



ALASDAIR CANT & ASSOCIATES

CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE EAST OF M11 BUS PRIORITY ISSUES

Project Team Workshop with Stakeholders

Diamond Room Selwyn College 21ST August 2017

Aim: For stakeholders to work together to consider the range of bus priority issues and options to the east of the M11

Objectives:

- To develop the project team's understanding of transport and environmental constraints in this area
- To identify in outline form the potential interventions to improve bus operational conditions relating to both on road and off road options
- To consider the strategic links with the options to the west of the M11

Introductions, overview of objectives and group agreement

We began at 6pm with introductions around the room and overview of objectives. The timing of workshops was evidently an issue for many. It was acknowledged that August is not ideal, with some people being away on holiday, but nevertheless necessary to keep the process on track to be able to report to the Board in early September. There were over 30 people in attendance. In order to accommodate those who could not attend, follow-up session is planned to take place on 11 September. This was still unsatisfactory for some, and was mentioned in a statement read out later on behalf of the South Newham Neighbourhood Forum as described in the separate attachment. The facilitator reminded group that to make the most of the workshop, we all need to try to listen to each other. To help this happen, it would be appreciated if where possible we can be concise, so that air time can be shared around the room as much as possible.

Ashley Heller then gave a brief context to the whole process, explaining that these are still 'high level' considerations, and everything is still open for further discussion. No decisions have been taken, and this workshop is an opportunity to help the project team understand more of stakeholders' concerns, take into account any further facts and issues arising.

John Wetton of Skanska outlined the route options as projected and indicated on maps. There were a number of questions and observations relating to the routes. Several people voiced a frustration with a perceived the contradiction of information given before and what was now emerging, and 'feel at least misled and at most lied to'. The questions and discussion that followed were mainly about the overall wisdom of undertaking such a major infrastructure with all the 'upheaval' and environmental impact to get people quickly into 'a medieval centre' with all the bottle-necks and 'inevitable' delays. Unanswered questions were as follows:

- 1) What would bus priority in Option 6 look like?
- 2) Where is traffic from Cambourne going?
 - a. To Biomedical Campus (south)
 - b. Science Park (north)
 - c. West Cambridge
 - d. City Centre
 - e. Time related split between peaks AM / IP / PM)

At five tables, the groups were as follows:

Table 1

James Littlewood	Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Edward Leigh	Smarter Cambridge Transport
Pauline Joslin	Hardwick PC
Grenville Chamberlain	District Councillor and Assembly Member
Roger Tomlinson	Coton Parish Council
Angela Chadwyck-Healey	Madingley Road Area RA
Rod Cantrill	Cambridge City Council

Table 2

S. Coates	Save the West Fields
P. Heath	NNRA
A. Shaw	Madingley Road Residents Association
W. Wilson	Camsight
J. Hower	Camsight
H. Du Quesnay	NNRA

Table 3

Mary Sanders	Local Access Forum
Lynda Warth	British Horse Society
Richard Moulton	Secretary – Gough Way Residents' Association
Eva Gordon	Cambridge Residents
Ellen Khmelnitski	Gough Way Residents' Association
Andy Campbell	Stagecoach East
Tania Elliott	South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum

Table 4

Dr Gehring	Cambridge City Council
Cllr R Betson	Bourn Ward (includes Cambourne)
J. Firman	
Matthew Danish	Camcycle
Valerie Holt	Cambridge City Council
Steve Jong	Bourn Parish Council
David McLean	South West Fields

Table 5

Sarah Street	Cranmer Road Residents' Association
Maggie Challis	Granchester PC
Richard Scurr	Clerk - Maxwell Road Residents' Association

