

Response to Cambourne to Cambridge LLF Outcomes and Questions – 6 June 2019

Environmental advice to GCP

To answer your initial question, I believe the ‘misrepresentation’ referred to was in relation to Natural England and Historic England consultation responses cited within the December Board paper. We have previously responded on this issue in response to the LLF Technical Group’s ‘Review of Peter Blake’s Report to Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly’. The [response is published online](#) on the LLF webpages.

The stakeholder responses to the Phase 1 consultation were published in full on the GCP website in March 2018, including responses from National Trust and Natural England. The Historic England letter was included at a later date, as this was received after the close of consultation. The relevant link is below.

<https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/download/7639/C2C%20Stakeholder%20Responses%202017%20redacted%20%28copy%205%29.xlsx?type=inline>.

Printed full versions of stakeholder responses were also provided to all Executive Board members, as is the case with all consultation responses.

1. The Phase 2 consultation process

- **The depiction of the off-road phase 1 route in the consultation literature, as though it had been definitely decided upon, was thought to be misleading.**

As any scheme progresses towards Outline Business Case, a range of options are assessed so that a preferred option can be identified. At the 6th December GCP Executive Board, Board members noted the assessment and recommendation of the project team, which presented the off-road Phase 1 route as the best performing against the project’s objectives, and approved continuing work to further develop an end-to-end route on this basis.

As the Phase 2 consultation information made clear, following assessment and taking on board consultation feedback, the Phase 1 off-road route was assessed as the best-performing in line with project objectives, and further developed to present a recommended Specific Route Alignment (SRA), which is the indicative alignment presented on Phase 2 maps. This SRA was presented within [Executive Board papers for the 6 December meeting](#) and in a subsequent [Project Update](#) issued to key stakeholders by email and available online.

In order to provide a wider public audience for Phase 2 consultation with project background and status, this indicative route is also presented in consultation materials and, subsequent to being noted as the best performing option, is now

subject to ongoing further assessment in advance of an Outline Business Case for a full end-to-end scheme being presented in the Autumn. The consultation materials also signpost further information regarding assessment and alignment of the route, which has been available online since early December on the Cambourne to Cambridge section of the GCP website –

<https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/cambourne-to-cambridge/cambourne-to-cambridge-the-route/>

This point was also been addressed in correspondence with Coton Parish Council on both 20th February 2019 and 19th April 2019.

Request 1: The LLF asks GCP to check the measurements along St Neots Road, and henceforth ensure that drawings and indicative diagrams are drawn to scale and accurate so that residents can be confident about the implications of what is being proposed.

The request regarding drawing scale is noted and understood.

Drawings used to date have been indicative because they represent only possible solutions, prepared to support stakeholder engagement, and should not be interpreted as representing designed solutions.

As plans progress a greater level of detail and accuracy will be needed for any preferred scheme, which will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.

It is important to note that until a detailed design has been prepared based on a full topographical survey of the area, plans must continue to be marked “Not to Scale”.

Request 2: The LLF asks GCP to reconsider their plans along St Neot’s Road in light of the impact on the residents there.

We are very aware of concerns of St Neots Road residents and will continue meeting with the Parish Council and Hardwick residents at other community events to take on board concerns and seek to address these as the scheme develops.

Levels of traffic will be marginal on the C2C scheme when considered in the context of A428 traffic volumes and provision of public transport on the corridor will help to manage future traffic growth on the A428.

Current screening is poor and better noise screening has the potential to mitigate noise to some degree. Visually, planted screening will be provided where possible, and in general the C2C and A428 traffic lanes will be at different levels, avoiding a single block of tarmac.

Request 2a The LLF also asks GCP to clarify the noise, pollution and safety implications of the options along St Neot’s Road.

The impact of (air) pollution should be minimal. The only additional vehicles on the St Neots Road associated with the scheme will be public transport vehicles. Both the

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the GCP intend that electric vehicles, which generate only very low levels of air pollution, should be used.

