

## Questions for the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board, Wed 21 March 2018

### Agenda Item 7: Histon Road

#### Question 7a: From Anna Crutchley, Secretary of the Benson Road Residents' Association (BenRa)

##### Mitigation

Benson Area Residents Association (BenRA) raised a question at the GCP Joint Assembly on February 28th regarding consultation on traffic-calming measures to alleviate the increased pressures on Canterbury/Benson/Priory Streets, and Oxford/Windsor Roads, due to the expected increase in rat-running through our streets as part of the GCP mitigation process.

The answer to the BenRA question was:

'The mitigation ideas put forward regarding rat-running are out of the scope for this scheme and need to be further assessed by GCP'

However, in the original major objectives of the City Deal, mitigation was listed (Objective 6) as an objective, and an assessment of the impacts on the existing residents was considered important. BenRA would like assurance that ideas regarding rat-running **are not out of the scope for this scheme** and that mitigation measures regarding rat-running will be carried out by GCP.

**Could the Executive Board clarify to BenRA what its role will be regarding mitigation?**

#### Question 7b: From Anna Crutchley, Secretary of the Benson Road Residents' Association (BenRa)

##### Environment

BenRA also asked whether the GCP Joint Assembly could reassure residents that air quality and vibrations will not worsen as a result of changes on Histon Road, with specific relation to the removal of parking. Also, what specific measures are proposed to reduce noise and vibration?

The answer to this was:

'It is not considered that air quality and vibration will worsen following implementation of the scheme. Rather, improving facilities for walking, cycling and public transport should contribute to improving air quality'

At the LLF meeting on 5th March, a diagram of cross section measurements at the south end of Histon Road showed 2 x 1.8m pedestrians, 2 x 1.5m cycleway and 5.8m carriageway = 12.40m total. The representative from Stagecoach advised that this was not enough space for 2 buses to pass each other safely, indicating that buses [and heavy goods vehicles] would have to use cycleways in order to pass each other. This indicates that heavy traffic **will be passing much closer to houses on the west side of Histon Road than at present**. It is likely also that the removal of parking will result in vehicles **driving faster down the road**.

For that reason, it is vital that BenRA residents receive reassurance from the Executive Board:

**Can the GCP reassure residents that air quality and vibrations will not worsen as a result of changes on Histon Road? What specific measures are proposed to reduce speed, noise and vibration?**

### **Question 7c: From Lilian Rundblad, Vice-Chair of Histon Road LLF**

At its most recent meeting on 5 March, Histon Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) agreed that the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Board should be requested to request and direct the GCP Project Manager for Histon Road Project to analyse in full the matters set out in (a) and (b) below, with a report to the GPC Board on each proposal after this analysis is completed:

(a) The proposal from HRARA to move the bus-lane further north to end at Hazelwood Close where sufficient safe space is available for a combined toucan crossing and bus-gate giving better bus priority than the current proposal; and

(b) Coordinating with the developer of Darwin Green to formulate a combined solution between the developer and the GPC incorporating a toucan crossing at the junction of Histon Road and Darwin Green Squash Court road and Carisbrooke Road to ensure improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

As Vice-Chair of Histon Road LLF I ask the GPC will it so request and direct the GPC Project Manager as above.

### **Question 7d: From Lilian Rundblad, Vice-Chair of Histon Road LLF**

#### **Environmental Impact on Histon Road**

The dangers to our residents' health from air pollution from nitrous oxides and particulates is well known. Reducing population exposure and reducing local traffic emissions as quickly as possible is urgent.

The Cambridge Air Quality Action Plan AQAP 2018-2023 is welcomed by the residents along Histon Road and nearby areas and in particular that it is a joint commitment by Cambridge City Council, Health England, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council, having identified the range of actions required and agreed to take responsibility for ensuring they are progressed. The Histon Road/Huntingdon Road/Victoria Road (Ring-road) is on the border of the Clean Air Zone.

Although we are grateful for the preliminary design of Histon Road showing attention to the rows of trees from Gilbert Road to Carisbrooke Road, a valuable protection from air pollutants, there are further restrictions to traffic movements to be considered.

Huntingdon Road has a 20 mph speed limit starting at the crossing with Histon Road, and so has Victoria Road.

- a) We request that a 20 mph speed limit be enforced on Histon Road from Victoria Road to Windsor Road/Akeman Street.**

The GCP Joint Assembly were concerned about the enforcement of restrictions for HGV delivery trucks to the local stores. Victoria Road and Gilbert Road have restrictions on HGV night time traffic.

- b) **We request that HGV night time restrictions on Histon Road be enforced between Victoria Road and Kings Hedges Road.**

**Histon Road Area Residents' Association (HRARA) requests the GCP Executive Board to direct the GCP Project Manager for Histon Road Project to include a) and b) above in the analysis for improved air quality and noise reduction and report to the Executive Board on each proposal.**

## **Agenda Item 8: Western Orbital**

### **Question 8a: From Jane Ward, Chair of Hauxton Parish Council:**

How will the various options for the Park and Ride in our parish which have been presented to us, impact on the A10 traffic along Cambridge Road Hauxton? And what provision will be made to permit our residents to exit onto the A10 at Hauxton Gap?

I am most concerned that a shortlist of options is going out for public consultation without sound modelling of the impact on our residents.

### **Question 8b: From Niall O'Byrne, Chair of Harston Parish Council:**

Harston Parish Council wishes to pose the following three questions, relating to the potential new Park and Ride at Hauxton, to the Executive Board at the above mentioned meeting.

