

Purpose of meeting	Local Liaison Forum (LLF) - A428
Date and time	26 September 2016, 19:30-22:30
Venue	Coton Village Hall, Coton
Attendees (LLF)	Neil Blair (NB) <i>Bourn PC</i> ; Edward Byam-Cook (EBC) <i>Madingley PC – Vice Chair</i> ; Helen Bradbury (HB) <i>Coton PC - Chair</i> ; Cllr Rod Cantrill (RC) <i>CCiC - Newnham</i> ; Angela Chadwyck-Healey (ACH) <i>Madingley Road Area RA</i> ; Stephen Coates (SC) <i>Save the West Fields</i> ; Bev Edwards (BE) <i>Barton PC</i> ; Harriet Gillett (HG) <i>Storey's Way RA</i> ; Penny Heath (PH) <i>North Newnham RA</i> ; Lynne Hieatt (LH) <i>Smarter Cambridge Transport</i> ; Cllr John Hipkin (JH) <i>CCC/CiCC – Castle</i> ; Cllr Lucy Nethsingha <i>CCC – Newnham</i> ; Rita Langan (RL) <i>Cranmer Road RA</i> ; Cllr Janet Lockwood (JL) <i>SCDC - Harston and Hauxton</i> ; Cllr Niall O'Byrne (NO) <i>Harston PC</i> ; Robin Pellew (RP) <i>Cambridge Past Present and Future</i> ; Howard Russell (HR) <i>Dry Drayton PC</i> ; Cllr Bridget Smith (BS) <i>SCDC - Gamlingay</i> ; Cllr Nick Wright (NW) <i>SCDC - Papworth and Elsworth</i>
Attendees (Officers)	Ashley Heller; Bob Menzies; Adrian Shepherd
Project name	Cambourne to Cambridge and Western Orbital Better Bus Journeys

	Agenda Item	Key points from debate	Resolutions/Actions
1	Meeting administration (HB)		The minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2016 were approved and signed. The following were co-opted as members of LLF: Harriet Gillett (HG) <i>Storey's Way RA</i> ; Lynne Hieatt (LH) <i>Smarter Cambridge Transport</i> ; Rita Langan (RL) <i>Cranmer Road RA</i>
2	June 14 th resolutions and responses (HB)		Accepted

3	Is a busway what people want? (HB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that a busway is the right solution and will sufficient buses use the route? (BS) • Other congestion tackling measures should be attempted first to avoid losing green belt land without benefit (RL) • The busway will take a long time to build and delays would worsen the urgent need to ease congestion on Madingley Hill for those coming into Cambridge from the villages, especially as this congestion will only increase as housing developments to the West of Cambridge take shape (NW) • Deferring the busway risks development on green belt land closer to Cambridge, because developments outside Cambridge will not be approved without better infrastructure (BE) • The congestion must be addressed now, as it is creating dangerous conditions on the M11 J13 sliproad (NO) • It is questionable that Phase 2 will be funded, and valuable land may be destroyed without achieving broader goals (RC) • There is a need to look at Girton Interchange in parallel with other options (RC) • Busway has very low benefit to cost ratio (RC) 	<p>R1: The GCCD Executive Board remove the whole of the A428 busway project from phase 1 to phase 2 in order to give sufficient time for a full assessment to be made of the success, or otherwise, of the current congestion tackling strategy especially in relation to the points at which a busway will join the current road network.</p> <p>R1 addendum: More research is needed into the benefits of the busway and how it will tie in with the Girton Interchange and the Western Orbital route.</p> <p>R1 with addendum passed: 14F; 3A</p>
---	------------------------------------	---	--

4	The 'preferred corridor' proposals – presentation by AH and AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The GCCD understands the public's concerns about the environment but feels that a segregated route is the only fast, frequent and reliable option (AH).• The focus of the GCCD is on economic benefits and faster journey times (AH)• The proposed P&R is actually located on Crome Lea Farm, not Madingley Mulch (Stewart Sadler)• Is the exercise was a consultation process or an informative process, and how much weighting does the GCCD gave to public opinion (several members of the public and LLF members)• Despite detailed objections and alternatives offered by so many groups during the consultation, Option 3/3a has been selected and is put forward largely unchanged (RL)	
---	--	--	--

