

## Notes from the Cambourne to Cambridge LLF Meeting Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2019

**Date:** Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2019

**Time:** 18.30 – 20.45

**Venue:** Cambourne Village College, Sheepfold Lane, Cambourne, CB23 6FR

### **Present - GCP Officers**

Tom Bennett (TB) – Head of Communications

Peter Blake (PB) – Transport Director

Laura Gates (LG) – Communications Lead

Austin Nwadike (AN) – Project Manager

Beth Warmington (BW) – Communications and Engagement Officer

### **Present – Cambridgeshire County Council**

Mike Soper (MS) – Research Team Manager

Nathalie Watkins - (note taker)

### **Present – Mott MacDonald**

Jo Baker (JB) - Consultant

James Montgomery (JM) – Consultant

### **Present - LLF Members**

Philip Allen (Vice Chair) - , South Cambridgeshire District Council, Harston and Comberton

Helen Bradbury (Chair)

Rod Cantrill (RC) – Cambridge City Council, Newnham

Charles D’Oyly - North Newnham Residents’ Association

Alan Everitt

Gabriel Fox (GF) - Cotton Parish Council

Markus Gehring (MG) – Cambridge City Council, Newnham

Tumi Hawkins – South Cambridgeshire District Council, Caldecote

David Jones (DJ) - Cambourne Town Council

Steve Jones (SJ) - Bourn Parish Council

Pauline Joslin - Hardwick Parish Council

Ellen Khmelnitski - Gough Way Residents’ Association

Rita Langan - Cranmer Road Residents’ Association

James Littlewood (JL) - Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Cheney Payne – Cambridge City Council, Castle

Chris Pratten - Save West Fields

Tim Scott - Countryside Restoration Trust

### **Present (from organisations)**

Jess Cunningham – University of Cambridge

Lynda Warth – British Horse Society

### **Apologies:**

Ruth Betson – South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne  
Shrobona Bhattacharya – South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne  
Greville Chamberlain – Hardwick Parish Council

*Meeting commenced 6.35pm*

## **1. Introduction and Welcome by Chair**

The Chair opened the meeting welcoming everyone and introducing herself. She provided an update on developments since the last meeting.

The GCP Executive Board met and considered the outcome of the public consultation. They received the key conclusions of the Interim Report and agreed that Phase 1, Phase 2 and a Park and Ride (P&R) location continue to be developed towards an Outline Business Case for a High Quality Public Transport route between Cambourne and Cambridge.

They did not endorse the recommended off-road route for phase 1 between Madingley roundabout and Grange Road but noted that it best meets the strategic and policy objectives of the Greater Cambridge Partnership. They therefore agreed to develop options for Phase 2 between Cambourne and Madingley roundabout for further Business Case assessment including a public consultation. This public consultation has taken place and will be reviewed in the meeting this evening. The GCP confirmed that a preferred route and recommendation for a preferred P&R site, be presented in the final Outline Business Case. This is due to be presented in October 2019.

## **2. Minutes of previous meetings**

The Chair approved the minutes from the last meeting confirming that they were good and an accurate record of proceedings. There is a full list of questions and responses on the GCP website.

From the previous minutes it was noted:

- 1) That the LLF wanted to ensure that there were at least 2 weeks between Joint Assembly papers being published and the Joint Assembly meeting itself so that LLF members have a chance to input. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)
- 2) The LLF requested to see a panel of independent experts assessing the economic, environmental and transport implications of the scheme, independent of the GCP. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)
- 3) The LLF recommended by resolution that no decision be taken on a preferred route until greater clarity on CAM is provided. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)
- 4) The LLF requested an independent environmental and heritage assessment to be completed before the full EIA and HIA at planning stage. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)

- 5) The LLF asked that a northern off-road development be looked at to act as a comparator to the GCP's only route that is compliant with CAM. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)
- 6) The LLF recommended that an in-bound bus lane design on Madingley Road be looked at now as a quick win. **See response to Nov 18 LFF resolutions** [https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov\\_010719.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/GCP%20response%20to%20LLF%20resolutions%2014%20Nov_010719.pdf)

A member of the public raised further concerns in relation to what he described as the 'flawed reports' from Historic England and Natural England. Through a Freedom of Information request he believes that he has seen evidence that officers from the GCP have distorted the reports and despite colleagues pointing out the issues that the reports were still able to be used in the report to the GCP Executive Board. The Chair asked that this be looked into later in the meeting in item 5.

Chair reminded the meeting that all questions should come through the Chair (via SJ who was facilitating the meeting with the microphone) and that at all times it was expected that participants be courteous and polite towards officers.

A presentation of the below items (3-5) discussed can be found here: <https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/Cambourne%20to%20Cambridge%20LLF%2006-06-2019%20Presentation.pdf>

### **3. Cambourne to Cambridge Project Update**

PB talked through a quick project update (pages 1-3 of the presentation).

PB explained that this meeting was scheduled as an update as there are no imminent decisions required. The GCP intends to continue to meet with the LLF technical group between now and October when an LLF will be scheduled in advance of an Outline Business Case being presented to the GCP Executive Board for a decision on a preferred scheme.

### **4. Phase 2 Consultation Findings**

MS introduced himself and explained that he was from the Research Team within Cambridge County Council. The Research Team undertake compiling the consultation responses and conduct all analysis. His report on the findings from the public consultation is pages 4-10 in the presentation.

#### Questions and Answers

**Q.** On behalf of Bourn Parish Council why was the consultation paper not initially circulated in Bourn? Had to complain in order to finally get it distributed.

**A.** LG explained that the complaint had actually been about a promotional flyer which was misunderstood to be consultation materials. The full consultation papers were circulated within a 10 day period and included Bourn.

**Q.** Why do you think that there was such a poor response compared to previous consultations on this scheme?

**A.** The earlier consultations had responses from a wider geographical area, now the focus on the narrow corridor involved affects a smaller geographical area so is not surprising that there are fewer

who feel the need to respond. It is also common to see consultation fatigue impact numbers on later consultations.

**Q.** What was the cost per respondent?

**A.** The answer is not to hand but can be calculated. **ACTION: Chair to request GCP provide a consultation cost.**

**Q.** With a smaller response rate can it be seen as representative of the population?

**A.** MS explained that a consultation is held over a defined period of time and people opt in to take part, this is a different process to a questionnaire that is to be used for statistical analysis where the team would push to get a certain number of respondents. For a consultation, a smaller number of respondents does not diminish the results.

**Q.** MG stated as a precursor to his question that he was against the bus way. Given that this is the second time that you have asked in a consultation about the P&R have you matched in size the responses with the previous results? MG also stated that the residents he represents criticised the stated journey times.

**Q.** Are you surprised that so many supported an on road solution? Is it not better to see who was in favour of on road?

**A.** MS explained that when talking about favouring the off road option the focus is on consistency and reliability rather than the speed of the journey.

**Q.** A member of Hardwick Parish Council asked what the process would be for registering a village view now. The consultation occurred between a village plan survey being completed and it being published. The results of the village plan survey show that the majority do not want the off road option. How can we input this?

**A.** MS advised that you can submit this to the GCP from the Parish Council but that the people of Hardwick also took part in the consultation so their views will be within the results already. The Chair asked that this also be sent to her. The GCP officer advised differently explaining that there will be three weeks between the next LLF and the GCP Executive Board meeting and that this is when there will be an opportunity to present this.

**Q.** DJ, a member of Cambourne Town Council stated that the Town Council are in favour of the off road bus way. Is it not the case that it is people who object who often shout loudest? How do you take this into account with the results?

**A.** Cambourne is well represented in the respondents and this favour can be seen in the results.

Chair called a stop to questions as there was a need to move on through the agenda.

## **5. Environment and Landscape – indicative design features**

Chair read out a statement sent to her from Cllr Grenville Chamberlain (SCDC) referring to the off road proposal along the St Neots Road as an abomination for just 3 minutes time saving. He stated that at points along the road there will be 9 lanes right in front of houses.

JL raised concerns about the lack of detail around the environmental concerns, the report didn't state what the environmental impact would be and he had to look very hard to find this information.

PB stated that the proposal has to fit Government appraisal and this is not a decision for a vote. The GCP is obliged to follow national guidance while trying to reflect key concerns and themes in its decisions.