1. Traffic on the A10 is forecast to increase by 30% in the period out to 2031. Currently, there are 16,000 vehicle movements on an average working day on Harston High Street [A10]. A 30% increase will bring this total to over 20,000 vehicle movements. Detail the palliative measures GCP will take to address this traffic situation? Pollution issues must be included.
2. Confirm that the proposed Rural Transport Hub / Park and Train at Foxton will be an integral part of planning for the replacement of the level crossing there and not a separate and later project?
3. Confirm that GCP will organise a study to determine how many parking places will be required at this new Rural Transport Hub / Park and Train? Sufficient parking must be available to accommodate a maximum number of vehicles that could be filtered off from going north through Harston and onwards towards Cambridge. Commuting by train must be encouraged to the maximum.

### **Question 8c: From District Councillor Janet Lockwood**

Please would the Board delay starting the public consultation on the various proposals for the junction 11 Park and Ride arrangements until they have seen the evidence on how these will impact on the A 10 traffic? I understand this is being prepared but is not yet ready. I am concerned the P&R will not work for the increased traffic along the A 10 corridor. In fact, when the Foxton Level Crossing is closed, I think there is a distinct possibility of a continuous traffic jam from Foxton to Junction 11 at peak times, significantly delaying cars reaching the P&R and not allowing modal shift.

### **Question 8d: From Jan Nanor, Member of Harston Residents' Group**

Harston Residents Group believes that the proposed Hauxton Park and Ride is a short-term solution to increased commuter traffic, at the expense of a long-term, sustainable integrated rail and road strategy along the A10 corridor. At current traffic volume, there is a queue of slow moving cars and lorries right through Harston in rush hour.

Harston Residents Group asks that modelling and impact assessments of traffic through Harston be done to assess effects of traffic flow at peak times (including modelling of the knock-on effect of the proposed developments at the Foxton crossing), ingress and egress from the Park and Ride site on to the A10, and, very importantly, the effects of air and noise pollution, particularly on children and elderly residents. Harston primary school is directly on the A10 in the centre of the village.

We note that other solutions, including rail links and alternative sites and strategies, have not been put forward and we ask that the decision to proceed to public consultation is postponed until the Board has scrutinised all data on the expected effects of increased traffic through Harston and fully explored other options.

### **Agenda Item 9: City Access**

#### **Question 9a: From City Councillor Oscar Gillespie**

I am a Green Party councillor for the city centre. Some of the headline objectives for the GCP listed on the landing page are 'Better Greener Transport', 'Strong and Healthy Communities' and 'Air quality'. I'd really like to see these as well, these are needed in the centre just as much as the outer edges. But I'm confused as to why the GCP has apparently done so little to research, to promote, or to develop car clubs as part of the transport mix for Greater Cambridge. In particular, electric car clubs which seem like a massive opportunity to improve air quality, reduce private car ownership, provide better access to EV technology, improve the street scene, and accelerate EV charging infrastructure. As well as offering cheap occasional access, car clubs can bring EVs onto the second hand market faster and cheaper, because of the way they purchase fleet cars.

We have a car club operator who have done little to promote their business. But in places like Norwich, Oxford and Exeter they are growing. I've seen a section on car clubs in the South Cambs transport strategy, so I know they have been discussed here too. But I had hoped to see some mention of car clubs in the City Access Update or the Big Conversation report. One respondent did mention them specifically, in response to question 8, "What would be the one thing that would improve travel in and around Greater Cambridge?" But it's not that surprising that respondents aren't mentioning them if you're not pitching them to the public and showcasing the places, very similar to Cambridge, where they've succeeded.

Can you explain the omission in GCP working of car clubs, the working assumption that you need to get people out of cars, and the incredible reliance on private buses?"

"Many opportunities have been missed, but I'm pleased that city and county officers are now undertaking some groundwork to extend the scope of car clubs in the city. I'd like to promote a public exhibition that Transition Cambridge Cleanwheels are holding about electric car clubs on the 9th April, and I'd like to invite anyone here who is interested. Will you please commit now to undertaking a GCP report and

consultation this summer or as soon as possible, on the potential scope of car clubs with emphasis on electric and hybrid vehicles?"

## **Agenda Item 10: Progress Report**

### **Question 10a: From Keith Warburton**

The largest element of the Greater Cambridge Partnership funding strategy is about facilitating people travelling into Cambridge in as green a manner as possible. Also welcomed is the objective to "*harness smart technology to facilitate economic growth and quality of life*". It is that element which these questions cover.

Many residents enjoy their workplaces at various locations in and around Cambridge. The well-recognised problem of the travel in between is what GCP seeks to address.

So shouldn't the GCP be actively seeking ways to reduce our population's need to travel? Reducing the need for travel doesn't mean discouraging travel by way of cost or inconvenience, too often this is the easiest, knee-jerk response, rather it means offering viable and acceptable alternatives.

Research has revealed that contrary to the popular view that many people would like to be able to "work from home", in reality most people would prefer to be able to work within a 10 minute walk or cycle ride from home.. If this is what people would like, shouldn't the GCP be actively working towards it?

**Question 1:** would it not be attractive for the envisaged Local Travel Hubs to become Local Travel and Work Hubs, providing meeting rooms with high speed communications and conferencing facilities?

We should also recognise that through remote diagnostics and communications many of our health and care services can be delivered to the user without the need for travel, and without the need for any technological skills on the part of the user. A reduction in the number of journeys to our hospitals and GP surgeries is surely a worthwhile objective. GP practices are often struggling to be viable and / or handle the workload.

**Question 2:** Why not facilitate local consultation rooms, located in GP practices, with state of the art telemedicine systems linked to specialist consultants at centres of excellence such as Addenbrooke's or further afield?

I sincerely hope the Greater Cambridge Partnership might officially adopt as one of its targets a *Reduction in the Need for Travelling*.