

Project Name	Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum
Venue	Comberton Sports & Arts
Date & Time	Monday 11 September at 7:15pm (opened at 7:30pm)
Attendees	<p>Members of the Local Liaison Forum: Helen Bradbury, LLF Chair, Cllr Bridget Smith LLF – Vice Chair.</p> <p>Greater Cambridge Partnership: Ashley Heller, Katy Rogerson, Robin Marshall, Adrian Shepherd.</p> <p>Guests: Cllr Grenville Chamberlain (SCDC), Lorraine Mooney (Harston PC), Cllr Janet Lockwood (SCDC), Cllr Lina Joseph (CCC), Cllr Tumi Hawkins (SCDC), David Plank (Trumpington Residents Association), Eva Gordon (Crammer Road Residents), Araceli Carceller (Gough Way Residents' Association), Josh Newman (Granchester PC), Cllr Rod Cantrill (CCC), Harriet Gillet (Storey's Way Residents Association), Steve Jones (Bourn PC), Gabriel Fox (Cotton PC), Colin Young (Atkins), Jo Baker (Mott MacDonald), Abigail Shaw (Madingley Road), Stephen Coates (SWF), Markus Gehring (CCC)</p>
Apologies	
Purpose of Meeting	Local Liaison Forum (LLF)

Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	<p>The meeting was opened by Helen Bradbury</p> <p>Minutes of the last meeting (17<sup>th</sup> July 2017) – Amendment to final page – fair attendance at the workshops; person is named as Helen Bradbury. The minutes were agreed as accurate</p> <p>Update since the last meeting – nil</p>

	<p>Bridget Smith conducted the election of the Chair of the LLF - Helen Bradbury voted for unanimously.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Response to the previous LLF resolutions;</p> <p>Resolution 2: Asked for work on option 3A to be stopped – the response was (this) could be characterised as the LLF wanted to block work for a period. Helen Bradbury refuted the statement from the Executive Board. It was not about blocking but asking the GCP to provide something that was better. It was clarified that a park and ride was not an accepted option, it was the LLF’s request that work should be stopped until the Rapid Mass Exit feasibility study should be concluded first.</p> <p>Ashley Heller, GCP - it was agreed that the response to the resolutions would be emailed to Helen Bradbury to be posted up on the relevant GCP webpage.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Overview of proposed route alignments – Colin Young – Atkins PowerPoint presentation</b></p> <p><b>Q&amp; A Sessions</b></p> <p>Q. Tim Scott (SCDC) – How will the introduction of a busway improve biodiversity in a section of arable land?  Response from Colin; The area would be planted within the busway to improve biodiversity</p> <p>Markus Gehring (CCC) – Visual impact does not cover the pollution and environmental impact on 3A.</p> <p>Q. Steven Jones (Bourn PC) - Your consultation paper released to the newspaper does not match your presentation, it said that this development would not impact on the west fields.  Response from Colin; Our consultation always showed the crossing of the west fields, nothing has been hidden.</p> <p>Q. Why did you choose to show construction only costs in 3A? The figures are clear, they show that 3A costs significantly more than the other options.</p>

Response from Colin; The consideration for us is that it may be prejudiced to discuss land costs in advance.

**Questions from the public;**

Q. Can Mr Baker give reasons why option 6 cannot be done (busway along the A1031 carriage way).

Response from Jo; It can be accommodated with engineering.

Professor Jackson; Option 1 and 6 would cause mayhem on the road and spill over onto the other arteries into Cambridge. I think 3A is the better option for the long term.

Q. Carol Holborn (Coton) Why are we all supposed to go Grange Road on the super-fast bus where we get off to take a punt!

Response from Colin – Balfour Beatty indicated that more infrastructure that would need to be put in would cause longer congestion. Within the City centre access becomes harder for a bus route.

Q. Tumi Hawkins (SCDC) – You state that 3 is still feasible but at the same time you are saying that 3A is the recommendation.

Response from Colin; Options 3/3A are both still viable. Further feasibility study data will need to be gathered before there is a final recommendation.

Q. Why did you consistently omit Caldecote in your feasibility study? How valid is your modelling?

Response from Colin; Caldecote will be considered along with the Bourn development.

Q. MCAF was scored without consideration to the LLF which led to an enhanced MCAF and the LLF still are not referenced.

When you are assessing 1 it stated that there are no improvements to the cycle route. Do you mean that there is no improvement to the cycle route or that the cycle route will be impaired?