Helen Bradbury
Paul Nelson
Robin Heydon

Chair Local Liaison Forum
Cambs CC Passenger Transport
CamCycle

1.1. Initial Thoughts

- Start with existing infrastructure;
- No access to existing P+R
- Why would people use the buses? For a 3 minute gain
- Priority bus lanes would improve speed and reliability
- People want to go to employment – hospital, North Cambs, not City Centre (Orbital)
- Preserve iconic green space + vistas
- Option No6 – in principle preferred – needs more analysis
- Medium term light rail – why spend unnecessary £ on busway
- Safe + convenient walking + cycling in any option (NMU)
- Address issue of cars in the City
- Future proofing e.g. O-C Railway and North station
- Where will the buses go?
- Scheme not joined up – 3 different pieces
- Grange Road? A lot of cyclists / pedestrians crossing bus path
- Gough Way residents association opposed to development on Green Belt – need to preserve beauty of Cambridge
- Alternative Light Rail? U/G
- City Centre Access?
- Not Grange Road
- West Cambridge Access – JT + requirement to serve WC
- Western Orbital Integration
- NW Cambridge site needs to be serviced
- Think about end to end journey times
- Origin and destination
- Did not take into account new route though NW Cambridge
- East of M11 – JT should not be criteria
- Cycle impacts of Option 1
- Bus Lane = Old Fashioned
- Peak-Time control points
- Protect Conservation Zones + Landscape
- Girton Interchange

Amy Barnett of Atkins outlined the key criteria used, under the main headings of Transport and Environmental considerations. Several people voiced their frustration that these criteria had seemed to change from those that were put forward in June. The viability of the whole enterprise was called into question by many, and mounting frustration and anger was expressed that the will of the vast majority did not seem to be taken into account, and in particular the fact that option 3a (off-line route) is still being seriously considered. The extent of strong feelings about this was such, that a suggestion was put forward for a vote to be held to propose throwing out the off-line option completely. This had popular support in the room, but the risk was that a vote would curtail discussion and any consideration, which needed to happen as part of due process. Officers emphasised that these views are important and need to be captured in writing in order to be taken into fuller consideration by the project team. In the event, the group chose to progress with the process of working in groups at their

tables to consider in detail what they liked and didn't like about the on-line/on-road routes, leaving aside the off-line route till later.

This was a productive exercise, with much detailed input, as the consultants had requested. After the on- road options, the groups did then give some input in relation to the off-road routes. The main themes that emerged were as follows:

1.2. Option 1 & 6

Table 1

Journey Time

- Bus Congestion in City Centre
- Madingley Rise (Hill) – J13 right turn will reduce JT for all – (if removed)
- No congestion east of High Cross
- JT irrelevant because buses will divert after high cross
- Detour into WC will penalise passenger users to City
- Where is interchange for Option 6?
- Most people going north or south not city centre
- Cycling impacts – very significant for Option 1
- Girton Interchange – P+R Potential
- Run buses like rail services with limited stops

Environmental Criteria

- Bus Lane up to High Cross only
- Urban Realm – Option 1 – High impacts
- Importance of road identified in Local Plan
- (approaches study)
- Nature and form of road
- Electric buses – air quality and noise
- Run tram on Option 6?
- No need to extend Option 6 beyond high cross
- City centre access will reduce car parking
- Pollution levels of extra buses

Table 2

- Constraints and conflicts between modes
- Would a bus lane be placed in a conservation zone?
- How could the area be enhanced?
- Visual impact of gantries? Would they be needed?
- Tidal flow may take time to adjust to
- What is the growth in the City Centre? Who is the scheme for?
- Is impact on conservation zone justified for limited time saving?
- Smarter ways of controlling traffic to enable bus priority
- Worried about the precedent set
- How are lessons learnt from existing infrastructure being captured?
- Should enhance environment, not degrade

- Conflict in areas with driveways etc
- Potential for Transport Hub in West Cambridge
- Congestion charging?

Table 3

- Is it possible to join bus priority schemes from Options 1 and 6?
- Is it work sacrificing the Green Belt for a 2 min improvement in journey time?
- Dr Fox looked at and solved all the obstacles with Option 6
- Are bus schemes redundant if light rail (underground) is built?
- Look at options of tidal bus lane from West Cambridge to Mount Pleasant (Option 1 bus lane) for Option 6
- Why can't be bus gate one of the five junctions
- Need to preserve Green Belt even more as air pollution increases and Cambridge expands
- Westfields would serve as a reservoir of green spaces for university / historic Cambridge
- If land has to be taken then Option 1 bus lane is not an option

Table 4

- Prefer on road because
- Ecological and heritage impacts less
- There is no need for concrete busway from west site to City Centre because most passengers coming from the west will (i) Use the western orbital to reach the science park / Cambridge north or the biomedical park or (ii) Stop at the west Cambridge site and would be more than adequate for the next 0 – 15 years after which other options like light-rail would emerge
- Option 1 /6 would cost c. £150 million less than Option 3 – money that could be used for the western orbital and light rail
- Impacts of air pollution and noise on Madingley Road will be less with new bus technology (e.g. hydrogen buses)
- Prefer Option 6 over Option 1 because we are convinced you can have a bus lane east of the west site and accommodate cyclists and cars (also may require taking peoples gardens)

