

TECHNICAL NOTE 3

R1: The forum believes that the steps the City Deal has taken in relation to the western bus corridor lack strategic overview. The Forum requests that, before any additional road infrastructure is decided upon, demand management options are explored and their impacts assessed. Such demand management options should include residents' parking, employers' car parking levy, and congestion charging.

R1 addendum: The Forum recommends that there be a public consultation in which specific options are put forward.

Addendum passed:

19F; 0A

R1 with addendum passed:

23F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board is assured that the strategic aspects of the project are well considered. In particular the project is grounded in a clear policy background including the Joint Transport Strategy, Local Plan and other local transport strategies. Additionally the project has been prioritised in accordance with Department for Transport Early Sifting Tool assessment processes which are well focused on strategic overview.

As work being carried out in the parallel City Centre Access study demonstrates, the City Deal is also seeking to understand and potentially deliver demand management measures. These will form part of the overall strategy which needs to be focused both on travel demand but also better public transport.

The A428 and Western Orbital corridor measures will not include demand management measures in isolation. The wider City Centre Access approach will undoubtedly have an impact on the A428 corridor and other corridors. The Project Board agrees that during the ongoing development of detailed proposals for the A428 corridor full understanding of the impact of demand management options must form part of the assessment process.

R2: The Forum asks that proposals for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway and Western Orbital be reviewed to clarify how they will improve the sustainability of Cambourne and the new A428 settlements. No final decision should be taken on either scheme until this has been done and a full business case that includes bus operational impacts and viability is completed.

R2 passed:

19F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board agrees that – in line with the standard project development approach - the sustainability of any recommended option will be fully assessed through the development of a full business case.

R3: In view of widespread criticism of previous consultations run by City Deal, the Forum proposes that planners consult with its members, before any future consultation documents are issued, in order to ensure more positive engagement. In particular, the Forum requests that particular care is taken to ensure the accuracy of all factual information, including maps, in consultation documents.

R3 addendum: A summary of social and environmental impacts should be included in future consultations.

Addendum passed:

23F; 0A

R3 with addendum passed:

19F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board agrees that that a summary of social and environmental impacts should be included in future consultations and will consult with the LLF on the presentation of these issues. It also agrees that the LLF should be consulted on issues such as presentation and structure of material.

R4 amended: The Forum considers that no evidence has been provided on the projected usage and commercial viability of the Western Orbital to justify the expense and environmental damage of an off-road solution. More evidence is requested.

R4 Amended resolution passed:

17F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board agrees that as part of further development work for the Western Orbital assessment of bus operations will be required. This would form part of the wider business case assessment which would also include full considerations of environmental issues along the corridor.

R5 amended: The Forum notes overwhelming public opposition to off-road busway proposals either side of Madingley Hill (Area 1 North & Area 1 South). It also notes it is 'considered potentially possible to implement a tidal bus lane along the stretch of Madingley Road between the Madingley Mulch Roundabout and the M11 bridge' (Atkins, Technical Note, 1/2/16). Should the City Deal Board select one of the off-road options, the Forum would strongly object on the grounds that an on-road dedicated bus lane, on this stretch of the road, amply satisfies the aims of the scheme in terms of speed and reliability. It would therefore consider the expense, environmental damage and negative impact on the neighbouring villages, of that selected off-road alternative, not to be justified. The Forum's support for on-road only extends as far as the M11.

Addendum passed:

17F; 2A

R5 Amended resolution passed:

17; 0A

Project Board Response

The selection of a preferred option will be a matter for the City Deal Executive Board. The Project Board notes the point regarding the adequacy of a bus lane. The Project Board would, prior to the recommendation of any preferred option require the Project Manager to produce a full case for investment in one or other of the options. The case for investment would include both transport and wider economic considerations in line with City Deal objectives. The Project Board would require for any Preferred Option a full business case to be developed which would need to demonstrate that the option has clear strategic benefits. The Project Board would not recommend to the City Deal Board a proposal which could not be justified on the range of assessment criteria.

R6 amended: The Forum understands that discussions have taken place between City Deal planners and the University as regards a route through the West Cambridge site for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway. The Forum requests more information on these discussions, and the routes and technology being considered.

R6 Amended resolution passed.

20F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board agrees that as part of the ongoing project development the LLF is updated as any discussions develop with West Cambridge, while not prejudicing any specific negotiations which may be undertaken with the West Cambridge site developers.

