

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

No.	Questioner	Question	Response
7a	Janet Lockwood	<p>I agree with the need to persuade as many people as possible to use public transport rather than private car to Cambridge destinations.</p> <p>Please would the Board consider changing its basic plan from bus to the more sustainable train where-ever possible? - that is, away from Park and Ride sites near the City to rail stations further out?</p> <p>It is clear from the Assembly vote that opinion is completely divided over Recommendation 1. Before preparing a Full Outline business case for 2000 new Park and Ride spaces near junction 11 for which there is no site without significant harm - please would the Board investigate other options, particularly rail which I think is a late starter in these studies?</p>	<p>Parking at rail stations and park and ride have different constraints as rail parking can only be located at rail stations where as the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) Park and Ride Guidance Note (18th February 2016) states that 'Sites should ideally be located on or adjacent to the strategic road network or on radial routes'.</p> <p>However, the GCP also has a paper planned on the development of the level crossing bypass scheme at Foxton that could also provide additional car parking within its scope. This paper is expected to be received at the February 2018 Executive Board.</p> <p>For clarity the Joint Assembly vote was more about the location of the site, i.e. expanding the existing Trumpington site or a new site at Hauxton. There was unanimous support for the provision of additional park and ride capacity.</p>
7b	Jane Ward, Chair of Hauxton Parish Council	<p>I am most concerned that there has been insufficient modelling of the traffic flow along the A10 from Foxton through Harston to junction 11 of the M11. In particular has a survey been done of the peak time A10 traffic through Harston to the junction 11 roundabout? Has modelling been done to show the effects on the A10 when the new Hauxton Meadows exit opens? Have the possible impacts on this traffic by a new P&R been assessed?</p> <p>I believe all these will have a severely detrimental impact on the flow of traffic along the A10 through Harston, plus, there is a great chance that commuters living in Barrington and Haslingfield may also decide to make use of this P&R rather than the Madingley P&R attracting even more traffic along the A10.</p> <p>Please would the Board not rush into making a hasty decision and consider all the above points?</p>	<p>Modelling has been undertaken in terms of P&R impacts including Local Plan sites and existing development sites. This modelling has considered the impacts on the A10 of a future P&R at J11 west including the impacts of a new access point on the A10 close to the existing M11 junction.</p> <p>This modelling is being shared with Highways England to gain their views. The modelling demonstrates that congestion will be a concern in 2031 based on current growth projections and modelling assumptions for housing and jobs and that P&R will form a key part of mitigating that issue.</p> <p>The direct marginal impact of the P&R itself on congestion along the corridor is not significant and any impact must be weighed against the overall impact of congestion on key destinations if vehicles are not intercepted en-route.</p> <p>A stakeholder group involving all the affected Parish Councils together with local councillors is to be formed. This will enable full involvement in the development process. The first meeting of this</p>

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

			group will be held by the end of this year.
7c	Sunanda Billur	<p>My name is Sunanda and working in Addenbrokes hospital. My question: is there any direct transportation from Cambourne to Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's or Rosie Hospital)? Please note that Papworth is going to move to Biomedical Campus. So many people from Cambourne and surrounding village people will work in the hospital and have their appointments. Direct Bus facility will be more beneficial to all. So, everyone no need to take the car. Please consider the request and do the needful.</p>	<p>The GCP has 2 projects that cover this geographical area, the Cambourne to Cambridge better busways and the Western Orbital. The 2 projects combine in study area to cover a public transport route from Cambourne to the CBC site. Currently the Cambourne to Cambridge better busways has an interface where options for an ongoing bus service from Cambourne to CBC could either run on the M11 or off line to the existing Trumpington Park and Ride where further off line infrastructure runs directly to the CBC site.</p> <p>In addition exploratory discussions are currently underway with CBC stakeholders regarding the possibility of some additional bus provision.</p>
9a	Edward Leigh	<p>Park & Ride parking charges</p> <p>The Economy & Environment Committee received a report from officers in February 2017 that set out clearly why forfeiting £1.2m/year of income is inadvisable.</p> <p>The £0.53m/year with which the Board could decide to compensate the County Council will not create any new bus services; it will not extend services that currently end too early; it will not increase the frequency of any services; and it will not make bus services more affordable. So, I ask the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where is the analysis showing that removing the P&R parking charge is a more cost effective use of public funds than, say, subsidising extensions to P&R and rural bus services? 2. Where is the social impact analysis – in particular recognising that P&R competes with rural bus services, on which our poorest and least able citizens depend? 3. By how much is peak-time traffic forecast to reduce as a result of this intervention, (at one and two sigma confidence levels)? 4. For how many years is GCP proposing to 	<p>1) The £1 parking charge at Park and Ride sites was introduced in 2014 as part of a range of proposals in the County Council's Business Plan for that year. Following the implementation of the charge, there was an immediate drop in usage of the services by around 14% and there was considerable public criticism over the difficulty of using the ticket machines and the charge itself. So although there may well have been some other factors at work, it does seem quite clear that use of the park and ride fell as a direct consequence of the charge. It was expected that passengers would return to the system over time, but in fact there has been a further decline in usage since the charge came in.</p> <p>2) Park and Ride is a really important part of the mix of access to Cambridge City. It still carries in excess of 3m passengers every year and is as important for commuters as it is for shoppers. This will become increasingly the case as further Residents Parking Zones are introduced, limiting the opportunities for on street parking, and congestion continues to be a problem in Cambridge.</p> <p>3) It is therefore really important that as these measures come in there is a real and attractive alternative for commuters and shoppers to access Cambridge. It is for that reason that the County Council and GCP are jointly proposing to remove the</p>

