

18 March 2019

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Councillor Lewis Herbert | Cambridge City Council (Chair) |
| Aidan Van de Weyer | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Phil Allmendinger | University of Cambridge |
| Councillor Ian Bates | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Claire Ruskin | Cambridge Network |

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find attached a **SUPPLEMENT** to the next meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**, which will be held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER - SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 20 MARCH 2019** at **4.00 p.m.**

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

AGENDA

| | PAGES |
|--|--------------|
| 4. Questions from Members of the Public | 1 - 2 |

This page is left blank intentionally.

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 4 | Milton Road | |
| 4a | Lilian Rundblad | <p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership supported and part-funded the Smart Cambridge project. It sought to collect and analyse air quality monitoring data from across the city using innovative sensing stations developed with the University of Cambridge Chemistry Department. The “Smart City” data collection platform already exists and measurements could be made publicly available.</p> <p>HRARA supports the proposal that monitors be placed at two or three locations along Milton Road to compare results before, during and after the construction phase. HRARA supports this proposal because an objective of the Milton Road Project is to improve air quality, and the air quality of Milton Road affects the surrounding roads including Histon Road.</p> <p>HRARA further observes that, similarly, one of the objectives of the Histon Road project is to improve air quality and air quality of Histon Road. This affects the surrounding roads including Milton Road. It would make sense for monitors to be placed at two or three locations along Histon Road to compare results before, during and after the construction phase. This will complement the Milton Road Project and impact directly upon it.</p> <p>HRARA requests that in recognising the objective to improve air quality is an aim of the Milton Road Project and the air quality of Milton Road and Histon Road are directly linked, the Greater Cambridge Partnership directs the Milton Road Project Manager to implement the proposal that monitors be placed at two or three locations along Milton Road and further directs the Histon Road Project Manager similarly effect plans for air quality monitoring for Histon Road before, during and after the construction phase and ensure budget for this purpose.</p> <p>Furthermore, could the data be displayed and made easily available to the public?</p> |
| 4b | Maureen Mace | <p>I would like to thank the officers for listening to the residents who travel on foot and by cycle in the area and for making their journeys much safer.</p> <p>However, I am unclear about what actually happens near the crossings. For example, there is a designated cycle route from Ramsden Square to Kendal Way. This means cyclists would either have to go the wrong way along the cycle path or proceed down the pavement to get to the crossing opposite Kendal Way. Also at this crossing, many children from East Chesterton cross here to go to school at the North Academy via Woodhead Drive, again they will be against the flow.</p> <p>Will there be two way cycling at this and similar points where there are crossings along the road and if so will the cycleway be wider to accommodate this?</p> |
| 10 | Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review | |
| 10a | Jim Chisholm | <p>In 2011 there was a report to the Cambridge Area Joint Committee about an area wide parking plan for South Cambridge.</p> <p>Little progress been made.</p> <p>A telling phrase in that report is: “Over time the Park and Ride sites have become increasingly important as a means of accessing the hospital, which is now impacting on its key role of facilitating access to the city centre”</p> <p>Today’s reports on the CBC seem to have forgotten that key role of P&R, and suggest spending tens of millions on expanding P&R as free facilities for the CBC. Is that not a conflict with possible ‘Workplace Charging’?</p> <p>The real solution is the Cambridge South station rendering such P&R facilities as redundant and unsustainable, but interim solutions are available.</p> <p>Sustainable solutions such ‘turn up and go’ buses to serve the CBC could be provided. These are being trialled from Papworth, but hardly turn up and go.</p> <p>We need more buses on the A10, A1301, & A1307. Have these been costed? They could be supported not only by CBC, but also other big employers.</p> <p>That should create a win-win for operators and passengers. Many drive just a few miles to a P&R yet have a nearby bus stop. Make the buses frequent and reliable and the customers will come! That would free P&R for more appropriate use.</p> <p>This does need also needs, easy to achieve, ‘inbound flow control’ on radials, such that buses by-pass queues of private car traffic.</p> <p>Why have we not done these ‘easy wins’ of traffic regulation and better buses already?</p> <p>Can the GCP publish a matrix of car trips to CBC & P&R sites showing trips easily captured by an improved bus service?</p> |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|
| <p>10b</p> | <p>Sam Davies</p> | <p>The findings of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review should not have come as a surprise to members of this Board, the Joint Assembly or indeed any elected members in the Greater Cambridge area. It certainly came as no surprise to residents, myself included, who have been lobbying vigorously on the need for urgent action for over a decade.</p> <p>As you know, what the Review describes is a network, already operating at almost full capacity, which faces the prospect of 30-40% traffic growth in the next five years, and then a similar further increase to 2031, leading to a forecast of 67,500 daily trips to the Campus by the end of that period. This prospect was rightly described by members of the Joint Assembly as “scary,” a view shared by the staff, patients and visitors who need to access the Campus, and by local residents concerned at the impact on their quality of life.</p> <p>Given this context, I have two questions for Board this afternoon.</p> <p>The first concerns the 47 short-term interventions identified in the Review. Given the multiple stakeholders on the Campus, how does the GCP propose to convert these suggested interventions into distinct funded actions, with identified accountability and appropriate monitoring processes, delivered within an acceptable timeframe?</p> <p>The second concerns the longer-term prognosis. The Review emphasises the critical game-changing importance of Cambridge South Station. Can the Board explain what the GCP’s fall-back plan for maintaining access to the Campus is if Cambridge South Station does not open in 2023 as forecast in the Review, but instead at a later date, consistent with Network Rail’s estimate of 2025 or the Combined Authority’s recently published press release suggesting opening in 2027?</p> |
|------------|-------------------|---|