R 7: The Forum notes that considerable work has been undertaken to assess various options for remodelling the M11 bridge at junction 13. It also notes that one proposal for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway requires spending up to £50 million on a new bus-only bridge across the M11. The Forum suggests that, should the City Deal Board select an option using the existing bridge, measures should be included to ensure it better serves all traffic, as well as providing bus priority. This would deliver greater economic benefit, and would thus represent a better use of City Deal funds.

R7 addendum 1: The Forum proposes no further action on this until a range of demand management measures have been investigated.

Addendum passed:

18F; 0A

R7 with addendum passed:

17F; 0A

R7 Addendum 2: The Forum believes that the Girton Interchange needs upgrading to accommodate full movements from the A428 onto the M11. This would be the most beneficial traffic improvement in the area, and would significantly reduce congestion on Madingley Hill.

R7 Addendum 2 passed:

19F; 0A

Project Board Response

The Project Board agrees that any on road option recommended to the City Deal Board for preferred option development should – as part of that development – include further consideration of the J13 bridge and how that would support the corridor scheme objectives. Such an assessment would need to consider the economic and transport benefits of improvement of the bridge and also the environmental impact.

The Project Board considers that it has responded to the issue of demand management as part of its response to R1.

The Project Board considers that the Girton Interchange is not within the scope of the A428-A1303 project nor the Western Orbital. It does however recognise, in line with the County Councils representations to Highways England on this matter, that there could be strategic benefit in further consideration of this issue as part of the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway work currently being undertaken by Highways England. The Project Board understands that the County Council in its role as highway authority continues to engage with Highways England on this matter. The Project Board agrees that the A428-A1303 and Western Orbital Project Managers will provide assistance to Highways England in exploring this matter.

R8 deleted: The Forum supports a new Park and Ride along the A428 corridor. However should the City Deal Board select the Madingley Mulch Roundabout for a Park and Ride location, the Forum would object as it considers Scotland Farm to be a better location.

R8 replacement: The Forum recommends that City Deal Officers to work with Smarter Cambridge Transport to discuss alternative Park & Ride sites and Transport Hubs for the A428 corridor.

R8 passed.

15F; 0A

Project Board Response

As part of the project development work undertaken on the A428 corridor a number of Park & Ride locations were considered. The conclusion of these assessments were that small transport hubs were not precluded by the provision of a strategic Park & Ride but that they could not replace such a Park & Ride. Reasons included the operational and bus service planning benefits of a single Park & Ride and the need to provide capacity for future growth of the corridor. The Project Board agrees that as part of preferred option development smaller hubs in addition to a strategic Park & Ride site can be considered if a positive case for such hubs can be made. The Project Board instructs the Project Manager to engage with Smarter Cambridge to discuss specific proposals for transport hubs as part of the scheme development process for the preferred option.

R9: Should a Park and Cycle site be approved at J12 by the City Deal Board, the Forum considers that the locations proposed by Barton Parish Council to be safer and easier to access.

R9 passed.

XXF; XXA

Project Board Response

The Project Board instructs the Project Manager of the Western Orbital to engage with Barton Parish Council to discuss future Park and Cycle sites at J12 if such a proposal forms part of a preferred option recommendation.

R10: The Forum recognises the peak time traffic problems on the A10 South, and supports Harston and Hauxton Parish Councils in asking officers to investigate siting the new Park and Ride south of Harston instead of at Hauxton. Foxton is suggested with its train station offering a choice of travel.

R10 passed.

15F; 0A

Project Board Response

The development of Park & Ride options at on the A10 south corridor forms part of the Western Orbital scheme development. This included a consultation in early 2016. In this consultation the proposal was made for a Park & Ride at J11 immediately to the west of the junction. The proposal was based on both the existing land option which the County Council has on this site and an assessment of the benefits of a site close to the M11 to intercept traffic both north and eastbound. Consideration of a Park & Ride at Foxton formed part of the assessment process but has been ruled out because it will not capture north bound traffic, has high operational costs due its distance from Cambridge, has no clear suitable available land site and would have limited benefit for bus priority. The Project Board agrees that any proposal for a Park & Ride on the A10 corridor as a preferred option should be subject to a full environmental and traffic assessment and that there should be ongoing engagement with the local Parish councils regarding local impacts.