

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
1	Dr Joanna Gomula	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Congestion charge	<p><i>There are many services, and individual companies and persons - ambulances, school deliveries, disabled travellers, airport transfer companies - that should be exempted from the restrictions.</i></p> <p>Where can one find a list of such exemptions? How and where can someone, for example a disabled person or an airport transfer company, apply for an exemption?</p>	<p>Part 5 of the questions was answered and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a></p> <p>The questioners was advised to submit all remaining question parts to the County Council for a response.</p>	Yes
2	Andrew Dutton	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Workplace parking levy.	<p><i>I note that you still intend to introduce the non-progressive parking tax on those who work in Cambridge. Whilst £1.75 might not be significant to many of the well paid workers in Cambridge (Most companies will pass this charge on to their employees) for the low paid or disabled this is a significant an unfair burden. Many of these people have no option but to drive due, physical disability or time constraints of running a family i.e getting children to schools and working. I am surprised a socially responsible party such as yourselves have not considered the negative implications of this.</i></p> <p>How do you plan to resolve this unfair burden on some of the lowest paid workers in Cambridge? <i>These people have to drive due to housing costs and cannot use public transport or cycling due to physical disability or time constraints and the need to both work a full day and take children to schools. Would you consider a wage limit below which it cannot be passed on or an exemption for those below a certain wage or for those with disabilities?</i></p>	<p>Was recommended for answering at the January Executive Board as could not be present. The question has been answered as part of the Executive Board published questions.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&amp;MIId=6853&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1074&amp;MIId=6853&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
4	Carolyn Postgate	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p><i>At the Joint Assembly Meeting September 29<sup>th</sup> 2016 you committed to making a decision on your preferred Park &amp; Ride locations, 1, 2, 3 and Scotland Farm. You asked the Officers to produce a side-by-side analysis of the sites so that you could make an informed decision.</i></p> <p>My questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When Andy Williams of AstraZeneca asked for a simple side-by-side analysis, why did the officers not disclose to the Assembly the Atkins Report on Park &amp; Ride locations dated September 2015?</li> <li>Has the Assembly had sight of the Atkins Report before now?</li> <li>Given the strength of feeling against site 3 on 29 September, does the Assembly have the courage to recommend that site 3 should be excluded from further consideration?</li> </ol>	<p>Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
10	Alistair Burford	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the officers state that the Atkins report 'informed the consultation' that was carried out in late 2015, why was site 3, Crome Lea Farm not disclosed as part of the public consultation?</li> <li>Does the Assembly think that if the Crome Lea had been clearly identified at the public consultation that the objections to the site would have been far greater?</li> <li>I have concerns about the report that was sent to me. I have made further FOI requests in an attempt to retrieve the original version and the revised version of the report, but my requests have not been successful. Could officers explain why the reports have been withheld?</li> <li>As the consultation excluded some vital information about the location of site 3, does the Assembly agree that the consultation conducted in November 2015 was flawed and failed to meet the principles of a fair and transparent consultation?</li> </ol>	<p>Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
13	Stephen	18 <sup>th</sup> January	Park and Ride	<i>Landowners are clearly having a huge input in terms of formulating a route for</i>	Written answer was given at the chairs request	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
	Coates	2017	locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p><i>the A428 busway. The Cambourne developers will now give the City Deal £8.7m towards the corridor. We have still not received any answer from Cambridge University as one of the landowners saying building over the West Fields could provide land and financing to the busway.</i></p> <p>Given Cambridge University had detailed information from Atkins on the potential park and ride sites before the October 2015 consultation, which enabled them to formalise a detailed consultation response, why was this information not disclosed to the local community at the same time?</p> <p>Secondly, why are officers saying that the local community is not entitled to any information now on the extensive discussions with landowners and developers when this is clearly having a huge impact on routing and funding of the busway - what about democratic oversight?</p> <p>Thirdly, how can the Assembly allow officers to insist that the best strategic outcome is a greenfield busway whilst avoiding answering questions (as they did at the Atkins meeting) by saying detailed work is not complete yet?</p> <p>Does selective release of information to privileged parties show that this argument is highly misleading and just an expedient way of making it harder for the community to challenge poor proposals (especially when they do not get the same information)?</p> <p>How can the officers select an option that could cost £207m and yet keep saying that the detailed work is not yet done?</p> <p>Does this not therefore add up to evidence of predetermination and therefore should the Assembly not challenge this in a robust way, especially given the poor business case of the busway?</p> <p>Given clear evidence of predetermination, should the Assembly not question the Board about its management of conflicts of interest in relation to Cambridge University?</p>	<p>because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	
14	Chris Pratten	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p><i>A recent Freedom of Information request uncovered an Atkins report from September 2015 (A428 Western Corridor Study: Park and Ride Locations) which was only shared with City Deal Partners. We have requested that City Deal officers immediately release all documents and reports produced by Atkins regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor. This request was made at a meeting organised with City Deal officers and Atkins representatives. A subsequent request by email from a representative of Save The West Fields was also refused, in a manner implying an even more hardline approach to information sharing than was in evidence at the Atkins meeting.</i></p> <p>Will the Assembly recommend that officers be asked to immediately produce and publish a list of all documents and reports produced by Atkins and other consultants regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor</p>	<p>Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
