



ALASDAIR CANT & ASSOCIATES

CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE PARK AND RIDE

COMBERTON VILLAGE COLLEGE

22 AUGUST 2017

Project Team Workshop with Stakeholders

Objectives:

- To present the emerging views of the technical consultant in relation to the shortlist of Park and Ride sites
- To have opportunities to discuss and determine main areas of concern in response to this shortlist
- To gather further information and document concerns on these shortlisted sites against the assessment criteria

The workshop began at 6.30pm with introductions around the room, a welcome to everyone including newcomers, overview of objectives and an explanation of the process for the evening. There was good attendance, particularly from Parish Councils. As with the evening before, an explanation was given about the August timings and arrangements for a further 'mop-up' session on 11 September for those on holiday or unable to attend, and wish to input to the process. As before, we made a group agreement, emphasising the need for active and respectful listening, to share air time and to get as much down in writing as possible during the exercises.

Ashley Heller began by setting a very brief context, explaining that the options would still be at a 'high level' i.e. not yet in such detail, but that will follow, and that nothing has been decided.

The initial presentation of the shortlisted sites by Jo Baker was projected on screen. Jo took questions during and after this presentation. The main themes that emerged from the group were frustration at not being able to fully comprehend the maps as displayed; frustration at the repeated emphasis of 'high level', yet the group 'are being asked to comment in depth', which is 'impossible'. Disbelief and upset was expressed at the choice of the shortlist, particularly the sites 3 and 4 near Madingley Mulch and site 6 – even if decisions haven't yet been made, the uncertainty and upset that this will create for villages such as Coton makes some people feel that the process is 'already decided' – i.e. whatever input is given (and much has been given over many months), it does not seem to be 'making any difference'. As the questions and comment continued, the tension and lack of trust became more apparent. The facilitator emphasised the need for constructive focus on the facts, and to try to keep open to hearing each other. However, several people replied that there had been a 'breakdown in trust' and that it was difficult to get beyond this in open discussion. We then worked in four groups, exploring each site in turn. As with the previous evening, the groups settled to the

tasks and produced relevant and specific details which will be helpful to the consultants and the Project Team.

Table 1

Tom Waterhouse	Stagecoach East
Howard Russell	Dry Drayton Parish Council
Roger Tomlinson	Coton Parish Council
Grenville Chamberlain	District Councillor – Hardwick

Table 2

Amanda Nolan	University of Cambridge Transport Manager
Peter Dear	Elsworth Parish Council
Shaun Harrison-Fuller	Park & RideCambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Hawkins	Madingley Parish Council
Alan Quick	Cambridge Campaign for Future Transport
Tumi Hawkins	District Councillor, Caldecote ward

Table 4

Rod Cantrill	Cambridge City Council
Tim Scott	SCDC – Comberton
Pete Price	Greater Cambridge Partnership City Access Team
Lorraine Mooney	Barton Parish Council
Robin Pellew	Cambridge PPF
Jo Morrison	Mott Macdonald
Stephen Coates	Save the West Fields

Table 5

Andy Campbell	Stagecoach East
Bunty Waters?	SCDC Cllr Bar Hill Ward
Markus Gehring	Councillor Cambridge City Council Newnham Ward
Rita Langan	Cranmer Rd. Residents' Association
Helen Bradbury	Chair Local Liaison Forum

Summary of findings from group work

There will be more details on this to follow, but in brief, all groups favoured Site 5, mainly because of improved connectivity, less environmental impact and access from the east and west. Sites 3 and 4 were particularly unpopular as it was thought queuing and congestion on Madingley Mulch roundabout would result, concerns about environmental impact including visual impact and light pollution as well as an over-arching threat to Green Belt. Site 6 not considered viable as too distant from congestion or Cambridge and has no direct connection to A428 so would get little use, and would have negative impact on housing development land at Bourn Airfield.

Conclusion

There were strong feelings expressed during this workshop, with some fundamental concerns about how meaningful the consultation is. Emphasis was put on people having an opportunity to be heard, and this seemed an important part of the process, before the work in smaller groups which produced more detailed and specific feedback on each site. Again, many said that the workshop was an important opportunity to express their views which they sincerely hoped would be taken seriously and reflected in the final outcome. Everyone was thanked for giving their time and commitment.

30th August 2017