The safety of all design features will be subject to Road Safety Audit to ensure compliance with current design guidance. This will cover issues such as the need for final layouts of planting and other features to ensure adequate visibility.

Noise should not be significantly impacted given the small number of vehicles on the C2C scheme and there is potential for improvement on current levels with provision of bunds and better barriers to block A428 noise.

We will continue to work with local residents to identify specific concerns and seek to address these as the scheme develops. Noise and air quality will be covered in the Environmental Impact Assessment which will be prepared to support any future application for powers to construct the scheme.

2. Environment and Landscape mitigation

Resolution 1: 10F, 0A, 0Abst

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.

Request 3: The LLF asks GCP to look again at the views, particularly from Madingley Hill over the historic city, as the LLF believes the loss of these views and the damage to the landscape is not being adequately assessed.

Request 4: The LLF asks GCP to set up a further environmental mitigation workshop, but to include all the affected villages along the route.

The support of the LLF is welcome. GCP is committed to ensuring that all landscape matters, including views from Madingley Hill and elsewhere, will be addressed as per WebTAG guidance. The advice of statutory consultees will guide this process.

To that end, as you will be aware, we have established a Landscape and Ecology Working Group which includes experts from CPPF and the National Trust, and we will work with this group to address, in greater detail, some of the specific landscape issues, including your concerns.

Two environment and landscape drop-in sessions are planned for July 2019 and residents of all affected villages are encouraged to participate and we would be happy to set up further LLF Technical Group session, if required.

3. Northern route via Girton

Resolution 2: 10F, 0A, 0Ab

LLF resolution in relation to Northern Alignment:

- **Welcomed opportunity to discuss a viable Northern Alignment route**

- **Disappointed that the MM 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 (ie the longer route length) given the potential for greater patronage and modal shift were a P & R located there.**

Request 5: The LLF asks GCP to work with the technical group to investigate the feasibility, economic and environmental benefits of the northern bus route as proposed by the LLF. The work undertaken to date is neither deliverable by GCP nor focused on possible bus options.

The issue of a northern alignment route has been previously covered in correspondence with LLF members in May 2019. This has also been discussed in previous Technical Group workshops.

As you're aware, in response to LLF feedback, the project team has also already undertaken work to provide further clarification on reasons why a northern alignment was previously discounted. Technical papers are available on the [LLF webpages of the C2C section on the GCP site](#). If there are outstanding issues regarding a northern alignment as proposed by the LLF, we would be happy to review.

As covered in previous meetings and correspondence, GCP has lobbied for enhancement to [Girton Interchange as part of Highways England Roads Investment Strategy](#). Any change of HE's position on Girton would be complementary to GCP's aims, but would not meet the objectives of the C2C project.

GCP is tasked to address existing and growing congestion problems on the A428/A1303 and support future growth. Further housing is planned at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield, along with the current growth at Eddington and anticipated growth on the West Cambridge site. The Cambourne to Cambridge project seeks to address these challenges, as well as reducing traffic on the A1303 through Junction 13, and providing an alternative to the need to pass through Junction 13.

4. On-road solution on Madingley Road

Resolution 3: 10F, 0A, 0Ab

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

Request 6: The LLF asks GCP to work with the technical group to optimise further the low-cost on-road option taking into consideration the hybrid scheme proposed by the LLF.

An optimised on-road solution was developed incorporating LLF feedback and assessed against the off-road option in 2017.

GCP provided the LLF Technical Group with a response to Gabriel Fox's proposed hybrid scheme, a route which includes the off-road section opposed above, in an email and attachment sent on 4th June.

That response makes clear that Dr Fox's assessment of road widths are inaccurate, and that the assertion that a continuous on-road bus lane could be accommodated without taking property frontage on Madingley Road is unsubstantiated.

If there are outstanding issues regarding a hybrid alignment as proposed by the LLF, we would be happy to review.