5	Allan Treacy	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to	<p>With the topographical study on the Madingley Rise on road busway option having been completed, why has the feasibility study not yet been completed and by what date will it be available?</p>	<p>Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was</p>	

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
			Cambridge scheme		published as part of the public questions document. <a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	
16	Amanda Fuller	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<i>Given that Option 3/3A for the West Cambridge busway was opposed by the majority of people in the consultation, given that the economic case for this option has more holes in it than a crocheted blanket, given that this option will be hugely environmentally destructive, given that this option represents very poor value for money and given that a Park &amp; Ride on Madingley Hill can only be described as a blot on the landscape, does the Joint Assembly endorse the Executive Board's decision to choose this as the preferred option over the more cost effective and environmentally sensitive on-road scheme proposed by the LLF?</i>	Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. <a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes.
17	Roger Tomlinson	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Park and Ride locations on Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	Can the Joint Assembly members confirm that they have read the "Strategic Economic Appraisal" and understood it?  Assuming the answer is Yes, what is their view of them being supplied seriously misleading and inaccurate and incomplete information? And what action do they propose in relation to the officers who supplied it?  Will the Joint Assembly insist that officers go back and re-develop the economic case on the correct basis?	Written answer was given at the chairs request because it was a grouped question and the questions was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. <a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes
6	Cathy Mitchell	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	City Access	<i>As a Cambridge resident I am very disappointed to hear that the traffic restrictions at rush hour that I thought had been agreed on have now been ditched because of protests. I believe that there will always be protests about trying to restrict car use in a city, just as there were about pedestrianisation years back (now taken for granted!) Councils simply need to lead in a brave and visionary manner. But something radical has to happen soon. This is because of gross (and illegal) air pollution in our streets and also potential grid lock in the centre as Cambridge continues to expand. Now government money is coming our way, can the following be considered, perhaps again!?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion charging between certain hours</li> <li>• Requiring all private schools in centre to bus their pupils to Park and Ride (we experience much less traffic out of school term!)</li> <li>• Making 'Park and Ride' much cheaper and more effectively promoted. (Set up a council run service of mini buses to challenge Stagecoach)</li> <li>• New railway stations or light transport routes. e.g. Addenbrookes and to Cambourne and other new towns into Cambridge.</li> <li>• Bus subsidies – get help of large and wealthy private companies, e.g. Microsoft and Astra Zeneka</li> <li>• 'Boris bikes' available and easy to access, as in many European cities, e.g. Barcelona</li> <li>• More and improved cycle paths that are <u>well maintained long-term</u> (Hills Road near station and Botanical Gardens is a disgrace)</li> <li>• Closing all city centre car parks except to disabled drivers and those with electric cars</li> <li>• Extending pedestrian-only areas beyond present boundaries</li> </ul> Tree-planting and landscaping to help improve air quality and ethos of city centre.	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document. <a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes
7	Aylmer	18 <sup>th</sup> January	City Access	<i>It is encouraging to see that the Council's City Deal includes plans for orbital</i>	The question was answered in the meeting and was	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
	Johnson	2017		<i>bus routes, which will greatly improve the city's public transport network – however the main benefit will only be realised if the existing 'radial' routes are made straighter (especially citi 1), and if 'oyster' cards are introduced to allow all passengers to change buses easily.</i>  Does the Council have any plans to introduce either of these measures?	published as part of the public questions document. <a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	
12	Robin Pellew	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	City Access	Will the City Deal Assembly recommend that the Executive Board should instruct Officers to work up the measures in the proposed Access and Congestion package as proposed in Agenda Item 7 whilst at the same time ask the Board to develop elaborate what this pollution charge comprises and how it would be applied?	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.  <a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes
18	Lynn Hieatt	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	City Access	In advance of any County proposals, will the City Deal Assembly today unambiguously support the principle of (1) a city-wide solution to what is now an uncontrolled parking free-for-all; (2) a scheme designed in partnership with residents and businesses, allowing local flexibility and experiment, so that neighbourhoods can get the system that works for them and supports the City Deal's objective of controlling congestion?	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.  <a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes
15	Robin Heydon	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	First part of the question relates to forward plan items  Second part of the question relates to City Access	<i>We are concerned that the forward plan shows a March agenda item for the city deal design guide but we have not seen any consultation on this document or any process for commenting on it.</i> Could you inform the public how they should comment on this document such that those comments can be considered before the March meetings?  <i>We welcome the summary of findings for the city access. We note that the most preferred proposal was the introduction of better pedestrian and cycling facilities with 43.8% of respondents saying it would improve their journey. We support the introduction of work place parking levy and on-street parking controls as we believe these will have the most benefits for increasing the use of public transport and cycling, and also provide a revenue stream to help provide better public transport and improve pedestrian and cycling facilities in the city deal area. We also note that the reallocation of road space on Hills Road has doubled the number of people cycling.</i>  Doesn't the Hills Road cycle scheme prove that when high quality cycling facilities are provided that they will be used?  When will the city deal extend these benefits to other main roads, and reallocate road space on other main roads for people walking and cycling?	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.  <a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	.
