

**GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD – 26th JULY 2017
PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSES**

Agenda Item 9: Rapid Mass Transport Strategic Options Appraisal

9a	Question from Councillor Rod Cantrill
	<p>Assuming the Board approves the proposed feasibility study into a Rapid Mass Transit system for the Greater Cambridge Area, does the Board not agree that work on the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should stop until there is clarity on the way forward?</p> <p>Assuming the Board progresses a Rapid Mass Transit system following the feasibility study, does it not agree that the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should constitute no more than a low level intervention along the lines of the LLF's Option 6 and including smart transport features?</p> <p>This would still allow those living west of Cambridge to access the City quickly and reliably, yet would be far less expensive and would offer greater flexibility when Rapid Mass Transit decisions are made.</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The proposals are at an early stage and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) is looking to future proof schemes. With reference to Cambourne to Cambridge, whatever the form of transport it will need to get through the traffic. This options appraisal report will tell us what form of rapid transit we could be looking at, but the problem of how to get it into town will remain. The GCP will be asking the consultants to look at tunneling amongst other things, operating costs and how much the capital costs could be.</p> <p>The Board isn't making decisions today in terms of Cambourne to Cambridge; in fact the final decision will not be till the middle of next year. Nothing is pending this report, no decisions have been made and in any event we are looking to future proof.</p>
9b	Question from Roger Tomlinson
	<p>The Mayor James Palmer of the new Combined Authority we are told has agreed with the Greater Cambridge Partnership to commission a study to establish an overall vision for transport for Greater Cambridge, including Light Rail and tunneling options. However, consultants previously commissioned by the officers of the County Council and former City Deal have shown a bias to buses and excluded other options, and the community does not feel they can rely on their independence, indicated when one consultant told the LLF he was preparing a "rebuttal" of LLF views for the GCP.</p> <p>The question is therefore: Will the Executive Board please appoint new consultants with no previous involvement in planning for current schemes and options, and no contractual or personal ties to the County Council Directorate of Economy, Transport and Environment, or any other conflict of interest, to provide a genuinely independent study of the wider needs for transport, without influence by officers?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The options appraisal will look at a wide range of options, not just busses. The consultants will be asked to look at light rail, heavy rail and advanced rapid transit. They will also be asked to look at anything elsewhere in the world that they are aware of that would potentials suit a city of this size and nature.</p> <p>With reference to the independence of the study, the brief contains reference to asking the consultants to state what other connections they have to Cambridge, details of schemes they have been involved in as well as information on any relationship they have to anyone or any body who may have done work previously for any County Council or Greater Cambridge Partnership Scheme.</p>

Agenda Item 10: Milton Road and Histon Road Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements

10a	Question from Edward Leigh (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
	<p>Will the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and restate objectives for Milton (and Histon) Roads so that they are clear, forward-looking and coherent across all projects? • Commission a feasibility study of connecting the Milton Park & Ride to the busway via the A14 underpass behind the Regional College, which would bypass up to a mile of queued traffic and five sets of traffic lights? • Commission analysis of Inbound Flow Control on Milton Rd as an alternative to constructing 1.3km of bus lanes?
	<p>Response</p> <p>The objectives have changed as the process has developed, but notwithstanding that people still use busses. With reference to addressing problems further up Milton Road, this will be looked at as part of City Access proposals. However that would be addressing the symptoms and not the cause. The cause is there are too many cars. Why are there too many cars? That's because there are no real alternatives. What is being proposed will provide good alternatives, not to hold people outside the area and queue them there, as all you are going to do then is create a great big car park. This needs to be addressed in a much wider way. Tidal flows of this nature could be an option, but this needs to be considered in the round. This type of problem can't be dealt with in isolation. The A10 corridor study will look at this and the use of the bus lane, the park and ride and use of the underpass to get onto the busway.</p>
10b	Question from Matthew Danish
	<p>We ask the Executive Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will you take up our proposal to put forward a hybrid design that is based on 'Final Concept' for the junctions and junction approaches while incorporating the concepts of 'Do Optimum' for much of the links in between? • Will you instruct officers to take into account the diminishing returns of lengthy bus lanes, and to consult the Local Liaison Forum to find when the costs of lengthy bus lanes exceed the benefits?
	<p>Response</p> <p>In terms of cost benefit there is a chance that given the amount of public realm being put back in, the cost benefit at the end of the day might be lower than originally hoped for. The Interim Transport Director confirmed he would not be putting into the scheme, redundant pieces of bus lane that increased costs and didn't result in any cost benefit.</p>
10c	Question from Erik de Visser
	<p>The present plans of the GCP, whether Cambridge-wide or just for Milton Road, need major alterations or a different mind-set before spending tax payers' revenue on them.</p> <p>You aim to solve contemporary and future problems with somewhat outdated methods. In 2035 your present choice will be seen as antiquated. Your legacy will not be applauded.</p> <p>The question is: how will the GCP successfully manage a modal shift away from cars to trains and buses?</p> <p>It is high time this question is answered satisfactorily before new tarmac is put on Milton Road and elsewhere around the city.</p>