MG asked why the age profile was being looked at as this shouldn't be relevant and is being used to support a decision which was really already decided on 3 years ago.

JM introduced himself and explained his role, giving context to the follow on slides he presented. He explained that Mott MacDonald have been liaising with the LLF's technical group talking through the appraisal process and meeting with heritage, landscape and ecology specialists. The GCP is working hard to deliver biodiversity gain within the planning policy requirements. There are two working groups 1) non-motorised user access and 2) landscape and ecology (including National Trust and Wildlife Trust) both with representatives from statutory groups. These groups are taking a strategic view as to how projects should progress. Mott McDonald aims to address environmental concerns raised by the LLF through these working groups. He clarified that tonight was not about providing answers just thoughts.

The discussion opened on opportunities for mitigation (slides 10-21 from the presentation). JM pointed out that the images were illustrative sketches and no scaling was involved. JM stated that Mott MacDonald had not yet considered the route through Bourn Airfield as this will be decided on by the developers.

#### Questions and Answers

**Q.** TH asked why have you not already considered Bourn Airfield as the developers are waiting to hear from the GCP where they want the route.

**A.** There is a proposed route at present but it is not confirmed.

**Q.** LW from the British Horse Society asked why there is no labelled provision for horses, only pedestrians and cyclists.

**A.** This came up in the working group, the point has been taken and GCP are aware of this situation.

**Q.** A Hardwick resident asked how will I safely access the road from my house with all the proposed planting.

**A.** This is a valid concern and will have to be taken into account; in this specific area lower vegetation would be better. JM reminded everyone present that these were just indicative drawings for the area.

**Q.** Referring to Option 1 from the presentation, it would be possible to get 10m in at one end of St Neots road but towards Cambridge only 3-4m as it then goes down to the A428.

**A.** This is correct, the drawing provides an average.

**Q.** What is the annual juicing revenue for Coton Orchard as it is being stated as a commercial factor?

**A.** We don't know as Coton Orchard have not engaged with Mott MacDonald, despite attempts made to establish contact

**Q.** At one stage 'cut and cover' was discussed; why has this not progressed?

**A.** It is very expensive and not particularly environmentally friendly. There is lots of material to move and it would take longer to complete.

**Q.** What is Cut and Cover?

**A.** A big trench is made, the road then built in it and the material is then put back. It was also pointed out that cut and cover would mean the loss of houses.

LG asked that attention be drawn to two drop in sessions being held on 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> July at Hardwick Primary School giving people the opportunity to talk to officers and the environment team.

**Q.** Surely the LLF should not only be considering the environmental factors? Was this route not supposed to link up to the Mayor's metro, or has that idea been given up on? The Metro would not be able to travel on this current concrete and grass proposal.

**A.** JM drew the meetings attention back to the early slide that stated 'Road surfacing is under discussion -determined by vehicle and guidance type'. The routes shown in the images are likely to be tarmac.

**Q.** Why then have new drawings not been made? These are very misleading

**A.** The GCP explained that it was about balancing costs; new drawings would be expensive and it is not usual for to-scale drawings to be produced before a preferred scheme is agreed.

**Q.** At the beginning of this presentation you explained that this was not a specific set of plans but a generic overview. At what point will the LLF get to consult on this specific route?

**A.** Currently this is an environmental appraisal. Once the GCP have a preferred scheme then an Environmental Impact Assessment is undertaken. This is a formal statutory process that requires consultation. There will be 1-2-1 meetings with land owners, residents and public meetings. This will in turn lead on to an Environmental Statement where there is a further opportunity again to make further objections.

**Q.** Why is there no environmental mitigation for the on road option? The Board only noted the off road best met the need; it did not suggest that the GCP stop looking at on road.

**Q.** The Chair asked if the bund idea on Madingley Hill was still being considered.

**A.** Yes though it would not be big enough to hide the scheme.

JL stated that Cambridge Past Present and Future are happy to liaise on mitigations however he wanted it noted that liaising does not mean that Cambridge PP&F are in favour of the option.

An LLF member stated that the images are misleading as they are not to scale, he would feel much more comfortable discussing these if they were to scale.