19	Antony Carpen	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Engagement of young people from academic institutions	Please can members - in particular the representatives from Cambridge Regional College and Anglia Ruskin University update the Assembly on what actions they've taken to ensure they are systematically engaging with and getting ideas from young people - in particular in the run up to tranche 2 of funding.	The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.  <a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ielistDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MIId=6847&amp;Ver=4</a>	Yes
3	Nigel Seamarks	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Travelling in and around Waterbeach	1) Traffic Lights - Did you know that between Waterbeach and Parkside Swimming Pool you have to negotiate 21 sets of traffic lights. Could we remove lights or make some part time? At 04:30 in the morning it is mad!!  2) Resources - Time to allow out of City development of Cinemas, World Class Leisure Centres etc. Waterbeach is a village under development of the old barracks, don't you think this would be a prime	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions submitted did not relate to an item that was on the agenda for discussion and were ruled out.	Part 1 of the question was submitted to the County Council to provide a response to Mr Seamarks  Part 2 of the question

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				location for out of City leisure facilities? Currently you have to drive into the City for nearly all shopping and leisure facilities.		was submitted to South Cambs to provide a response to Mr Seamarks
3	Richard Wood	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	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?	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question related to an item scheduled for the March agenda.	The questioner was contacted and invited to re-submit the question to the March meeting.
9	Peter Cutmore	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Travelling from Cambridge City	<p>My letter recently published in the CEN "The queue of traffic trying to leave the City via Trumpington High Street over the Christmas period has been very annoying. The tailback goes way back past the Long Road traffic lights. Unfortunately it is caused by the inconsiderate customers of the Waitrose supermarket waiting to turn right into the Waitrose car park and holding up the through traffic. Perhaps whilst we wait for the Council to amend the junction Waitrose could try and educate their customers by suggesting they approach the supermarket from the Hauxton Road direction."</p> <p>It is now occurring on most days that outward bound traffic is delayed at various times from leaving the City by queuing Waitrose customers. [It means that the P&amp;R bus is also held up]</p> <p>Q Are there any plans to remedy this situation?</p> <p><i>2 Shelford Road / new Addenbrokes Road traffic lights. There is no left turn for traffic leaving the City via Shelford Road.</i> Q As this is the case why couldn't cyclists be allowed to continue towards the City when that traffic is moving? [a simple filter light for cyclists is all that would be needed]</p> <p><i>3 Travellers seem to be more than occasional visitors to the P&amp;R sites.</i> Q Would it be possible for them to be monitored &amp; charged &amp; provided with basic facilities [such as mobile toilets &amp; rubbish bins]?</p>	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the questions did not relate to an item that was on the agenda for discussion and were the responsibility of other bodies.	The questioner was contacted and invited to contact the relevant bodies
11	Bob Jarman	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Milton Road and Histon Road	Do you still plan to remove existing trees from Milton Road and Histon Road? Please give details.	Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. In this instance the question related to an item scheduled for the March agenda.	The questioner was contacted and invited to re-submit the question for the March meeting.