	<p>Response</p> <p>In terms of cost benefit there is a chance that given the amount of public realm being put back in, the cost benefit at the end of the day might be lower than originally hoped for. The Interim Transport Director confirmed he would not be putting into the scheme, redundant pieces of bus lane that increased costs and didn't result in any cost benefit.</p>
10d	<p>Question from Anne Hamill</p> <p>Cllr Lewis Herbert's letter of 14 September 2017, states that the Board supports '...an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road, and also the provision of grass verges...' but the 'Final Concept' doesn't follow this through.</p> <p>The flat-plan graphic (Appendix D, page 1) shows a miniscule verge between Herbert Street and Chesterton Hall Crescent – too narrow for tree planting – conflicting with the letter's commitment. The problem is this is the narrowest section of the road.</p> <p>However, at the 19 July Joint Assembly meeting, in his report on 'Final Concept', Chris Tunstall said that the officers will continue to look at this narrowest section of the road, and acknowledged that, here, there is no buffer of verges with trees. He also said that they could reduce some of the lane widths further, as well as the length of the bus lane.</p> <p>So to ensure there's enough space for adequate verges with trees along the whole length, it'll be necessary to vary the widths of the carriageway, pavements and cycle ways locally – as well as minimise bus lane lengths.</p> <p>My question is: will the Executive Board commit to instructing the officers to use flexibility in determining the widths of the carriageway, pavements and cycle ways, and the lengths of the bus lanes, to provide sufficient space to achieve healthy verges planted with mature trees on both sides along the whole length of Milton Road?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>There is support for an avenue of trees but there is one area where lack of space presents a real problem. Officers will do their utmost to address resident's concerns. It may be possible to reduce the width of the carriageway and officers would work with the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) to try and get the avenue of trees the whole length of the road.</p>
10e	<p>Question from Jamie Daizell</p> <p>In a letter dated 26th September 2017, Lewis Herbert wrote to the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum on behalf of the City Deal Board to confirm your support of 'an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road'. The 'Final Concept Design' being discussed later, in an effort to squeeze in bus lanes, incorporates grass verges of only 1m width which would be insufficient for 'mature trees' and has now started to refer to 'semi-mature trees' as a design element.</p> <p>Will the Board therefore honour its commitment to local residents and reject the current proposals?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>As stated above, officers will endeavor to do what they can to deliver their commitment to residents and proposals will be discussed with the LLF.</p>

10h	Question from Barbara Taylor
	<p>The Final Concept design increases the length of cycle lanes on Milton Road. However many local residents will be unable to access these lanes, as safe crossings with several side streets have not been included. At the Joint Assembly meeting officers promised to review potential crossings as part of detailed design.</p> <p>Will there be a commitment to allow all residents in side streets off Milton Road to access both north and south bound cycle lanes via the provision of safe crossings? Will these crossings be included at the earliest possible stage of detailed design development, rather than as an afterthought?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>Crossings will need to be looked at in general and it is planned to commit to Copenhagen style crossings, which is quite unique to this country. It is planned to arrange a workshop to look specifically at crossings. At the moment the concept shows one or two crossings, but by no means does it show the full extent of crossings that will be looked at as part of the final design proposals.</p>
10i	Question from Roxanne de Beaux
	<p>We ask the Executive Board: will you instruct the officers to protect the segregation assumption of the model by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring respectable signal timings for cycling crossings of carriageways, and • reasonably scaling back the lengths of the bus lanes in order to provide safe bus stops, places for loading bays, and sufficient space for trees to grow? <p>With these changes, the integrity of the cycle ways and footways is maintained</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>This will be a particular issue in the narrow area around Herbert Street where there are narrow verges. Consideration will be given to getting more out of the verge there including tree planting and bus stops, acknowledging that floating bus stops will take up space.</p> <p>This will be considered as part of the detailed design work. Work will include looking at pedestrian and cyclist movement to reflect interactions and at the junctions. This would be considered but this would not be looked at where this was segregation as this did not affect the traffic. You are correct in assuming that some cyclists will be on the road and not everyone will be segregated. With that in mind officers would make sure they allowed for this in the modelling.</p>
10j	Question from Richard Taylor
	<p>I am surprised the results of a safety assessment are not available to inform today's decision on remodelling Milton Road. When a safety audit is carried out will it take account of risks to pedestrians and cyclists and will it be possible to amend the plans to implement any changes arising as a result of the safety audit process?</p> <p>Also In relation to Milton Road could we please have clarity on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • which, if any, elements of the plans are fixed today and what remains up for discussion • who will be able to participate in and observe proposed workshops to discuss elements such as tree selection, bus stops, crossings and loading bays?
	<p>Response</p> <p>The proposals represent a concept not a design. It would not be cost effective to spend money now working up final design and assessing road safety implications before a final decision on design is made. Final design proposals will be fully safety audited and the outcome of that will be presented to the Board.</p>

10l	Question from Michael Page
	<p>I note that the 2031 predicted maximum inbound queue length at Gilbert Road junction is 12 cars, yet a 40 car length overtaking lane for buses is planned. At the Arbury Road junction the 2031 predicted maximum queue length is again 12 cars but an overtaking lane equivalent to 140 cars is planned.</p> <p>I believe that there is real scope here for further optimisation without compromising bus journey times or reliability. Any reduction in lane lengths would unlock the potential for accommodating properly-sized bus stop boarding areas or allow for better trees and verges and unloading bays which would help overcome some of the potential conflicts and safety fears which put off cyclists and bus users.</p> <p>Question: rather than accept that bus lane lengths “will be considered further” as in para 34 page 30 of the report, will the Board please make this more substantive by requiring officers to “make bus lane lengths subject to further technical review with the objective of reducing their length wherever possible”.</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The proposals represent a concept not a design. It would not be cost effective to spend money now working up final design and assessing road safety implications before a final decision on design is made. Final design proposals will be fully safety audited and the outcome of that will be presented to the Board.</p>

Agenda Item 12: A424/A1303 Better Bus Journeys Scheme

12a	Question from Dr Gabriel Fox [asked by Roger Tomlinson]
	<p>Will the Board accept that a fair allocation of scores of Options 1, 3a and 6 does not support the Interim Transport Director’s assertion at point 33 of his report that “Option 6 does not score as highly as Options 1 or 3a” and that Option 6 should therefore remain in the process and undergo a full, fair and, most importantly, independent assessment?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The scoring has not affected the end result, as the recommendation is that option 6 goes forward for a full appraisal alongside other options.</p>
12b	Question from Allan Treacy
	<p>With reference to Table 15 on pages 153 and 154 of the board papers, I have noted many glaring inconsistencies in the scoring. In particular I have noted that the promoters of Option 3A, the GCP transport officers, have estimated that Option 3A would deliver a modal shift from car to bus of 31% compared to 28% for Option 6.</p> <p>How many real people does that 3% represent and given the difference in capital cost, what does that equate to in £s per person?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The scoring had not affected the end result, as the recommendation is that option 6 goes forward for a full appraisal alongside other options.</p>
12c	Question from Alistair Burford
	<p>Question in relation to Agenda item 12 A428/A1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme (further scheme development update (Park and Ride).</p> <p>Last week, the GCP Joint Assembly voted 10 to 1 (3 abstentions) in favour of removing Crome Lea from the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Park & Ride shortlist.</p> <p>In order to restore some public confidence, will the Board confirm that this democratic decision will be upheld? If the Board is minded to reject the Joint Assembly’s recommendation then, could the Board explain the purpose of the Joint Assembly?</p>

