

Local Liaison Forum - meeting notes

Project: Cambourne to Cambridge better bus journey Western Orbital schemes

Date and time: 02 February 2017, 19.00 - 22.30 Shire Hall

Present: Helen Bradbury (HB) Coton PC - Chair; Cllr Bridget Smith (BS) SCDC - Gamlingay; Cllr Rod Cantrill (RC) CCiC - Newnham; Angela Chadwyck-Healey (ACH) Madingley Road Area RA; Stephen Coates (SC) Save the West Fields; Bev Edwards (BE) Barton PC; Penny Heath (PH) North Newnham RA; Lynn Hieatt (LH), Smarter Cambridge Transport; Cllr Lucy Nethsingha CCC – Newnham; Rita Langan (RL) Cranmer Road RA; Howard Russell (HR) Dry Drayton PC; Cllr Sebastian Kindersley (SK) SCDC/CCC; Robin Heydon (RH) Cambridge Cycling Campaign, Gabriel Fox (GF) Vice-Chair, Coton PC, Steve Jones, Convenor of Coalition of 20, Jeni Sawford, Cambourne PC, Stuart Hawkins, Madingley PC, Stephen Rose, Hardwick PC, Ellen Khmelnitski, Gough Way RA, Paul Solon, Chair, Elsworth PC, Chris Blencowe, CPPF, Tim Scott, SCDC, Charles Nightingale, SCDC, Eddie Blair, Caxton PC, Jeni Sawton, Cambourne PC

Officers:

- Ashley Heller, Tim Watkins, Adrian Shepherd, City Deal & Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC)
- John Wetton, Highway Engineer, Skanska; Colin Young, Atkins
- Alasdair Cant - Independent Facilitator

Item	Description	Speaker
1	Introductions & Welcome <u>VOTE – To accept Cambridge Cycle Campaign onto the LLF</u>	HB <i>17 Votes in Favour</i> <i>1 votes abstained</i> <i>0 votes against</i>
	<u>VOTE – To accept Gough Way Residents Association onto the LLF</u>	<i>18 Votes in Favour</i> <i>0 votes abstained</i> <i>0 votes against</i>

Item	Description	Speaker
2	<p data-bbox="260 293 639 322">Minutes of Previous Meetings</p> <p data-bbox="260 327 951 387">Change to item 9 of last minutes requested by NNRA. City Centre Access Study and interface with A428 scheme</p> <p data-bbox="260 423 363 452">Change:</p> <ul data-bbox="260 456 1102 539" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="260 456 1102 510">• Urges GCCD to protect and enhance constructive conservation, not just mitigate its impact (PH)<li data-bbox="260 512 1102 539">• Urges GCCD to let LLF write questions for Executive Board (PH) <p data-bbox="260 544 300 573">To:</p> <p data-bbox="260 577 1086 638">City Centre Access study results needs to be integrated into decision making</p> <ul data-bbox="260 642 1086 689" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="260 642 1086 689">• Gave presentation of concerns on impacts of transport proposals in NNRA area. <p data-bbox="260 694 608 723">No discussion time available.</p> <p data-bbox="260 728 536 757">Defer to next meeting.</p>	HB

Item	Description	Speaker
3	<p>Presentation - Further appraisal of catchment area</p> <p>Presentation - Transport benefits and Journey times</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions were asked about the specifics of both presentations which included points of clarification about timings, assumptions and measurements. • A concern was raised about the potential conflict with cyclists on Adams Road. • HB asked a speaker from the floor to send in their idea about regulated access of Madingley Road between Madingley Mulch Round about and the M11 slip road. <p>Presentation – Western Orbital Update and GCCD Board decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was stated that the further work would include a traffic assessment at J11 of M11 and into Harston and including the A10. The further work will also include an assessment of the pollution caused as a result of the proposals. <p>Presentation – Possible options of designing an ‘online’ option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions we asked about the specifics of the presentation which included points of clarification about widths, assumptions and measurement’s. • Clarification was provided why the assessment did not include bus lanes or a one-way bus option. Why just a guided busway? • A question was asked about the exact land take of each option since the on-line option seemed to include land take whilst the off-line was included no land take. • A questionn was asked why the on-line option cost included a new bridge? • The LLF resolved to undertake an independent evaluation of the Topographical survey and transport implications. <p>Presentation – Bev Edwards - Chair, Barton PC</p> <p>Presentation – Option 6 - Gabriel Fox - Vice-Chair, Coton PC</p> <p>Presentation - Steve Jones - Convenor of the Coalition of 20</p> <p>Presentation – Rod Cantrill - City Councillor, Newnham</p> <p>Questions were asked about costs and how they might be able to be re allocated.</p> <p>Further contributions were invited, and final draft would be issued on 28th February.</p> <p><u>Vote – The LLF and should move forward with option 6 and ask GCCD to undertake a full evaluation of it alongside option 3/3a.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was also noted by BS that the overwhelming majority of those not permitted to vote clearly supported option 6. 	<p>Skanska Atkins LLF and others from the floor</p> <p>TW LLF and others from the floor</p> <p>Skanska / Atkins LLF and others from the floor</p> <p>HB RC BE GF</p> <p><i>18 Votes in Favour 2 votes abstained 0 votes against</i></p>
4	<p>Smarter Transport Cambridge read a statement opposing option 3 and 3a.</p>	
5	<p>Presentation – Park and Ride location - Madingley PC</p> <p><u>Vote – Scotland Farm should be considered as the location of the P&R and to also assess the impact of a P&R impact on Dry Drayton</u></p>	<p>SH <i>20 Votes in Favour 0 votes abstained 1 votes against</i></p>

Item	Description	Speaker
6	<p>'Option 4' revisited Lucy Nethsingha, County Councillor, Newnham</p> <p><u>Vote – a letter should be requested to justify why Option 4 was removed as an option</u></p>	<p>LN</p> <p>20 Votes in Favour</p> <p>0 votes abstained</p> <p>1 votes against</p>
7	<p>Presentation - City Centre Access Study & interface with A428 scheme</p> <p>North Newnham and interface with City Centre. Showed parking data, Cycling & walking pressures on Adams Road and impact of University growth on West Cambridge; inadequate crossing capacity of bridges. Call for sensitivity to West Cambridge CA, open spaces & historic approach roads. Too premature to make decision on routes until City Access proposals understood. Encouraged 'smart travel simple demand' measures for solving City congestion.</p>	
8	<p><u>Vote – to establish a working group to write to the GCCD Board about the evidence base and outstanding questions not yet answered.</u></p>	<p>HB</p> <p>16 Votes in Favour</p> <p>0 votes abstained</p> <p>0 votes against</p>
9	<p>Proposed Workshops - Independent Facilitator appointed by CCC to run workshops</p> <p><u>Vote - LLF will only take part in workshops after option 6 has been worked up and not until it has been properly assessed.</u></p>	<p>AC</p> <p>19 Votes in Favour</p> <p>0 votes abstained</p> <p>0 votes against</p>
10	<p>House keeping. Governance. Ran out of time. Take forward to next meeting. (Suggest subgroup formed to discuss East of M11 was cut short)..</p>	