1	Richard Wood	3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2017	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and bus travel	<p>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?</p> <p>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 t/e 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.</p> <p>Will they further commit to introducing integrated, smartcard, ticketing across all routes and all operators?</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
3	Antony Carpen	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge	<p>If the latter, will they commit to using all possible influence on the LTA to implement franchising and integrated ticketing?</p> <p>Just over a year ago, you published this press release at <a href="http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/news/article/35/public_consultation_proposed_to_tackle_congestion_between_cambridge_and_haverhill">http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/news/article/35/public_consultation_proposed_to_tackle_congestion_between_cambridge_and_haverhill</a> 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.</p> <p>(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."</p> <p>This strategic option is central to the business case for Haverhill, for it links by rail the two campuses of Anglia Ruskin University (Chelmsford &amp; Cambridge via Colchester)</p> <p>Who made the decision to restrict this strategic option for Rail Haverhill to be between just the town and Cambridge Station?</p> <p>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-Wisbech and then... 2) That Rail Haverhill will be part of the Connect Cambridge Light Rail proposals</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
4	Robin Heydon	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>What design standards, if any, are being used to help guide the A1307 scheme?</p> <p>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?</p>		
6	Jim Chisholm	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge	<p>How many Assembly Members, and Officers, have heard of the 'Road Network Paradox'?</p> <p>This, one of a number of similar paradoxes, shows that it possible to make 'network' improvements that result in worse conditions overall.</p> <p>I have serious reservations about the proposed scheme on three fronts:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I live in this area and we clearly need to have a proper systems approach</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The question was answered in the meeting and was published as part of the public questions document.</p> <p><a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				<p>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.</p> <p>'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)?'</p> <p>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.</p>		
2	Bob Jarman	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Histon Road / Milton Road	<p>Do you still plan to remove existing trees from Milton Road AND Histon Road? Please give details.</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions relate to an item for discussion at the June meeting cycle, not at this meeting cycle.</p> <p>A written response was provided following the meeting.</p> <p><a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes
5	Alistair Burford	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Cambourne to Cambridge scheme	<p>By the end of this month expenditure on work on the A428 Madingley Mulch to Grange Road project will be in the region of £1.3m before shared costs. By the time it's back on the agenda in July a further third of a million pounds will have been spent</p> <p>Given that there is such widespread opposition to the preferred option to build an off road busway and P&amp;R that will inflict irreparable damage to the Coton Corridor, West Fields and one of the City's most iconic landscapes at Madingley Hill.</p> <p>Given that the Mouchel Report concluded that there was;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of dedicated resources and insufficient resource</li> <li>• Lack of strong dedicated technical leadership</li> <li>• Weak systems and processes</li> <li>• The need for a more up to date evidence base</li> <li>• The need for more robust governance</li> <li>• An inability among those delivering projects to articulate the overall vision and how their piece supports that</li> <li>• Insufficiently developed working relationships between officers and members</li> <li>• The need for a more proactive approach to communications</li> </ul> <p>Given that there are moves afoot to legally challenge the public consultation process.</p> <p>Does the Assembly not think that it should be demanding that the Executive Board recognise that City Deal money is actually Public Money and that the Officers and councillors are Public Servants entrusted to manage our money responsibly and;</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions do not relate to an item that is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.</p> <p>A written response was provided following the meeting.</p> <p><a href="http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes

No.	Questioner	Date of Joint Assembly	Subject	Question	Where and how answered	Completed
				As the body established to scrutinise decisions made by the Executive Board, will the Assembly recommend to the Executive Board that work on the A428 corridor be paused to allow some consideration to the real concerns being raised?		
7	Barbara Taylor	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Milton Road	<p>We hope that you have all had a chance to look at the Milton Road Alliance's "Do Optimum" alternative for the proposed redevelopment of Milton Road.</p> <p><a href="http://www.miltonroadalliance.org/Will_Milton_Road_set_the_standard_A4.pdf">http://www.miltonroadalliance.org/Will_Milton_Road_set_the_standard_A4.pdf</a></p> <p>We understand that discussion regarding Milton Road has been deferred from these March meetings to June "in order that officers can take more time to assess and engage further with the LLF, on the detailed proposals submitted before developing final recommendations to present to the Board". (Quote from City Deal email to MR LLF members, 17th Feb)</p> <p>Given the City Deal's stated commitment to take account of the views of the public in decision-making, will the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum be given an early preview of the traffic modelling to be proposed in relation to the Milton Road Alliance's "Do Optimum" alternative and the opportunity to comment on it before decisions are made by the Joint Assembly and Executive Boards? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Standing orders reinforce the Chair's discretion not to accept a question if it does not relate to an agenda item. The questions relate to an item for discussion at the June meeting cycle, not at this meeting cycle.</p> <p>A written response was provided following the meeting.</p> <p><a href="http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4">http://scambsmoderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1073&amp;MId=6848&amp;Ver=4</a></p>	Yes