	<p>Response</p> <p>A decision on this is be a matter for the Executive Board to determine. From a process point of view it was recommended that this option be included in the shortlist, at this stage and be fully appraised and considered alongside other schemes at the next stage of the process.</p>
12d	<p>Question from Edward Leigh (Smarter Cambridge Transport)</p> <p>Will the Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate the Rural Travel Hubs project, to bring a much-needed bus station to Cambourne? • Commission analysis of Inbound Flow Control on the A1303 as an alternative to constructing 2 miles of busway or bus lanes? <p>Examine the implications of adding connections and a Park & Ride at the Girton Interchange, as set out in our A428 LLF resolution?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>Discussions are taking place with key stakeholders about possible development in Cambourne. With reference to the idea of flow control, this could be looked at, but there could be all sorts of reasons why there might be problems with it. Like many things, this was addressing the effect rather than the cause. That it something that has to be considered in the round and applied to all roads, not one in isolation. Otherwise you just displace the traffic and make it someone else's problem.</p>
12e	<p>Question from Roger Tomlinson</p> <p>The 'technical group' of the Local Liaison Forum for the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys, and others, have identified glaring inaccuracies and blatant bias in the comparative assessment of route Options 1, 3a and 6, and in the assessment of Park and Ride sites by officers and their consultants. Experts have noted that this has occurred on previous reports.</p> <p>The question is therefore: Will the Executive Board please appoint consultants with no contractual or personal ties to the County Council Directorate of Economy, Transport and Environment, or any other conflict of interest, to provide a genuinely independent technical review of options, without influence by officers, for the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys scheme?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The GCP always looks to use consultants that come in with an independent mind. The key thing is bus is still the means by which most people are transported around area, so at the moment that is the submission we are looking at, notwithstanding the fact we are doing a comparator study.</p>

Agenda Item 13: Cross City Cycling

13a	<p>Question from Bill Jenks</p> <p>The proposed TRO is to impose double yellow lines [no waiting at any time] on both sides of Green End Road from Scotland Road to Chesterton High St where the cycle lanes end [there being none on the next section through Water Lane to Water Street].</p> <p>This is very short residential section of about 150 meters, on which 20 out of 30 houses have no space on their property for visitor parking, a number considerably underestimated in the officer's report to committee. The no parking/waiting of any kind would deny 2/3 of our residents the kind of visitor parking which must be very near each property for serious matters including; essential maintenance by tradesmen with heavy equipment; essential care visits by social and health workers and other important services who do not have parking exemptions as a matter of routine; deliveries of heavy items; setting down, and picking up, including hospital cars and</p>
------------	---

	<p>taxis.</p> <p>While understanding there is no right to parking on highways, there are basic legal and/or common sense rights in matters of personal health and safety including emergency/routine maintenance of properties which we strongly feel should not be prevented, and that doing so could result in the risk of real harm to residents and the general upkeep of the neighbourhood. Officers suggest in reports alternative parking spaces in nearby roads, however these are no longer free since the increase in high density buildings with no parking provision, and in any event any such spaces would not be appropriate for the type of essential visiting services parking we are very worried about.</p> <p>The question or proposal, therefore, is that some parking rights be retained on one side of the road only, the north/east side, where there are a few spaces in between large properties who benefit from large courtyards or drives for visitors. Perhaps it would be a reasonable compromise to have the lines on both sides but with the north/east side banning parking only between the busy commuting hours on weekdays, [perhaps 0730-0930 and 1630-1830?] when the cycle lanes are most used?</p> <p>Many of us have lived here for decades, are cyclists, and are broadly in support of the intent of the cycle scheme when it adds to health and safety, but not when it would seem to needlessly threaten the health and safety of people and property. Many residents did not realise the extent of the ban on parking and a petition and/or request for a judicial review is being prepared which, it is hoped, will not be necessary if a decent compromise can be achieved that allows improved cycling for visitors as well as vital services to local citizens.</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>With reference to the proposed no waiting restrictions there are a number of exemptions which will address many of the concerns raised and will allow residents to conveniently receive some services outlined. The exemptions include loading and unloading, essential maintenance and building works, wedding and funeral cars, post office vehicles, emergency vehicles and taxis. As seen on p162 of the report there is parking near by on street on Enniskillen Road, Ashfield Road and Scotland Road. Health workers could use these areas or residents could allow use of their driveways by moving their own cars. On the east side of this end of Green End Road all properties have two off street parking places with the exception of three recently built smaller houses which have one space. On the west side there are the older properties, but all properties have at least one parking space except for the two that are nearest to Scotland Road, where off street parking is available. There are also 7 off street garages located off Green End Road, although it has not been possible to ascertain who uses these.</p> <p>The scheme seeks to generally keep cycle lanes clear of parked vehicles although some objectors as we have heard feel the scheme does not go far enough in keeping the lanes entirely clear.</p> <p>As with most streets in the City there were competing demands for space, in this case cycle lanes, shop related parking and residential parking. On balance the view is some short stay parking should be made available outside the shops and this equates to a length of 40 metres. Given that the residents in all but two cases have some off street parking and that there is on street parking nearby the officer view is that that their needs are less than that of cycling or the shops.</p> <p>TROs could be revised and altered in light of experience, as the new Cambridge North station becomes more used and developments around the station follow. This may trigger the need to review parking on a wider scale in East Chesterton, but this won't be included in the first phase of reviewing areas for residents parking schemes</p>

