

✉ Postal Address:
FREEPOST CAM CONSULTATION

☎ 01223 608001
@ cam@consultation-online.co.uk



Date: 23rd April 2021
Contact: 01353 667721
Email: james.palmer@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk

Three Tuns House
109 Borough High Street
London, SE1 1NL

The Mayor's Office
72 Market Street
Ely, CB7 4LS

Dear Phil

C2C Audit

Please see our comments on the Assumptions and Constraints document, below:

A&C Register ref.	CAM comment
A. Policy Context, general	<p>The policy context for these assumptions and constraints relies upon out-of-date policies or policies which have not been translated into the Local Transport Plan. The assumptions and constraints are therefore based upon incorrect policy foundations. There are two key concerns about policies within the Assumptions and Constraints document.</p> <p>(1) Some older strategies are obsolete. The <i>Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, March 2014</i> was made under the former Local Transport Plan by the Cambridgeshire County Council. This Transport Plan was replaced by the current Local Transport Plan and the earlier policies became defunct.</p> <p>(2) Some newer strategies have yet been incorporated into the current Local Transport Plan and therefore are not 'strategies' but guidance documents. For example, reliance is placed upon <i>Transport Evidence Report. Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Strategy and Funding Team, November 2020</i>, which is a factual summary of evidence and modelling for part of the local plan process and not a policy or strategy. Transport Strategy has been the remit of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority since 2017 and is no longer that of the Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> <p>Further exploration of the basis for the transport evidence to support this scheme and its relation to the current Local Transport Plan is required. Should the link between the current development of the GCP routes and the Local Transport Plan not be evident, there is a risk that the scheme will work towards objectives which are not achievable through the Local Transport Plan, for example restriction of traffic through the City Centre or charging schemes.</p>
A.1	Constraint: this is not a constraint but a statement of fact
A.6	The paper, which was published via the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 8 th July 2020 entitled 'CAM Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority Cambridge to Cambourne Review Against CAM Sub Strategy' concluded that C2C

	<p>does not fully meet twelve of the CAM Sub-Objectives, and in turn does not support the four main objectives. In order for C2C to meet the objectives, it would need to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commit to electric / zero emission vehicles 2. Connect to the EWR Station at Cambourne, preferably via a segregated route around Cambourne. (We are aware that, whilst EW Rail is at options stage, provision cannot be made, and that GCP recognise this and ongoing discussions will be held as EW Rail plans develop), plus segregation into Cambridge City 3. Be future proofed for CAM vehicles 4. Provide a Metro-style service 5. Minimise potential environmental impacts, particularly around Coton and Westfields.
A.7	The actual constraint is not identified. As above, the constraint here is that C2C needs to enable integration with EWR and currently does not.
A.8	There is no constraint identified here; C2C needs to complement the upgraded A428, so the constraint should note the interchange proposed at Scotland Farm transport hub.
A.9	The constraint is not identified. The constraint is a need for integration with EWR, which is not currently provided for.
B.4	Whilst we recognise the 'pinch points' identified in the Constraints column, we note that greater impacts in terms of 'pinch point' will be felt on the elements of the scheme that are not currently segregated i.e., past Bourn Airfield into Cambourne and into Cambridge City to the East. These are not listed in this document.
B.4	Assumption – note that C2C is not fully segregated. If this statement is assumed, what other elements of the scheme does this assumption impact upon.
B.5	Is this a true constraint of C2C. If this is, what measures are being undertaken here? We also note that GCP does not have the powers to deliver the public transport component of City Access, which rest with CPCA.
B.6	We note there are comments in the Arup report, which are not identified here. As such, the constraint statements are incomplete and so should not be taken out of context.
B.6 and C.1	Constraint implies that the vehicle operating on the C2C corridor will be autonomous/ electric/hydrogen/ sustainable. Is this the case?
C.1	Constraints: Is an integrated ticketing solution with C2C across the wider public transport network deliverable?
D.2	We suggest that this is re-worded regarding the statement that Bourn is “fully dependent” on C2C. We note that the Bourn development is dependent on adequate public transport provision at appropriate timings, of which C2C is part.
E.1	We agree with the first line. We would suggest the remainder of this paragraph is removed as it is not an accurate statement regarding the status of CAM.
E.2	The text in the Constraints column discusses the northern alignment but this is not a constraint of C2C, and as such, should be removed.
E.3	The text in the Constraints column should be re-worded as an assumption, stating ‘any elements of incompatibility between C2C and the wider CAM will be addressed by the CAM overlay project’.
E.3	There is no mention of the connection to Cambourne centre and EW Rail. We suggest that an assumption should be made regarding how this will be addressed.

✉ Postal Address:
FREEPOST CAM CONSULTATION

☎ 01223 608001
@ cam@consultation-online.co.uk



JAMES PALMER
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR



F – options selection, general	We do not understand how the text regarding optioneering is a statement of a constraint. The key constraint is that the C2C follow a rigorous and robust, evidence-based evaluation methodology, for example documenting the change from the Adam’s Road route to the Rifle Range route.
F.1	The last sentence ‘options following alignments for the CAM and EWR were not evaluated’. We suggest this should be re-worded to ‘options regarding the connection of C2C to CAM and EWR were not evaluated....’
L.1	Assumption should be that the impact of covid will not negatively affect the benefits of the scheme and the scheme remains viable.
General	Consider including an assumption that first/last mile provision will be delivered separately to C2C.

Further to comments above, we also note a misalignment of constraints and assumptions within the document, and that some constraints actually appear to be assumptions, as currently written. Consequently, we found this document very challenging to review and assess and consequently we cannot verify that it conclusively covers all the assumptions and constraints regarding C2C and CAM. For example, A5, the assumption discusses climate change, but constraint does not mention climate change.

Yours sincerely,

James Palmer
Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough