



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

13 November 2018

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find a supplement for the next meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**, which will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER - SOUTH CAMBS HALL** on **THURSDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2018** at **2.00 p.m.**

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

AGENDA

4. Questions from Members of the Public

PAGES
1 - 4

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 4

15 NOVEMBER 2018 GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY – PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6	Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project	
6a	Dr Marilyn Treacy	<p>The GCP and Combined Authority’s preferred SRA for the off road route does not link with future plans for the Oxford-Cambridge expressway, nor the A14/M11 junction, nor take account of the Comberton to Cambridge Greenway. Neither does it link the majority of commuters to their places of work. It relies on the possibility of as yet unfunded tunnelling.</p> <p>Would the J.A. therefore request that the Board take the recommended Specific Route Alignment off the table until the GCP proposes a scheme that takes account of these other developments?</p> <p>In the meantime, recognising the lack of need for a cycleway and walkway down the A1303 once the parallel Greenway is completed, the GCP could trial a dedicated busway down Madingley Hill which could, in future, be developed into a fully segregated CAM route if approval is given for tunnelling from the West Cambridge site.</p>
6b	Allan Treacy	<p>With reference to the Arup report (appendix 2, page 10, section 4.9), there is a wholly superficial assessment of the alternative proposal put forward by CPPF and others for a Northern route that links with the Girton Interchange which is summarily dismissed by Arup. The detailed basis of their rejection is not included in their report.</p> <p>Given the wide support that an improved Girton Interchange has amongst many of the area’s residents and interested organisations, will you please instruct Arup to publish, in detail, the basis for their rejection of this proposal. In the interests of openness will the Assembly ask that this information is made available to both the public and the Board before they make a decision to discount this option?</p>
6c	James Littlewood (Cambridge Past Present and Future)	<p>The Arup and officers reports refer to avoiding adverse impacts in the “West Fields” and Coton village. However the greatest impact of significance would actually be on Madingley Hill (ie the section between Madingley Mulch and the M11). This does not seem to be reflected in the summary assessment of Route Options, which scores Route A as “positive” in this respect. Nor is it reflected in the proposed mitigation options – for which it appears that only the section next to the village would be mitigated.</p> <p>Please can the Assembly ask why the length of route with potentially the greatest landscape impact, which is covenanted by the National Trust, does not appear to register in the constraints or mitigation?</p>
6d	Roger Tomlinson – Coton Parish Councillor	<p>GCP consults and engages the public, though the development of route options for Cambourne to Cambridge went through a series of five iterations, reducing 34 options to four, then six, BEFORE public consultation started in 2015. The public said the County Transport Officers chose the wrong routes but have championed their choice ever since.</p> <p>The report claims that “gathering and then reflecting public and stakeholder support and views are a key factor in option selection. As such the robust public consultation has informed and shaped the scheme and optioneering process which has led to the strategic option.”</p> <p>That is quite simply not true.</p> <p>The County Council ‘s lawyer told Coton Parish Councillors that consultations were not statutory and the Council had the power to ignore the responses. Attenders at the LLF, “workshops”, “focus groups” confirm these have been ‘contentious’ between participants and the officers and their consultants. The route options not chosen by the officers have never been fully evaluated.</p> <p>There is a table purporting to show the actions taken in response to public input, but no reference to the public and their elected representatives proposing alternative routes since 2015.</p> <p>This table under-represents the public supporting an on-road route; independent analysis of the data shows that over 64% rejected the off-road route options. The pattern of ignoring the public input has recurred throughout the progress of this scheme.</p> <p>As the Greater Cambridge Partnership is not the County Council, can we have an explanation of the GCP consultation policy, and how the views of the public are actually taken into account, and how the internal decisions are taken, and under what authority public input, including from local elected representatives and councillors, is ignored?</p>
6e	Alistair Burford	<p>Given that the Mayor and GCP have agreed that the transport system is a CAM rather than a Guided Busway, should the GCP be looking at an alternative route.</p> <p>The Arup report made a recommendation that the route must align with the CAM system. However there is no evidence in the report that the Officers preferred route will.</p> <p>Should the GCP now identify an alternative route that would better fit CAM ie: if the goal is to get to the Cambridge West Site and then on to the wider employment centres eg. BioCampus, Is a route north of the A428 and 1303 not a more direct and less environmentally damaging alternative?</p>