**Q.** For the drop in sessions in July will the material be updated?

**A.** Yes that is the intention of the GCP.

**Q.** Chair asked if these slides will go on the website.

**A.** Yes

**Chair summarised that she would write to the GCP asking that:**

- **drawings be redone to scale.**
- **they ensure representatives from Hardwick and other communities affected be consulted.**

- the cost per respondent be provided
- why the consultation material was circulated late in Bourn.

### 6 & 7. LLF Tech Group Workshops and LLF discussion on new information & issues raised

SJ provided a brief introduction as to the areas that the Technical Group were tasked to look at. The 4 topics were environment, wider economic benefits, quick wins and northern alignment up to the Girton Interchange. SJ said that the meetings were very beneficial.

#### Northern Alignment

RC presented a summary on the technical group's discussion.

The background: initial work looked at full Girton interchange with no consideration of a bus route; further work looked at a possible route involving a full interchange with P&R at Girton Interchange.

Details of the revised work: P&R at Girton interchange; dedicated road alongside the M11 on Eddington site; cost £75-90m (excluding land costs and P&R) including interchange work.

LLF technical group's observations: The cost of the Girton Interchange work would not be met by GCP but by Highways England and given all the current investment in A14 work they may not be keen on further investment; this option provides greater strategic transport benefits than just Cambourne to Cambridge; it is more future proofed, linking better with a CAM scheme. It saves money, is viable and is an easier route.

(Link to full Technical Note here: <https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/C2C%20LLF%20Technical%20Note%20Northern%20Route%202022-05-2019.pdf>)

#### Questions and Answers

**Q.** This doesn't address the Cambourne to Cambridge issue? It is not looking at A to B but A to C. There is a need to improve connectivity between Cambourne and Cambridge. Cambourne would support the Girton Interchange and the P&R as long as there were further connections beyond the centre.

**A.** RC stated that this is still A to B, the route simply ends on the other side of the university campus. There are other advantages too as you can do lots more with this, for example making all coaches use the Girton P&R. This would reduce congestion in the centre of town and visitors would provide funding by using the P&R hence reducing the cost to commuters.

A Cambourne resident stated that they want a route that gets people from Cambourne to Cambridge as quickly as possible. This option hasn't looked at environmental factors.

GF went on to present. He stated that a set of actions are being debated around a predetermined decision. He went on to question what was actually known about the existing Guided Bus as decisions are being made based on this existing bus way when there is very little actual information on the current Guided Bus.

- What is the total cost?
- How many people use the service on the guided track?
- What impact has it had on A14 traffic?
- How many jobs did it create?
- What is the actual BCR?
- How does it compare to alternatives?

GF stated that these questions need answering before effective decision making can take place. The daily traffic flow between the Dry Drayton/Oakington junction fell before the bus way launched and since opening this has gone up. This is not to say that it might have gone up anyway and the bus way simply prevented it going up further. The network takes 11k passengers a day and the A14 takes 90k. The technical group concluded that they were not saying that the current bus way was not successful but simply that they do not have the relevant information to draw a conclusion.

#### Madingley Road Quick Win

SJ presented. The Quick Wins defining 4 criteria were clarified.

The proposal: A short section of outbound public transport lane leading up to Madingley Mulch roundabout; potential signalisation of the roundabout; cycle improvements (between High Cross and Lady Margaret Road); signal timings; two way bus lanes on 90% of A1303 between Madingley Mulch Roundabout and the M11, giving a completely free-running peak hour service with inbound bus route for 100% of the route; bus lane over M11 bridge (Atkins report (Option 2) confirms adequate width even without widening).

It was argued that the GCP's proposal was in effect a hybrid scheme as it is around 75% off road but 25% on road. The GCPs route is on road exiting Cambourne, slow on road through the West Cambridge site and ultra slow on road past Grange Road. Based on the proposed Hybrid scheme from the LLF technical group it was suggested that it would take 23mins to get from Cambourne to the Biomedical Campus and 22 mins to get to the City Centre. SJ concluded that this hybrid scheme would provide superior journey times to the off-road scheme; equivalent reliability; likely be a quarter of the cost; carries negligible environmental impact; much quicker to implement; adequately future proofed given E-W rail and Girton Interchange upgrade coming; CAM compliant.

