Questions for the Cambourne to Cambridge Local Liaison Forum 8/12/20

LLF/Public question

Question to Peter Blake:

The residents of the 102 homes located on St Neots Road no doubt selected their homes carefully with their long-term futures at the forefront of their minds. For the past 5 years, since the GCP announced their chosen route, those homes have been blighted and the residents have been living in fear of being placed in a situation similar to London's North Circular Road with 8 lanes of live traffic running directly past their properties. This is akin to purgatory and is not seen anywhere else in the County, rarely in the Country, let alone in a village in South Cambridgeshire.

The LLF has been asking for many months for detailed plans and elevations of your proposals but none have been forthcoming and despite your assurance that many trees would remain post construction and that adequate land was available we now find that neither is the case; that virtually all the mature trees will be cut down and you are negotiating with Highways England to purchase some of their land as the available land is inadequate for your purposes.

It is, in my view, completely unacceptable to leave the 100+ families in such purgatory and I

GCP answer

The C2C scheme has been paused for some time, the project team stood down and during this time no work has taken place. This was a recommendation from the LLF earlier this year. There have been no discussions with Highways England.

More detailed plans and elevations can be prepared if the Board agrees to the recommendations. As soon as we are in a position to share detailed designs we will do so.

Subject to Board agreement, the Partnership will proceed to undertake an independent audit. The process will be fully transparent and as more detail is available this would be shared.

The audit will review the assumptions and constraints that underpin the outline business case for C2C scheme and the elimination of alternative options, including consideration of the evidence submitted to date.

As Cllr Chamberlain is aware, previous to this delay, GCP officers regularly attended Hardwick Parish Council meetings and held a number of events in Hardwick to hear and respond to resident's concerns. Planned attendance at a summer Hardwick PC meeting was postponed when the scheme was paused.

now look to you to provide those detailed maps and elevations together with assurances that the proposed audit will be required to operate in a manner which is balanced and considers the impact upon residents central to its objectives. Will you take the opportunity this evening to assure residents that their best interests will be at the heart of the audit and EIA in due course should it proceed?

1. Despite GCP statements regarding appraisal of alternative routes, and working with the LLF in the current papers, it is shocking that no CAM compliant alternative to the GCP's preferred route has been looked at. The public's views have been disregarded, inferior alternative schemes have been put forward and the LLF has been persistently side-lined by the GCP. The statement that 'the CPCA has no mandate to progress further with proposals' demonstrates a lack of willingness to work with the CPCA in a constructive manner. The GCP has never seriously considered a route following existing transport corridors to Girton and down into Eddington and has made only weak representations to Highways England to resolve congestion on the A1303 with an all-ways junction at Girton.

How will the GCP justify this when it come to a Public Inquiry and the GCP is asked to GCP has consistently applied the DfT TAG approach to scheme development and examined and sifted a number of alternative routes including on-road routes and northern options suggested by stakeholders. Full evidence of assessment of alternatives are published online.

GCP has previously petitioned Highways England to put the case for work to upgrade to Girton Interchange and enable movement between west and south. However, at present there are no plans for further works at Girton for the foreseeable future.

GCP has, and will continue to work closely, with the CPCA on transport matters, including;

- the review of the C2C scheme in 2018 when the CPCA consultants concluded that the GCP process was "robust" and that the appropriate route had been chosen
- Earlier this year CPCA consultants concluded that a northern route alternative was more expensive and performed less favourably against the GCP alternative

demonstrate a requirement for a greenbelt location for a new transport corridor?

It is disappointing and misleading to see the shocking degree of poetic licence in the current GCP C2C papers. There is a lack of rigour that borders on incompetence.