Table 5

- Big loop – one way system –
- Huntingdon Road / Madingley Road
- One inbound (1/2cycles / 1/2 buses / cars)
- One outbound (1/2 cycles / 1/2 buses / cars)
- Sort Girton Interchange traffic down Madingley Rise reduced by 26%
- Priority traffic lights for buses & key junctions
- Mandatory private school drop-off @ P+R & shuttle bus for schools
- Stacking west of M11 (inbound flow control)
- New w.cambs multi-storey to west of WC site, not east end
- Cycling zebra @ JJ Thomson Road – remove it
- Develop MR P+R as bus station – hub to connect with orbital to north & to Addenbrookes
- P+R free! No charge
- Inner Ring Road – in one direction (like Aldenburg) could be considered? (more controversial)

1.3. Option 3a

Table 1

Environmental

- Dark Blue impact on drainage ditches
- Landscape impact on pond
- Impact on 'fingers' entering into city
- Flood risk bin brooke – floods in heavy rain
- Setting of the city is part of historic setting of city

Transport

- Rifle Range- impacts on Grange Road
- Pinch point to turn out of rifle range
- Herschel + Cramner cannot accommodate buses
- Adams – main cycleway
- Stagecoach will not use Silver Street
- Bridge + Silver Street not suitable
- JT impacted by stops
- Green route – lower journey time
- Not future-proofed – because a tunnel could be put in place earlier

Table 2

- Significant opposition
- Residential roads are not suitable
- Are stakeholder members representative?
- Concern over width of the corridor
- Issue with residential with cyclists e.g. Adams
- Avoid routes that cross fields
- Whatever scheme agreed there is no need for significant landscaping and nature enhancements

Table 3

- Sacrifices Green Belt which should be preserved according to government
- High Court in 2008 ruled that Green Belt should be preserved and Westfield is part of Green Belt
- Scheme does not go anywhere
- What happens on Grange Rd?
- Orbital bus scheme not commercially viable
- Covering Westfield with concrete will increase flood risk for Gough Way which has already suffered from flooding – should be kept as flood plains
- Noise / pollution from buses is a problem
- Removing P&R charges would decrease car use
- Charge people who use P&R car parks just to park

Table 4

- Much worse than Option 1/6
- High cost (£150m extra) for a gain of a few minutes + low BCR
- Much greater impact on ecology + heritage
- Noise + environment adverse impact on roads like Adam's Road
- No need for busway from West Site into Cambridge because passengers from West will go mostly onto orbital N+S or stop at west site
- Busway would open up West Fields – iconic West Fields – for development
- As Cambridge grows West Fields should become a “Green lane” for the City
- What happens east of Grange Road

Table 5

Adams Road

- Adams Road – not viable because of volume of cyclists + residential
- Burrells Walk Bridge is a bottleneck
- RH turn @ end – major turn
- Charles Babbage – never designed for cyclists – shared use

Herschel Road

- Not wide enough. Residential. Narrowest of all access roads
- Grange Road is narrow there
- What's the point of any of the Grange Road access Roads – the bus operator still wants to return to Madingley Road (i.e. turn left)
- Barton Road is wider – why not run buses next to M11 + then in along Barton Road

Old Rifle Range Access

- Too narrow
- Lots of right angled turns. Slow
- Grange Road is narrow there

Cranmer Road

- Too narrow. Residential. Need to cross Bin Brook + spoil current pathway
 - Coton Path currently 5m wide – over capacity
 - Unhappy that buses would need to cross the cycle path – safety concern
-
- Use Barton Rd + Madingley Rd as short-term managed solution whilst light rail is developed

Conclusion

Although there were deep misgivings about several aspects of the workshop content and process, nevertheless, by the end of the workshop many people said that it had been useful to hear other perspectives, particularly as they worked on specifics together in their small groups. They hoped that they would be listened to and their views would count in the ultimate deliberations. Everyone was thanked for giving their time and effort.

30th August 2017