See full technical note here: [https://citydeal-](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/C2C%20LLF%20Technical%20Note%20-%20Madingley%20Road%20Quick%20Wins%2014-05-2019.pdf)

[live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/C2C%20LLF%20Technical%20Note%20-%20Madingley%20Road%20Quick%20Wins%2014-05-2019.pdf](https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/C2C%20LLF%20Technical%20Note%20-%20Madingley%20Road%20Quick%20Wins%2014-05-2019.pdf)

#### Questions and Answers

**Q.** A Cambourne resident asked how the journey times have been calculated as he felt they were incorrect.

**A.** It was taken as an average of peak hour. This proposal would mean traffic would be free running down Madingley Hill so times represent that.

The LLF Technical Group speakers closed with a summary stating that they find:

There is no evidence that a segregated off-road bus infrastructure is materially faster or more reliable than segregated on-road bus lanes. The LLF feel that transport officers have been given a brief to develop an off-road bus way; not provide the most efficient transport solution, not provide the fastest route to key destinations and not provide a scheme that the community buys into. The LLF, from the technical group's work, feel that changing the brief will allow a much more efficient scheme to be developed.

This summary received applause.

Chair drew the Group's focus back to what the LLF could ask of the GCP.



## **8. Next steps, resolutions and closure of meeting**

The LLF requests the following from the GCP based on the findings from the phase 2 consultation:

1. Following a statement from Grenville Chamberlain (DC Hardwick), read out in absentia, the LLF expressed deep concern at the impact of the off-road route on residents living along St Neots' Road, who would be faced with nine lanes of traffic in front of their houses. The LLF asked the GCP to reconsider these plans in the light of this impact.
2. The LLF also asks the GCP to clarify the noise, pollution and safety implications of the options along St Neots' Road.
3. The LLF would like the GCP to check the accuracy of the measurements along St Neots' Road that appeared in the consultation literature as there was concern expressed that there would be insufficient space for the plantings and mitigation once the traffic lanes had been created.
4. The LLF asks the GCP to ensure that drawings and indicative diagrams are henceforth drawn to scale and accurate so that residents can be confident about the implications of what is being proposed.

Chair intends to send a checklist direct to the GCP compiled with Grenville Chamberlain and Pauline Joslin.

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### Environment and Landscape mitigation

##### **RESOLUTION 1** – passed unanimously

The LLF fully supports the development of a framework for mitigation for GCP schemes. However, it doubts whether the damage to the landscape and views of the historic city that the off-road scheme causes, from Madingley Hill and other contentious areas west of the city, can be adequately mitigated, if at all.

Chair asked if the principles being developed could be brought forward so that they can be incorporated within this scheme.

#### Northern route via Girton

##### **RESOLUTION 2** – passed unanimously

LLF resolution in relation to Northern Alignment:

- Welcomed opportunity to discuss a viable Northern Alignment route.
- Disappointed that the Mott MacDonald analysis didn't really focus on a possible options – but focused on the Girton interchange road network.
- Believes that further work on the Northern Alignment should be undertaken based on a route with a dedicated bus lane to the north of the A428, a P&R at the Girton interchange and a dedicated off road bridge over the A428 from the P&R on to the Eddington site – using where possible the existing road network on Eddington. It is recommended that specific further work be undertaken to assess whether the economic and environmental benefits would outweigh the losses (i.e. the longer route length) given the potential for greater patronage and modal shift were a P & R located there.

Chair acknowledged that PB wrote to the Chair on 1<sup>st</sup> May outlining the reasons for the discounting of a Northern alignment dismissal of however these plans were dismissed when it was not expected for the CAM to progress so need to revisit this.

On-road solution on Madingley Road

**RESOLUTION 3** – passed unanimously

The LLF would encourage the GCP to optimise further the low-cost, on-road option taking into consideration the hybrid scheme proposed by the LLF.

The Chair advised that she would circulate the resolutions and outcomes tomorrow. Chair stated that she would really like a representative from Cambourne at the table next time. The member of Cambourne Town Council asked that someone from the LLF come to a Town Council meeting to discuss what involvement is required.

A Cllr raised that there are many requests that the LLF have made of the GCP that have been noted but that the GCP have not answered or reacted to. It was suggested that these be looked back at and RAG rated.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm