for both buses and cars to be more complex to provide given proximity to the roundabout. Sites 3 and 4 do have some engineering issues but the engineering constraints south of the A1303 are fewer.</p> <p>Question 3</p> <p>Crome Lea does have overhead for expansion. This may be undesirable in environmental terms and that is reflected elsewhere.</p> <p>Question 4</p> <p>Fresh modelling data is being produced for the Stage 2 assessment and ability to accommodate generate traffic will be a determinant in final site selection. Size, per se, is not a determinant in site selection, but ability to provide accessibility is, and if the site cannot accommodate predicted traffic growth then that will need to be reflected in the final analysis. No site can be extended indefinitely but all the sites being currently considered on this corridor would all offer a level of park and ride at least comparable with other major sites around Cambridge.</p>
--	--

Agenda item 14: Improving Greater Cambridge Partnership Governance

14a	Question from Richard Taylor
	<p>Does the assembly consider the organisation's governance arrangements enable board members to effectively wield the reins of power in a public and accountable manner?</p> <p>I am concerned that significant decisions appear to have been taken within the Greater Cambridge Partnership organisation between cycles of board and assembly meetings. I was surprised the large Cambridge area traffic survey took place without the board and assembly considering the effectiveness of the proposed survey technique and its impact on privacy. The organisation even appears to have been renamed and relaunched between cycles of the formal meetings in public. The Green End Road scheme appears to me to have been changed after the board's approval of a plan in a manner exceeding the board's delegation of powers. If major decisions are taken between formal public meetings of the board they should at least be reported to the next board meeting.</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The principle of officer decision-making has always been that it needs to be within the framework of the Board's decisions and that members should be consulted where appropriate.</p> <p>The decisions Mr Taylor refers to were taken consistent with these key principles, for example the Cambridge Area Traffic Survey implemented the Board's decision in January that evidence and joined up thinking should be improved within the City Access Strategy project. [The ANPR survey has been designed so that privacy is not impacted and we are not made aware of individuals' movements.]</p> <p>We agree with Mr Taylor that decisions taken under delegated powers should be reported – this is part of the scheme of delegation in the Governance proposals. That scheme of delegation aims further to clarify roles and responsibilities.</p>
14b	Question from Wendy Blythe (Chair of FeCRA) and Bev Edwards (Chair of Barton Parish Council)
	<p>Will the Assembly today agree a resolution that residents will be represented on the Board and Assembly and involved in all future projects from inception as equal partners and that they will be involved as equal partners in taking forward existing projects, and that you will recommend that the Executive Board takes steps to implement the proposals we have made?</p>

Response

Residents were already represented on the Executive Board and Joint Assembly by their elected local councillors. The majority of this Joint Assembly and all the voting members of the Executive Board are Councillors elected by and representing local residents. Members of the Joint Assembly have been advocating much more and broader engagement, including with residents' groups and Parish Councillors.

Work was underway to strengthen work with stakeholders and to improve communications. For example there had already been improvements to the GCP website. Feedback on this indicated the changes have been appreciated and confirmed the site was much improved. The Executive Board and Joint Assembly had worked up a much improved statement of its vision and aims. These were being communicated via the website and it was planned to hold a range of consultation events in the Autumn with stakeholders, including resident, in order to take this forward.

Several other improvements were progressing, such as improved working with Local Liaison Forums and on the quality of reports and supporting papers. Officers were also looking at how they could improve use of multi media products. It was also planned to increase capacity to undertake communications and community engagement work. There had also been improvements to arrangements for handling public questions as referenced in the report.

It was acknowledged that there was more to do, in particular around improved visualisations and the use of customer relations software. These were being progressed together with the County Council.

This page is left blank intentionally.