5a	Overall assessment and response (RC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 3/3a ignores the broader criteria that the GCCD set in evaluating possible options as it fails in 3 out of 4 of these criteria – value for money, environmental and social distribution impact and consultation (RC) In value for money the cost/benefit ratio is 0.2, whereas GCCD puts a ratio of 2 as its benchmark. A score of 1 is considered poor (RC) In environmental and social distribution impact, the project scores only 11 out of 40, the lowest of any of the options considered, and destroys what the Local Plans are trying to preserve (RC) In consultation, 3/3a was the most opposed option (RC) The option gives a wider economic benefit of £679m over 30 years but this is based on complex and uncertain assumptions (RC) Option 4 looks worth reconsidering (BS) 	<p>R2: The A428 LLF accepts the necessity for a public transport corridor on the A438 but has serious reservations about Option 3/3a on environmental and social, value for money and public consultation grounds. It asks the GCCD to consider other options where the environmental and social impact criteria are given equal weight with economic benefits and marginally shortened journey times.</p> <p>R2 passed: 10(F); 2(A); 5(Ab)</p> <p>R3: The A428 LLF cannot support Option 3/3a while the West Fields area to the south of The Footpath, the Coton Countryside Reserve and the area to the south of the Polhill Garden Centre are included in the catchment area.</p> <p>R3 passed: 11(F); 1(A)</p>
5b	Using the Girton Interchange to facilitate rapid bus transit on Madingley Hill (RP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Girton Interchange were reconfigured to allow access to M11 south from the A428, and then access to the M11 from eastbound A1303 was removed, this would reduce traffic on the A428 by 20%, and there would be room on the current Jn 13 bridge for two car lanes, two bus lanes and a cycle lane (RP) Those living west of the city know this is by far the single most beneficial investment that could be made (HB) Officials in local government and Highways England have so far refused to explain why this critical reconfiguration of the Girton Interchange was not included within the A14 upgrade (RP) 	<p>R5: This Resolution calls on the City Deal and Cambridgeshire County Council to release all documents relating to their negotiations with Highways England, including correspondence, minutes of meetings, survey data, and modelling projections, that show the vigour with which these negotiations were pursued and which constitute the evidence-base for Highways England to take its decision.</p> <p>R5 passed: 14(F); 0(A)</p>

5c	<p>A cost-effective and less damaging alternative (Ben Dansie (BD) <i>Coton PC</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coton PC rejects Option 3/3a because it has not been proven that a segregated busway cannot run alongside Madingley Rise and thus avoid the damage to Coton village, its setting and its community. It could save £50 million for a minimal increase in journey time (BD) • Independent measurements of road width indicate that a two-lane busway on Madingley Hill would be possible. When the busway meets the bridge, a 'shoulder' type bridge for pedestrians and cyclists could be built (BD) • The GCCD considers this option is difficult as it would sever access from adjoining properties unless it ran in the middle of the road; middle-road bus lanes are difficult to manage, shoulders on the bridge can be expensive; the P&R would need to be located next to SSSi site; traffic lights would be needed at the Coton junction and there would be no room to plant trees to soften environmental impact (AS) • The GCCD is prioritising the need to prevent properties/gardens being developed (AS) • It is difficult to measure the environmental impact of 3/3a against such as scheme, as to explore the impact of all schemes in detail is a costly exercise (AS) • If the current bridge could not be adapted, the route could turn off just before the bridge and enter along Charles Babbage Road on a new bridge from the west (HB) • The disadvantage of the proposal seem minimal compared to the impact of Option 3/3a (HB) 	<p>R6: The A428 LLF believes that there is sufficient width for a high quality busway and cycle facility to follow the route of the existing road from the A428/ A1303 junction to the M11 junction and requests that the GCCD Board explore this option in more detail.</p> <p>R6 passed: 13(F); 0(A); 1(Ab)</p>
----	---	---	---