13b	Question from Roxanne de Beaux
	Will you support this resolution to create both a safe, protected cycle way and parking for the businesses? [The question refers to a PDF document circulated separately]
	<p>Response</p> <p>The length outside the shops (40 metres) is being proposed to be left as an area for parking. There has been a planning application submitted to redevelop the site and provide flats above the take aways. The Project Team had discussed this application with City Council planning officers to explore the possibility of a lay by being provided by the applicant. To install a lay by would require an area currently in private ownership outside the shops to be converted to footway and thus become part of the public highway. In order to accommodate the layby and ideally with a bypass cycle lane on the inside of it, utility diversions, protection, kerbing, drainage works and footway and carriageway resurfacing would make layby construction relatively expensive. Shop frontage, space for a-boards, cycle parking and space for pedestrians would be reduced to almost nothing. Fewer cars could park in a layby than in the current cycle lane proposal due to the approach and departure flares in the layby. Due to these reasons the planners feel imposing such a condition on the applicant would be unreasonable.</p>
13c	Question from Rad Wagon [asked by Roxanne de Beaux]
	How much money was spent on the Green End Road cycle way which is demonstrably more dangerous to ride now and has been taken over by a car park scheme? Can this money be recouped for proper cycle infrastructure?
	Will advice on pavement cycling be set in stone throughout these schemes?
	<p>Response</p> <p>The money spent on the cycle lane is £344,822.58 which includes inlaying a new 1.8 metre cycle lane from Nuffield Road to Water Lane, laying red tarmac, curved radii were also tightened up on all of the side roads involving expensive kerbing and drainage works and footway resurfacing as well as other works to provide new paving slabs, bollards, and trees. A floating bus stop has also been installed near Frank's Lane. All of the above required setting out and maintaining traffic management, facilities for workforce and advance surveys.</p> <p>Cycling on footways it is accepted generally that primary age children can cycle on footways if they are doing so considerately. Older children and adults should not ride on footways unless they are assigned as shared paths. With the new cycle lane and 20 mph speed limit most cyclists should feel safe to not have to cycle on the footway.</p>

Agenda Item 14: Improving Greater Cambridge Partnership Governance

14a	Question from Wendy Blythe
	<p>You have received the following letter, now signed by 54 community and local-business groups:</p> <p>“Residents and businesses in Cambridge and the surrounding villages are concerned that the City Deal is rushing through plans for major development and transport schemes that lack a clear overall vision, are not evidence-based and have been progressed using a flawed model of top-down 'consultation’.</p> <p>“The need to spend the first tranche of funding quickly has meant that so far this has not been a holistic programme to successfully manage rapid growth in a way that is sustainable and not environmentally damaging.</p> <p>“We call upon the City Deal to re-engineer the process to facilitate more effective partnership and collaboration so that the skills and talents of Cambridgeshire residents and businesses can also be engaged in proper research and evaluation of new infrastructure projects, in order to deliver a long-term vision for our region that is</p>

	about health, well-being and community as well as economic success.” My Question is: will the Board act on this letter?
	Response Refer to minute text.