Travel to work data is based on 2011 0NS figures. This data was collected before much of the current growth had occurred on the biomedical campus and the science Park. Where is the evidence that residents to the west of Cambridge will wish to travel to Grange Road by bus? There has been a trend towards homeworking particularly in high-tech industries, city stores are closing and going into administration. On page 159 of the papers in the employer's travel to work since Covid-19 survey it states 'The majority of respondents indicated that employees would be travelling for work 'less than pre-Covid-19 in 3 to 5 years' time'. On page 57, 1.13 it is stated that there has been' a short term (but there is no evidence for this being only short term) 'move away from public transport but that the case for schemes such as C2C will be stronger as a result of COVID-19'.

From where have you obtained your evidence for this extraordinary statement?

In a context where confidence in public transport has been eroded and people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode, the need to provide quality, reliable public transport options to encourage people out of private vehicles and avoid future pressure on the network is stronger.

In Greater Cambridge, people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode and morning and afternoon travel peaks have returned.

For C2C, the case for providing public transport, cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities in the Local Plan to the west of the city remains.

We will continue to monitor the impacts of COVID, draw on emerging data and review the project's business case in advance of application once more is known.

However, there remains an urgent need to progress planning to provide better, reliable public transport and cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities.

The project is one of four public transport routes that together create vital links between new developments in the Local Plan and key employment hubs including West Cambridge, City Centre, Biomedial Campus and Science Park.

Services will not stop or terminate at Grange Road, as has been made clear previously. This project has an adjusted BCR of 0.48. The Highways & Transport Committee of the County Council According to DfT guidance this reflects poor considered the Chisholm Trail project last week – As has been widely value for money. The indicative monetised reported, they acknowledged that the County Council was leading & impacts calculation in the appendix is based on delivering the scheme and that project shortcomings led to the supposition and has high levels of uncertainty. problems. The projected cost of this project is £195 million (in 2010 prices, according to Mott MacDonald The GCP does have a responsibility to safeguard public money Jan 2020). My question is in three parts: The OBC will be reviewed and where appropriate revisited to reflect: EWR and CAM at the point that these are confirmed schemes In the light of recent overspends on GCP relevant longer term impacts of COVID once more is known infrastructure projects what is the upper limit of an expected update to DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance confidence of overspend on this project? If the project overspends to the same extent as the GCP's portion of the Chisholm Trail what would be the projected overspend? Does the GCP team not have a responsibility to safeguard public money and revisit their already pitiful BCR in light of the pandemic and East/West Rail? Requesting that officers initiate the process of The Board report makes clear that public consultation is an integral an environmental impact assessment ahead of part of the EIA process and would only proceed subject to the an independent audit review on only one outcome of the audit, thus not predetermined. compliant option indicates clear predetermination. The GCP has repeatedly GCP has looked at a number of alternative routes including on-road failed to recognize the environmental impact of routes and options suggested by stakeholders. Full evidence of their preferred route on the Cambridge greenbelt assessment of alternatives are published online.

and villages of Hardwick and Coton. The route will destroy hundreds of mature trees, pass in close proximity to over 100 houses, traverse open fields, National Trust land, CPPF land, and a 100 year old Orchard. It will open the greenbelt up to development. The suggestion that any aspect of this scheme will insure positive biodiversity net gain (P80) is laughable.

Alternative routes following established transport corridors have never been properly assessed. Why not?

The lack of depth in analysis of the potential effect of East West Rail on the already weak business case for the GCP's preferred option is astounding. Once there is a train travelling from the direction of St Neots through Cambourne directly to the biomedical campus and on to the city centre, what incentive will there be to take a bus to Grange Road?

What evidence is there for the statement on page 67 6.22 that 'it is unlikely that EWR will have an impact on the core business case for C2C?

However, the recommended preferred route to the south of the A428 has been determined to best meet the scheme objectives.

Stakeholders and residents have asked to see more evidence of environmental impacts and need further confidence in the route assessment process. For that reason, in order to make some progress in the face of the significant delay to the project to date, we are recommending that officers should commence the technical work for an Environmental Impact Assessment and a further independent audit be undertaken, the results of which would be reported back to the Board in July.

Biodiversity net gain is not something which a single aspect of the scheme delivers but is a principle to ensure a net gain at scheme and programme level.

The C2C route supports growth in the Local Plan and is specifically required to unlock development at the New Village at Bourn Airfield of approximately 3,500 homes. This position was acknowledged in the Local Plan Inquiry.

The EWR project, which is not yet a committed project, will support delivery of 1m additional homes in the OxCam Arc over a much longer timeframe.

The C2C project is one of four public transport routes that together create vital links between new developments in the Local Plan and key employment hubs across the city including the City Centre, Biomedical Campus and Science Park, and, in the future, can form an integral part of the CPCA's CAM network.

	GCP's plans are continually reviewed to ensure compliance with local strategies and have been designed to be adaptable to developing CAM proposals. Going forward, officers are committed to continuing close working with the CPCA and also with East West Rail to ensure alignment with the emerging Bedford to Cambridge route and Cambourne station location.
	Integration is a key part of the C2C project. At this point in time, EWR have still not determined a station location and, indeed, there is no formal commitment to delivery of this section of EWR. As EWR proceeds, we will continue to work with them to ensure that the schemes are mutually supportive. EWR have stated a commitment to "integrate with proposed improvements to the local transport network in south Cambridgeshire such as the busway extension"
 What is the expected height of the Bin Brook flyover over the height of the current bridge? May we have copies of side elevations of the proposed bridge that have been produced in internal documents? 	The bridge would be around 2m higher than the current bridge This will be developed as part of the next detailed design process and will be informed by topographical surveys and dialogue with the Environment Agency.
We believe that it's inconceivable these two questions cannot be answered at this stage. This information should be provided to the communities impacted.	
The last report that discusses possible bus routes that might use the C2C infrastructure suggests only a single route will, in fact, use the section of C2C over the West Fields. Other routes suggested use Madingley Road or come via the M11. (C2C- Jan 2020 - App 1 - Bus Strategy Report)	The AM Inbound data is provided because it is the morning peak hour which currently causes the greatest problems. The Do-Minimum assumes buses continue to Drummer Street as they do now.

The agenda pack from 30th Jan only provides details of inbounded timings, even for the evening peak.(page 127 - Table 4: C2C preferred option benefits vs Do Minimum (DM)).

- 1. Would officers agree that the report should show timings for outbound travel from Drummer Street, as well as inbound (particularly for the evening peak)?
- 2. Could officers provide an update to table 4 to show figures for outbound travel? Could officers also provide details of the DM route and references for the source data?

We note in the GCP Board papers that the mayor's efforts to develop a northern route for the c2c scheme seem to have been blocked. An alignment via a Park & Ride at the Girton Interchange would seem to have a number of benefits, including:

- Passengers coming from the north and midlands (A14/M11)
- Passengers from Eddington and Girton
- Shorter shuttle route to P&R for operators (for inner CAM)
- Maintains new infrastructure within existing infrastructure corridor

Do officers agree?

A route and Park & Ride at Girton Interchange may well have benefits for those coming in from the north and midlands.

GCP has previously <u>petitioned Highways England in correspondence</u> and <u>meetings to put the case for work to upgrade to Girton</u>
Interchange and enable movement between west and south.

However a route/Park and Ride at Girton:

- does not best support developments primarily south of the A428 - longer and more expensive
- would not be accessible from the A428 west without major changes at Girton Interchange which are not currently planned

As part of a full and transparent appraisal process, compliant with DfT guidance, the GCP has readily and regularly considered, documented and published deliberation of alternative routes, including northern alignments and proposals from stakeholders. All are published online.

Alternative northern routes were recently discussed at the Combined Authority's Transport & Infrastructure Committee on 4 November when it was confirmed that northern routes were more expensive and performed less favourably than the current GCP proposal. The CPCA T&I Committee did not support the northern alignment and an alternative proposal has not at this point been put forward by the CPCA to the Executive Board. Can GCP officers assure the LLF that an Public consultation is an integral, substantial part of the EIA and will Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the not take place until after the audit reports. 'preferred option' will not be progressed until the Independent Audit is completed? To do so After a lengthy delay, we are recommending that an officer team be would send a strong signal to the public that the reinstated and initiate work on design and the process of an proposed Audit is simply being set up to validate **Environmental Impact Assessment.** GCP's work to date. Also, in the event of 'preferred route' being shown to be non-optimal. Many questions asked by the public can only be answered with the having progressed with the EIA on a nonevidence gathered as part of the EIA. optimal route would be an unacceptable waste of public money. Cambourne and its residents urgently need a Bus services using the A428/A1303 are impeded by the congestion which at pre-pandemic levels was already severe, especially in the fast, reliable, and affordable public transport service going to their workplaces. morning peak. The pandemic has undermined confidence in public transport and we know that in Greater Cambridge, people have It has been long time that we had been in static returned to cars more quickly than any other mode and that morning situation because we value the concerns raised and afternoon travel peaks have returned. by the communities affected along the route and C2C proposes a reliable public transport alternative to car use, on a their villages. dedicated route, free from congestion for people travelling to the West Cambridge site and onwards, including the City Centre, Biomedical Campus and Science Park.

Cambourne Town Council supports the proposed off-road solution and Town council had never favoured any specific route.

County Councillor Mark Howell and I met the directors of the local bus authorities a few times and I always prefer a revised, regular bus system covering more key destinations and routes which are also cheaper.

Bus services were criticised being slow because of their long routes and covering as many as destinations by one single bus. That can be easily solved having fast efficient office going routes through existing roads i.e. by using the roads which we already have.

Regarding, the proposed busway for Cambourne, it may save a few minutes, but it won't solve the problems unless the bus-way covers the Science Park, Addenbrooke's, railway-stations like St Neots or Cambridge, Biomedical Campus etc. People will rely on the cars if they must change the buses twice or thrice for reaching work.

Initially, I thought, busway alongside A428 without disturbing the villages in South Cambridgeshire might help, but, then I realised that people will still use their cars unless they have the good connections for the destinations they need to travel.

A public transport route between Cambourne to Cambridge supports growth outlined in the Local Plan to the south of the A428 and is specifically required to unlock development at the New Village at Bourn Airfield of approximately 3,500 homes.

Unless we offer the people the right service with better connections, especially at the office hours, this will not reduce the cars on the roads. I still believe that we are under utilising the existing resources to get an immediate faster solution without affecting the local communities along the route.

When can we focus on better bus routes, using the existing roads and giving the current generation a fast, reliable, and affordable public transport service sooner?

We are currently in the midst of a pandemic. Traffic levels are much reduced and no-one can predict what the traffic levels will look like in 3-5 years. The majority of companies have stated that their employees will not return to the office full time and that working from home will continue.

My questions are therefore;

- 1: Given the above, on what basis have the Officers made the statement that "schemes such as Cambourne to Cambridge will be stronger as a result of Covid-19"?
- 2: How can the GCP continue with a route based on historic and inaccurate data?

In a context where confidence in public transport has been eroded and people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode, the need to provide quality, reliable public transport options to avoid future pressure on the network is stronger.

In Greater Cambridge, people are returning to cars more quickly than any other mode and morning and afternoon travel peaks have returned.

For C2C, the case for providing public transport, cycling and walking connections for new and growing communities in the Local Plan to the west of the city remains.

A public transport route between Cambourne to Cambridge is specifically required to unlock development at the New Village at Bourn Airfield of approximately 3,500 homes.

We will continue to monitor the situation and emerging data. The C2C OBC will be reviewed in advance of application to reflect relevant longer term impacts of COVID once more is known.