5d	The conflict of interest of the University of Cambridge (SC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University is a non-voting member of the GCCD Executive Board but is the major landowner affected and has undue influence (SC) The University's response to the Consultation rejected the North and Central options, which led to Option 3/3a being chosen (SC) If Option 3/3a is selected, the University will find it easy to gain permission to develop green belt land between Barton Road and Madingley Road and would benefit financially from this on a huge scale, despite its contravention of the Local Plan (SC) Guidelines on the inclusion of those with vested interests in debates vary between CCiC and SCDC (RC/NW); the University is entitled to make its opinion known if it has declared its interest (NW) or a party with a conflict of interest should remove itself from the decision making process and debate to restore the faith of the public in the process (RC) 	<p>R7: We ask Cambridge University to remove itself from the Board of the Cambridge City Deal for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway decision only, to reduce the conflict of interest over its land development objectives.</p> <p>R7 amendment: The LLF is concerned that the University is both influencing the route decision and promoting land development to the local inspector.</p> <p>R7 amendment passed: 10(F); 0(A); 2(Ab)</p>
5e	Park and Ride sites at Madingley Mulch roundabout (Crome Lea Farm) (EBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Madingley PC is appalled by the proposal for the large P&R at Crome Lea Farm (EBC) Its location on a hill, environmental impact and light pollution are particular concerns and development could not be screened (EBC) The P&R would be a prominent landmark in a very sensitive site, visible from South, West and East (RP). Traffic would have to cross the carriageway to turn right into the P&R (HB) Scotland Farm at Dry Drayton would be a far less damaging location and could be used by more people, for example those working in the Science Park (EBC) If Scotland Farm were not chosen, site 2 would be preferable to sites 1 or 3 (HB) 	<p>R8: The proposal to place the possible new park and ride site close to the Madingley Mulch roundabout is not acceptable to Madingley and Coton parishes. It is strongly recommended by both parishes that the County Council reconsider this and we support that the new park and ride site should be built at the Scotland Farm junction on the A 428.</p> <p>R8 addendum: If this is not possible. the LLF considers that P&R site 2 would be significantly less damaging and is the only one that it could support.</p> <p>R8 with addendum passed: 14(F); 1(A)</p>

6	Proposals for slip road of A428 to Madingley Mulch roundabout		Discussion deferred
7	Proposals from Caxton Gibbet to A428 slip road		Discussion deferred
8	The displacement of traffic due to Tackling Cambridge Congestion proposals (RP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following road closures traffic will be displaced (RP) • Congestion on some roads will be increased, especially on the outer ring road and adjoining streets (RP) • The GCCD emphasise that this is a trial period and a decision on whether to continue will be taken within 18 months (AS) • Closure points will be clearly set out, strong messages about using alternatives will be sent out, Stagecoach will run more buses and employers will be encouraged to promote alternative modes of transport (AS) • The GCCD cannot offer reduced rates at P&R sites as an incentive as the monies for this will come from the workplace parking levy which will not be in place before the project commences (AS) • It is essential that traffic is monitored in Cambridge and the surrounding area, including Madingley village, both before and during the experiment to judge its true impact (EBC) 	<p>R9: The LLF requests that the 18 month trial period for road closures as part of the Tackling Cambridge Congestion proposals must be monitored and measured carefully, before and during the process, to see if introduction of these measures does meet the 15% traffic reduction projected</p> <p>R9 passed: 15(F); 0(A)</p>
9	City Centre Access Study and interface with A428 scheme (PH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges GCCD to protect and enhance constructive conservation, not just mitigate its impact (PH) • Urges GCCD to let LLF write questions for Executive Board (PH) 	

10	Next steps and closure of meeting (HB)		HB thanked EBC for standing as Vice Chair for the first two meetings of the LLF and noted he wished to stand down. BS was appointed Vice Chair with immediate effect. The meeting closed at 22:30.
----	--	--	--