6f	Dr Gabriel Fox	<p>We have heard a lot lately about the idea of a city-wide metro system including tunnels under the historic centre. There may be benefits to such a scheme and it will be interesting to see some practical details. But the fact is that such systems are extremely difficult to bring to life. That may explain why there are only 3 metros in the UK, two of them (London and Glasgow) developed in the 19th century and the other (Tyne and Wear) dating back 40 years. These systems can take decades to work out, well beyond one or even two terms of a local authority or Mayor. And they come with a frightening price tag. The Mayor has already suggested £3 billion – and we can expect that to double when lifetime maintenance, inflation, optimism bias and other costs are taken into account. And then probably double again, as is generally the way with these schemes.</p> <p>Now consider that the London Underground, serving a population well over ten million, generates just 5% operating profit on more than £2 billion a year of fares and clocks up a net annual loss of more than £600 million when depreciation, amortisation and the like are taken into account. If the Mayor is looking for private investment, it could be a very long wait indeed for them to get a return. And if he is looking to us, the ever-giving public, to provide the funds, consider that the final cost could add up to the entire expenditure of the City, County and South Cambridgeshire District Councils for more than a decade. That's a staggering amount of money to find.</p> <p>So it may be an interesting idea but it's still a long, long way from being a credible solution, especially as we move into an era when people will expect their transport to be on-demand, rather than at a bus stop.</p> <p>With that in mind:</p> <p>a) Why is there any need now to specify a preferred route for the Cambourne to Grange Road section of the metro, rather than waiting until we know if the metro as a whole can be funded and delivered?</p> <p>b) What is proposed to improve public transport for people west of Cambridge during the 10 or 20 years until a metro might be up and running?</p> <p>c) What will happen to this supposedly "preferred" off-road route if the metro doesn't go ahead?</p>
8	Histon Road: Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements	
8a	<p>Matthew Danish – Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Question to be asked by Anna Williams)</p>	<p>I am speaking today on behalf of Camcycle's 1,300 members, but also my own family. After too many scary experiences on Histon Road, I no longer cycle there with my children.</p> <p>Many people wrote in our Cambridge Cycling Survey that they avoid Histon Road under current conditions. If existing cyclists already steer clear of Histon Road, and if the proposals are only a slight improvement, then how can we expect new people to take up cycling here?</p> <p>We believe that the current designs for this scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fail sufficiently to improve safety for cyclists. Research consistently proves that the main barrier to cycling is feeling unsafe on the roads. This is even more true for women and older people. • Fail to improve conditions for pedestrians. Lost trees, interruptions at minor side roads and being forced to share narrow pavements with cyclists around busy junctions will not achieve the goal of a safe and pleasant community and won't help people with visual impairments • Betray the community process, by jettisoning years' worth of input from Local Liaison Forums, workshops and consultations. For example, the popular Gilbert Road segregated junction design vanished last week, even though it was supported by the LLF and two-thirds of the public in the most recent consultation. The current plans now look very similar to the discredited 'Do Something' design of two years ago. • Are no longer value for money and will fail to achieve a modal shift to sustainable transport. This plan misses a once-in-a-generation opportunity to make a true difference for walking and cycling on Histon Road. <p>We would like to ask the Joint Assembly if they agree with Camcycle and local residents that the project needs to reincorporate the LLF resolutions that have been dropped?</p>
8b	Windsor Road Residents' Association	<p>As participants at the Histon Road LLF meeting on 8 October 2018 we question why many of the proposals agreed at this latest LLF meeting have not been incorporated in the "Histon Road Final Design" to be considered at the Joint Assembly on 15 November.</p> <p>We therefore request postponement of Agenda Item 8 in order to give time for the proposals arising from the Histon Road LLFs to be given full attention?</p>
8c	<p>Lilian Rundblad (Chair Histon Road Area Residents' Association)</p>	<p>Since Histon Road Final Design includes so many changes in certain designs which have not been discussed and decided at a LLF meeting and since our request to have a LLF before the Joint Assembly was denied, it is evident that a LLF is necessary before the next Executive Board on December 6th.</p> <p>Changes after the Consultation:</p> <p>a. The Gilbert Road/Warwick Road/Histon Road Junction design which is the major concern in an article by CamCycles. The approved LLF design was presented in the consultation and</p>

		<p>was supported by 68.6%, no opinion 15.8% and opposed 15.4%. This has been ignored and a new Officers' design is presented in the Final Scheme which has not been discussed in the LLF.</p> <p>b. The Carisbrooke Road Junction design has never been discussed in an LLF and was not included in the Consultation, only a question if we wanted it. We believe the bus-lane should not stop in the middle of the junction but well before it to allow the private car lane to join the bus-lane and not causing congestion.</p> <p>On the request of the HRARA, please can a meeting of the Histon Road LLF be organised in good time before the GCP Executive Board on 6 December 2018?</p>
8d	<p>Lilian Rundblad (Chair Histon Road Area Residents' Association)</p>	<p>To create a vision of an avenue of trees as an entrance into the iconic, historic centre of Cambridge</p> <p>The very long ca 150m and more of wooden fence has been modified in the Histon Road Final Design to a steel-mesh fence with climbers. This new change has not been discussed at any LLF meeting nor with the residents living between Blackhall Road and Brownlow Road having their back-gardens bordering the intended fence.</p> <p>Although the steel-mesh fence with ivy and the verge with species rich grass may be an improvement, the length and height of the fencing is of concern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To safeguard the residents' privacy the height of the steel-mesh fence must be 3m which according to the project team is available. 2. The sloping verge requires a drainage construction towards the private property boundaries along the full length of the intended fencing due to the high water level surroundings. 3. Both 1 and 2 will be maintained by the Highways 4. None of the private fences will be removed. 5. Most of all – to create interest in this long fence we request that a tree of 3-4m height will be placed in the verge at every other panel. <p>On the request of the HRARA, please can the Joint Assembly recommend that the above points be incorporated in the Final Histon Road Design, to be discussed at the next LLF meeting and the Executive Board meeting on December 6 2018?</p>

This page is left blank intentionally.