3: Why has the whole scheme not been put on hold until we have a clearer view of what the future traffic levels will look like?	The C2C project has been developed over five years and faced significant delay. Without making progress to deliver viable public transport, walking or cycling options, new communities have no alternative to travelling by private vehicle and will add to the pressure on a transport network which was already struggling pre-pandemic.
Q. Why has a northern route been proposed by the Mayor when he must know that a route through the parish of Madingley was discounted in 2016, following 'high level assessment and public consultation' and, again, in 2019 when Mott Macdonald carried out a further assessment for GCP to make quite sure? Natural England and Cambridge University objected because the route was too close to Madingley Wood, an SSSI, and Historic England objected because of the impact on the American Cemetery, the most significant permanent American WW2 memorial in the UK. The Cemetery was created on land given by the University in 1943 and in 1954 Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden promised that 'the area will be restricted to agricultural use'. This is why the A428 had to be put in a cutting.	The GCP proposed route advances a route to the south of the A428, as the most sensitive sites in the C2C corridor lie to the north. A full and transparent Department for Transport (DfT) compliant appraisal process, conducted over five years has narrowed down options in order to present a preferred scheme running primarily offroad to the south of the A428. As confirmed by officers to the November 2020 T&I Committee, the northern alternative is more expensive and performs less favourably than the GCP recommended Preferred Route. The CPCA has not presented an alternative alignment that performs better than the GCP proposals in meeting the objectives of the scheme to serve growing communities and offer a viable alternative to car use to address congestion which is forecast to build on the A1303.
In its various concepts and plans, has the GCP considered an integrated solution for all transport solutions arriving to the north of Cambourne on the A428, ie train, metro and bus? If yes, can you please give details; if not, can you please consider it and give us a	The GCP has considered integrated solutions to the north and south of Cambourne. Integration is a key part of the C2C project and proposals have been designed to be adaptable to emerging CAM and EWR proposals as

timeframe in which you will do so? We believe that creating a travel hub in this location will deliver the fast, reliable and affordable transport that the 12,000 residents of Cambourne, the first town of South Cambridgeshire, need and should be entitled to. they are confirmed, as was demonstrated with the alternative routes at Cambourne in the 2019 phase 2 consultation.

Any interchange with rail services is dependent on EWR's selected station location and GCP officers are liaising closely with both EWR and CPCA officers regarding the future CAM.

GCP is supportive of the principle of a Travel Hub, and to working with EWR, CPCA, CTC and other stakeholders once there is clarity as to the location of the EWR station.

As Cllr Betson is aware, previous to the delay, GCP officers regularly attended Cambourne Town Council meetings and held a number of events in Cambourne. A planned meeting to discuss a potential travel hub with Cambourne Town Council has been postponed for some time due to the need to understand where the EWR station might be.

We welcome the decision of the GCP Board to appoint an internal auditor. This is an opportunity for the Board to build the trust of the local community in the C2C process. For trust to be bult in this way, the audit must be demonstrably independent. For this to be achieved, in our view:

• The audit should be managed by a steering committee (SC), which is made up of people appointed by GCP and the LLF. The auditor should report to the SC, which will have oversight of the audit process including drafting and agreeing the Terms of Reference, selection of the auditor, regular reviews of progress and

Subject to Board agreement, as the scheme promoter, it is right that the GCP Board would lead the audit commissioning process. Written submissions would be welcomed from members of the LLF and any other stakeholder wishing to contribute. The process will be fully transparent and as more detail is available this would be shared.

The audit will review the assumptions and constraints that underpin the outline business case for C2C scheme and the elimination of alternative options, including consideration of the evidence submitted to date.

commenting on reports and other outputs by the auditor.	
The audit should not be restricted to a narrow assessment of whether due process was followed but will look at wider issues of how decisions were made. Do officers agree with this proposal?	
1. How can you justify a business case for a road that does not reach its destination - the City Centre? It is the same as proposing to build a bridge that goes half way across a river.	The scheme forms part of a network across the city and will reach key employment hubs, including the West Cambridge site, City Centre, Biomedical Campus and Science Park.
2. Do you realise what a terrible eyesore your proposed Bin Brook flyover will be, not to mention the huge harm it will cause to Clare Hall?	GCP Officers have already and will continue to be in discussions with Clare Hall to address any concerns.