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

		<p>subsidise parking at more than £0.5m/year? Why is this not stated in the background paper?</p> <p>5. Will the Board confirm whether overnight parking will still be charged at £10/night?</p> <p>6. How confident is the Board that this decision will withstand judicial review?</p>	<p>charge, a move which is expected to be near universally welcomed as it will also simplify the process of travel by removing the need to enter car registration numbers to the ticket machines. There has been no detailed analysis of the impact of the reduction in the charge, but suffice to say, given that the introduction itself resulted in a loss of patronage, it is a fair assumption that as the system becomes easier and typically up to 25% cheaper to use, passengers will return, thus reducing congestion and pollution on the streets of Cambridge.</p> <p>4) In terms of the detail of this question, the proposal is for an ongoing joint cover of the costs of park and ride between the County Council and GCP although clearly for GCP, that depends on the ongoing funding being secured from Government which is expected.</p> <p>5) The £10 overnight charge will remain as it is necessary to ensure that the sites are not used for long stay free parking given the vital role they play in access and the economy of the Greater Cambridge area.</p> <p>6) If we follow correct procedure and process as we believe that we are and hope to continue to do so, then we will withstand any external scrutiny including judicial review.</p>
9b	Dr Ashley Easter	<p>I am a former resident of Cambridge, now living in Royston, and I cycle between the two frequently as well as to my place of work in Melbourn (AstraZeneca, in future at Addenbrooke's). This last June on the A10 near Melbourn (where there is no cycleway) I was struck by a car, luckily escaping with only moderate injuries.</p> <p>After the accident, whilst using the excellent cycleway from Melbourn to reach my Physio in Cambridge, it struck me that despite the hard work by a number of councillors, volunteers and local bodies, as well as detailed plans being in place,</p>	<p>Firstly thank you to everyone for submitting their questions, and for coming to the meeting today, particularly to Sambor for the survey work he has undertaken amongst fellow students.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have each funded various sections of the Cambridge to Melbourn A10 cycle route, and this is now well used and well received. As the questioners point out it is possible to extend the route further south to the town of Royston.</p> <p>A new foot and cycle bridge over the A505 would be needed, estimated at £2m. One side would land in Hertfordshire. Planning consent and one small plot of land would be required. To reach the</p>

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

		<p>commitment for the final stretch was still uncertain.</p> <p>Please can the Greater Cambridge Partnership do everything in their power to complete the Cambridgeshire part of the A10 cycleway scheme, extending the existing cycleway from Melbourn to Royston, before anyone is more seriously hurt?</p>	<p>bridge, a new path on the east side of the A10 would be required. This would be wholly in Cambridgeshire, and would cost around £1m to deliver.</p> <p>Delivering the path in isolation without a bridge would not realistically be possible on safety grounds, as people would be encouraged to use the new path only to find that there was no way of safely crossing the A505. The two scheme elements should be delivered together, though it is possible that different funding bodies could fund different elements.</p> <p>In terms of funding, Hertfordshire County Council (Herts CC) have funded a feasibility study on a new A505 bridge, as well as committing to lifetime maintenance costs of the bridge, which they estimate at £500,000. GCP officers have discussed the project with Herts CC further, and Herts CC have confirmed that linking Royston with Melbourn for non-motorised users is not a high priority to them, and they feel that their feasibility study and offer of maintenance is as much as they are prepared to offer.</p> <p>Royston lies geographically in two Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas (Hertfordshire LEP and Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP). LEPs are able to bid for local Growth Deals and have access to funding for capital projects.</p> <p>I understand that Royston Town Council have committed £30,000 towards the project, and four individual businesses have each indicated that they would also contribute £30,000 each.</p> <p>Royston is a town (15,781 population) and Melbourn a large village (population 4,725), both with a range of employment sites, educational establishments, leisure facilities, shops and services, for which logically there are many reasons for people to want to make journeys between the two settlements by non-motorised means. Currently most of these journeys are done by car.</p> <p>The narrative of future usage and improved safety needs to be weighed up with the fairly significant cost of £3m to provide both a new path and bridge, and thus more work will be done on the</p>
--	--	---	--

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

			business case, and further discussions with Herts CC. This will then allow an informed decision to be made to either fully or partly fund the scheme, or not to fund the scheme.
9c	Sambor Czarnawski-Iliev	<p>Hello all! I am Sambor, a Year 9 student from Melbourn Village College. Last May I got involved with the A10 cycling campaign, and began a survey which was completed by 62 students, to find out how much support there is for cycling to school.</p> <p>The results were pleasing, as you can see on the sheet we've given out. The survey also showed that the lack of a safe route for cyclists along the A10 between Royston and Melbourn hindered quite a few students from being able to cycle to school. I am here to ask for your support in funding that path. I would be delighted in also giving you a first-hand tour of the route.</p> <p>The College itself has dozens of students from Royston. This number has been increasing at an ever-faster rate over the last few years, and with the planned housing developments, it's bound to keep increasing. Most of the ones I know will be glad to use such a path.</p> <p>My whole family travels by bike, virtually all the time, virtually everywhere. A path like this will open up a much-needed link between Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire.</p>	Please see the answer for question 9b
9d	Cllr Susan van de Ven	<p>With a modest investment, the final link in the Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme could be quickly completed within the GCP Tranche 1 timeframe. The two-mile Melbourn-Royston link needs a path in Cambridgeshire and a bridge in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>This is a shovel-ready project that would deliver significant economic benefits, and make a</p>	Please see the answer for question 9b

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

		<p>substantial contribution to reducing reliance on the private car for travel to key areas of employment in Cambridge and along the A10 corridor from Royston. It will maximise the benefits of the investments in this route already made by GCP. Because it has the potential to be delivered within the existing GCP funding period, it can demonstrate real progress on innovative, economically led schemes to Government.</p> <p>Today, I am here to ask for your support just for the path in Cambridgeshire. This has been costed at £1 million. While Cambridgeshire County Council has no funding to offer, the GCP is ideally placed to make this happen.</p> <p>You will want to know what's happening on the Hertfordshire side for bridge funding. Following the LEP's indication of support on a collaborative basis, Herts County and Royston Town Councils, local businesses including AstraZeneca, and many small private donations are coming together to create a funding package.</p> <p>That this overall effort has persisted for so long is really down to commuters who want to leave their cars at home. As the owner of Melbourn Science Park said to the GCP Board last year, this sustainable transport link will not only alleviate pressures on Science Park parking, but will allow the creation of more jobs.</p> <p>So, today we are asking the Board to get fully behind the project, by proposing that the GCP commit the necessary funds to complete the Cambridgeshire portion of the scheme.</p>	
9e	Dr Michael Prior-Jones	The Quarterly Report notes that the Shepreth to Melbourn section of the A10 Cambridge-Royston cycle route opened in March, and came in slightly under budget. I would like to thank the board for	Please see the answer for question 9b

Appendix A to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 22 November 2017 – Public Questions and Answers

		<p>funding this part of the route, and ask them to seriously consider funding the proposed path from the south end of Melbourn to the A505. This would be as part of a package with a bridge over the A505 to Royston, with funding from several other agencies and private businesses. The total cost of the project is estimated at £2.5m.</p> <p>I work at a firm on the Melbourn Science Park. I have around 25 colleagues living in Royston, who make the two mile journey to work by car because it is not safe to cross the A505 - and there are plenty more working in the other businesses on the park. Our business is expanding and we are creating more jobs in Melbourn. The high cost of housing in Cambridge and South Cambs means that even young professionals on good salaries are struggling to buy homes in Cambridgeshire. More of our staff are choosing to live in Royston, where housing is fractionally cheaper, and the lack of safe routes to walk or cycle to work means that we are generating a lot of short-journey commute traffic and demand for car parking on our site.</p> <p>It reflects poorly on the structure of our local government institutions that the county boundary causes so many issues with the funding. I would urge the board to support this proposed scheme, and find ways to resolve the issues over the border with Hertfordshire, because it will help us create jobs, retain staff, and produce a better quality of life and health for both our staff and the wider community.</p>	
--	--	--	--