



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

Friday 8 September 2017

To: Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Councillor Kevin Price | Cambridge City Council (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 next meeting of **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**, which will be held in **KREIS VIERSEN ROOM, SHIRE HALL, CAMBRIDGE** on **WEDNESDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2017** 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 - 2**

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 4

Questions to Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly - 13 September 2017

Questions under Agenda Item 6: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys Scheme

Question 6a: from Mal Schofield

The A 428 corridor daily car commuters were +/- 5000 in 2011*. Of these, just 15%, 750 drivers would benefit from an alternative faster, reliable, frequent, service to work in Cambridge West and the immediate city centre. All other commuters would be obliged to journey onwards eg. to the Science Park.. The propensity to take a second bus etc. needs to be understood The assumption would be something like ----- *"onward commuting to work, two or more journeys, then depends upon the expectation of where predictable delays e.g. bus dwell time, represent less than 10% of the total journey time"*

The UCL DataShine** analysis shows, for the A428 driver, 1 in 4 (25%) commuting to Cambridge NE (A14); the same 1 in 4 (25%) to the SE (M11;A505?), the dominant commute 1 in 3 (35%) to the south/west (M11/A1304). The potential 750 drivers will subdivide in both demographic and behavioural terms. Some could be persuaded to car share, others will treat the car as a daily essential - the enabler of reduced time overall including school runs, visits en route and shopping essentials.

Using the research data above - **37% of 750 = 288 drivers. The peak time driver commuter potential for non stop services from Cambourne to Cambridge.**

In the fuller context this switch represents **.14%** of daily car commuters into the city (200,000 in 2015). The real issue therefore remains the high cost: benefit relationship if the primary "solution" to car commuter reduction is to be travel by bus + off road busways.

Question.

- How many more dedicated busways are anticipated? For just a 1% modal shift, it appears, 6 + more busways will be needed.

*Source: 2011 Census Travel to Work

**Source: <http://commute.datashine.org.uk/#mode=cardriving&direction>

Question 6b: from Dr Marilyn Treacy

As evidenced by the recent protest march and Cambridge Deserves Better meeting ,which was standing room only, residents from all across Cambridge do not feel that their views regarding GCP schemes are being heard. The GCP is about to embark on a another round of consultation regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme. After the previous round of deeply flawed public consultation for preferred options public opinion counted for only 4% in the subsequent scoring. Residents were left feeling incredulous and let down by the process .Can the GCP please re-assure residents that the planned public consultation will be fair and transparent and would you please inform me at this stage how public opinion will be scored i.e. exactly what % will be allocated to the public opinion in the scoring for the choice of the preferred option for the full outline business case development.

Question not being taken at this meeting (recommended to either be discussed at November's meeting or provided with a written answer)

Question from Patrick von Heimendahl

Last year the protest against the City Deal concentrated around the road closures. These closures would have hit many small businesses which required vehicle access. Many businesses are struggling to keep afloat for various reasons. One of them being access. Old established independent businesses contribute the flair and charm of living in our city. Open the paper and you read that small independent businesses in our City are facing a tough time. Since last year, amongst others, we have seen the loss of 'The Cambridge Toy Shop', 'Clowns' and now 'Hobbs' after 86 years.

It is without doubt that the road closures the City Deal proposed would have been another nail in the coffin of small independent businesses and would have led to an avalanche of further closures. We do not want this to happen!

In a meeting with the Interim Transport Director of GCP at the End of March it was mentioned that the City Access policy is to plan to make cross city access impossible. The traffic survey in June, few doubt, will have looked for and found evidence to support such a policy. You all heard of the 'petal scheme' a disastrous plan born out of the same unimaginative mindset as the road closures. These policies will lead to rat running and a dissection of our city. Cambridge has an unusually transient and mobile population but for the core residents and businesses the city is our neighbourhood. These policies only differ marginally from the PCCP and businesses and residents will pay hugely for such a negative policy.

By abandoning the road closure last year the Assembly and the Executive Board of the City Deal showed wisdom. The suggested new policy is so similar that by the same wisdom the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly surely must refrain from considering such traffic measures again. Could the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly please confirm that?