

Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly – 1 March 2017

Notice of Public Questions

1. Richard Wood (question deferred from meeting on 18 January 2017)

Will the Greater Cambridge City Deal become a Local Transport Authority (LTA) under the devolution proposals, or will this be the role of the forthcoming Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority?

If the former, will all the board and constituent members of the City Deal commit to replacing the current deregulated market model of bus service provision with one of franchising, whereby the authority specifies the services to be provided and bus operators bid to provide those services – akin to the system currently operated in London by Transport for London – thereby tackling the priorities for improvement which will increase passenger numbers and deliver maximum benefits to passengers.

Will they further commit to introducing integrated, smartcard, ticketing across all routes and all operators?

If the latter, will they commit to using all possible influence on the LTA to implement franchising and integrated ticketing?

3. Antony Carpen – for agenda item 8 A1307 Three Campuses

Just over a year ago, you published this press release at http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/news/article/35/public_consultation_proposed_to_tackle_congestion_between_cambridge_and_haverhill on the options available for dealing with congestion south-east out of Cambridge towards Haverhill. Much of the traffic coming into Cambridge comes down Cherry Hinton Road - where I live down. I am now on medication because of the impact of the worsening air quality due to the extended traffic jams down that road.

I note the City Deal Board rejected Rail Haverhill's proposals in Feb 2016. I would like to challenge that decision based on incorrect assumptions given to the consultants in carrying out their assessment as described in the draft rail viability technical note Jan 2016.

(It's appendix B of "REPORT NO 70012014-003 A1307 HAVERHILL TO CAMBRIDGE CORRIDOR DRAFT CONCEPTS REPORT")

The authors state:

"A Cambridge-Haverhill railway line could also ultimately form part of a more strategic rail link from Cambridge to Colchester, via Haverhill and Sudbury, including the existing Sudbury to Marks Tey branch. However, this strategic option is beyond the scope of this technical note and the current study."

This strategic option is central to the business case for Haverhill, for it links by rail the two campuses of Anglia Ruskin University (Chelmsford & Cambridge via Colchester)

Who made the decision to restrict this strategic option for Rail Haverhill to be between just the town and Cambridge Station?

I call on you to ask The Board to:

- A. Run a brief crowd-sourcing exercise to invite people to suggest what refreshed assumptions should be applied to a reappraisal of the rail option
- B. Commission the consultants to re-appraise the Rail Haverhill option subject to the following assumptions:
 - 1) That the Rail Haverhill proposals will be as part of the national rail network linking Colchester-Sudbury-Haverhill-Cambridge-Wisbechand then...
 - 2) That Rail Haverhill will be part of the Connect Cambridge Light Rail proposals

4. Robin Heydon, Camcycle

Our question is on Item 8, A1307 scheme.

Camcycle is disappointed with the low quality of the cycle provision in the draft plans for the A1307 corridor. A substandard width cycleway immediately adjacent to 50mph traffic (assuming drivers stick to the speed limit) is not the way to encourage more people to cycle on this route. If the City Deal truly wishes to increase cycling and walking on this route, we ask that the Assembly recommends a significant redesign.

It is unacceptable that the designs proposed leave people walking and cycling to cross roads with 50mph and National Speed Limit restrictions at grade without any help whatsoever. This includes people trying to reach bus stops along this route at Wandlebury and Babraham. A fully-accessible, usable-by-all-abilities, Equality-Act-compliant, non-motorised-user crossing of the A11 is absolutely vital and must not be omitted. This crossing must connect to safe facilities on both sides and must not become inaccessible because of high river levels.

We have been saying for the last few months that better design standards for cycle infrastructure must be met. Last year Highways England published Interim Advice Note 195/16 - Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network. This applies to Highways England schemes, but the standards and designs it contains are equally applicable to the County network. We ask that the Assembly recommends that this scheme be redesigned to meet this standard.

In particular both major and minor road junctions need extra attention to safety and usability, and any newly created on-highway paths should be verge-separated from the carriageway. The cycleway must have designated priority over all crossings - driveways, laybys and minor roads- instead of give way markings at each.

What design standards, if any, are being used to help guide the A1307 scheme?

Why is the cycling provision not being designed to support the Greenways project to provide a safe, pleasant route linking the villages and employment centres from Linton to Sawston and Shelford into Addenbrooke's and Cambridge?

6. Jim Chisholm: On agenda item 8 A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge

How many Assembly Members, and Officers, have heard of the 'Road Network Paradox'? This, one of a number of similar paradoxes, shows that it possible to make 'network' improvements that result in worse conditions overall.

I have serious reservations about the proposed scheme on three fronts:

Firstly, the Bus Services Bill, now before Parliament, and the extra powers delegated by the agreed Devolution for Cambridge and Peterborough should enable far more practical and efficient methods of regulating both traffic flow and bus services than available when these studies were started.

Secondly, those of us involved in cost benefit analysis, however minor, know that although we may be able to justify spending a large sum, it is often possible to obtain 80% of the benefits with 20% of the costs.

Thirdly, taking this road in isolation, without full consideration of the opportunities, pressures of development, congestion and inefficient bus services on adjacent routes seem short sighted.

I live in this area and we clearly need to have a proper systems approach.

Constructing a bus lane will have a rapidly diminishing effect the longer it is. Better use of the Wort's Causway option, simple adjustments to lights, and 'white line' engineering could easily give buses a ten-minute advantage under congested conditions.

We do need better cycling access, but I'm sure that options within the 'Greenways' report would provide a more pleasant cycle route for a wider range of users to a wider range of destinations than an unlit one that is within a metre of a fast and noisy and polluting A1307.

"How is it possibly to consider the A1307 in isolation given the close relationship with the A1301 and the respective (but not respected bus services)?"

I fear that these mega schemes can be neither secure in terms of benefits, nor good value for money, and take no account of the changing legislative environment.