Response from Colin; Option 1 will provide a busway but this could diminish the present cycle way along Madingley Road.

4.

**Overview of proposed Park & Ride sites – Jo Baker, Mott MacDonald – PowerPoint Presentation.**

**Q & A sessions;**

Q. To what extent were the bus operators consulted?

Response from Jo; The bus operators have been consulted and they have indicated that they would prefer a site further into the City centre.

Q. Is this decision by the bus company due to financial elements?

Response from Jo; Yes, the Madingley Mulch site is still in close proximity to the SSSI site. The environmental assessment will take into consideration the implications.

Q. How can you guarantee the Water Works will not morph into Chrome Lea?

Response from Jo; The planning will set this out.

Q. Have you scoped out how many people will use the Scotland farm site or the Madingley Mulch site? How will this affect the behaviour of the drivers?

Response from Jo; More work will need to be done on driver behaviour. There would be opportunities to improve the Madingley Mulch roundabout to improve the movement of traffic.

Q. Mrs Baxter (Hardwick) – has any consideration been made to the increase in the traffic accessing the A1303? Why has Cambourne not been considered for the Park and Ride site?

Response; I do not think the park and ride is the main factor in the potential increase in traffic, the proposed housing developments will be a key factor and this will be dealt with by planning. As already stated the bus companies have stated that it is preferable to be closer to the city centre.

Q. Alistair Murfitt (resident) Where do you see the water tower expanding to?

	<p>Response; The current provision is for 2000 spaces but any further development would need to go back to planning. Scotland Farm is constrained by housing to the North.</p> <p>Q. In your document you say 11 hectares and expansion but you have just said 9 hectares why?  Response; The site is a park and ride of 9 hectares with a provision of 2 hectares for landscaping.</p>
5.	<p><b>LLF discussion and resolutions</b></p> <p><b>1. Time to pause and develop a better vision – Cllr Rod Cantrill (Newnham)</b> It is agreed that the area does deserve a high quality public transport service and it does this in the context of the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Partnership. The LLF seeks to find short term interventions; a community proposal option 6, a tidal bus way, a new park and ride site before the Madingley Mulch congestion area. Long term improvements to the Girton Interchange and the introduction of a light rail system.</p> <p>One member of the board stated that they thought the focus should be on building travel hubs and use travel flow to allow the buses movement in the short term and focus on the long term – Girton Interchange.</p> <p>It was agreed that the board should be differentiating at looking for the long-term measures needed i.e. light railway and Girton Interchange improvements. Whilst still trying to find suitable short and medium term (5 – 10 years).</p> <p><i>The board voted 20 to none - unanimous</i></p> <p><b>2. Response to proposed Park and Ride Location – Cllr Grenville Chamberlain (SCDC)</b> Reject Water Works and all adjacent sites on Madingley Hill as site for a new Park and Ride and that any new Park and Ride site should be further west outside of the Madingley Mulch congestion area.</p>

*19 in favour of the amendment to the resolution – unanimous (as above) and 19 in favour of the resolution unanimous*

**3. The plan beyond Grange Road? – Cllr Markus Gerhing (Newnham)** Clarification from the GCP regarding the logic on the western edge of the City as the end for the proposed bus route and a detailed explanation of how buses will journey between the point and the key city centre locations of Bridge Street and Drummer Street.

*20 in favour of the resolution - unanimous*

**4. Response to enhanced MCAF – LLF Technical Group (Gabriel Fox)**

The LLF does not agree with the MCAF scoring of the Enhanced MCAF

Voted 17 in favour

**5. Comments on assessment of Option 6 – LLF Technical Group**

The LLF does not consider that Option 6 has been fairly presented in the documentation to date and is consequently not as the LLF intended

Voted 1 abstainer and 17 in favour

**6. Underestimating the environmental impact – Cllr Tom Scott (SCDC)** The LLF considers that environmental impacts of a park and ride and an offline busway are being underplayed by the GCP. It was thought the future proofing for the environment would need to be considered.

(Comment – the evaluation that resolutions 5 and 6 should be merged as they are the same denominators).

*16 voted in favour, 2 abstainers and 2 non-voters*

**7. The Public Consultation Nov/Dec 2017 – Cllr Markus Gehring (Newnham)**

The Board should go out to consultation once it has received a full set of data analysis.

Voted 17 in favour – unanimously

**8. LLFs involvement in the next consultation**

The A428 and Western Orbital LFFs request that they be included in discussion regarding the content and design of the questions to be asked.

Vote 16 in favour and 1 abstainer.