

Cambridge South East Transport Local Liaison Forum Meeting

Monday 1 June 2020

The meeting was held via Zoom Webinar

A recording of the meeting can be watched on [YouTube](#).

The presentations can be downloaded from the [project's LLF page](#).

1. Welcome and Introductions – Councillor Tony Orgee

Tony Orgee welcomed all attendees to the Cambridge South East Transport Local Liaison Forum Meeting.

Panellists for this evening's forum meeting include:

Councillor Tony Orgee (chair of the LLF)
Councillor John Batchelor (vice-chair of the LLF)
Councillor Roger Hickford (Deputy Leader Cambridgeshire County Council, Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board Member)
Andrew Munro (Greater Cambridge Partnership)
Jane Osayimwen (Greater Cambridge Partnership)
Paul Hinsley (Greater Cambridge Partnership)
Oliver Daffarn (Mott MacDonald)
Michael Payne (Mott MacDonald)
James Montgomery (Mott MacDonald)
Colin Harwood (Mott MacDonald)
Sarah Bearpark ((Mott MacDonald)
Alasdair McWilliams ((Greater Cambridge Partnership)
Michaela Headland (Greater Cambridge Partnership)
Benjamin Thorndyke (note taker, Greater Cambridge Partnership)

2. Phase 1 Progress Report & Recommendations – Paul Hinsley & Oliver Daffarn

- Questions
 1. **Q:** Why was scheme 5 underpass at Wandlebury, cancelled?
A: Poor VFM, Location revised to avoid ecology constraints and in that location an alternative crossing was possible.
 2. **Q:** (Amanda Taylor) scheme 5 underpass was chosen out of range of options for pedestrians and cycles. Why cancelled as had strong, local support?
A: Due to ecological concerns, relocated further downhill and cost (£2.4m) of underpass was high in relation to amount of users. New location is no different. Discussed with Board and at

stakeholder workshop at Copley Business Park on 16 October 2019. Provision was also challenged by Cambridgeshire CC.

- 3. Q:** (James Littlewood) scheme 3, Linton Greenway. Sections 2 – 5 completed but CPPF hasn't seen latest design stage, and could this be shared with stakeholders?
A: Regarding section 2, comments picked up from Copley Business Park event and will go through with others.
- 4. Q:** (Sam Davies) Scheme 5 – surprised to hear about underpass disappearing and design of section 1 finalised, without inclusion of residents of Queen Edith's.
A: Will check comments were taken on board but further consultations will take place and sorry if felt left out of discussions.
- 5. Q:** (Robert Atwood) been no mention of Babraham High St junction so far
A: Able to go out to site very soon. Delay due to CCC working on Fendon Rd roundabout and COVID.
- 6. Q:** (Geoff Hale) Scheme 4, Haverhill, Magog Farm Shop junction. Planning application gone in but what dates are comments needed by?
A: Docs submitted so should be able to receive comments this month from Cambridgeshire CC.
- 7. Q:** New, dual use cycle and walk way has appeared behind Addenbrooke's but has not been finished and has a dangerous exit
A: This was a planning obligation by Hill re: Ninewells development. Completion inhibited due to CCC and Fendon Road, as above.

Comment from Tony: emphasised importance of speaking to local representatives and ensuring design work is shared with local communities and that they are involved from the start and kept informed.

Andrew apologised, will take comments on board and ensure we communicate better and with all proposals moving forwards. Said there have been changes to team and consultants.

- 8. Q:** (Sheila Balden) Has P&R been finalised to be at Babraham?
A: On slides, this relates to an extension of existing site.
- 9. Q:** (John Burns) in relation to scheme 14. Stagecoach has not talked about extra buses and concerned that there are 600 new homes planned for Haverhill.
A: Timings of buses and amount of services being considered, along with how buses get in and out of Linton and a bus lane there.
- 10. Q:** (Barbara Kettel) Have not been consulted or kept up to date on changes such as Linton Greenway Wandlebury crossing
A: LLFs took place in 2018 and have been in discussions with directly affected stakeholders. Stapleford PC were invited to Copley Hill workshop via clerk.
- 11. Q:** (Clare Arthurs) Seen public comments following consultations on busway through Great Shelford etc, but how will you be responding to affected communities?

A: This questions will be answered later in the meeting when the Phase 2 proposals are being discussed.

12. Q: (John Batchelor) Lots of questions in Q&A, so trust officers will reply to these?

A: Yes.

13. Q: (Brian Mills): Last LLF meeting at Homerton College, neither member of Parish Council or LLF member have I seen further information/consultation.

3. Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro Update – Andrew Munro

1. Q: (Howard Kettel) Is bus option set in stone vs light rail? Believe the cost difference is not that great. A bus is difficult to mace via COVID whereas a tram would be easier to manage.

A: Decision still with CA but believe they are in favour of rubber tyred option. Light rail cost would be prohibitive. Don't agree in relation there being major differences to COVID.

2. Q: (Barbara Kettel): Yet to see costing in relation to light rail

3. Q: (John Grant) Re: light rail work in Coventry for smaller cities and danger particulates from rubber tyres, so do need to look at it.

A: Mott MacDonald is aware of Coventry but not a proven technology yet. Our fleet of vehicles would be quite small and a big improvement from using cars. Should be best directed to Mayor and CA for decisions.

4. Phase 2 Options Assessment – Michael Payne

1. Q: (Howard Kettel) Asking for two years into feasibility into rail option. Where is comparison and how do you cost for loss of green land/hills?

A: Appointed rail experts via Mott MacDonald. Long answer given by Andrew. Environmental options considered for both routes/options. Different kinds of impacts.

2. Q: (Brian) Comparison between routes. Some places like Little Shelford will be too far away from stops.

A: Tried to strike a balance in relation to journey times and stops. Aim to intersect current buses to travel to travel hubs. Also didn't want to demolish any residential buildings.

3. Q: (John Burns) What modelling is being done, as concerned that with amount of new homes planned for Haverhill, people will use new service but they will be full by the time they get to Stapleford area?

A: Nature of new scheme means would be easily to add additional services if required and run direct routes from Haverhill to Granta Park, for example.

4. Q: (Russ Moore) Looks like 90% of people in Great Shelford and Stapleford are nearer to existing train station. Should be serving area that doesn't have a service, to warrant cost and damage to environment. Where is evidence people from here want this?

A: Have looked into route along A1307. If it were built here it would run into more sensitive areas and no intermediate demand between Babraham Research Campus and Biomedical campus and wouldn't serve Stapleford or Sawston at all. Will serve a much larger amount of people. It brings people not in easy reach of rail within reach of high quality public transport.

5. **Q:** (Jim McBride) If we end up with shortlisted route, what can be done to mitigate visual aspect? Could it be lower than actual land?

A: Design would take in existing landscape to introduce planting which would be sympathetic, such as hedgerows. Screening options exist and more work will be done to look at view points and low bunds? Deep cutting unlikely due to visual impact and cost.

6. **Q:** (Rees Lough) Can't think the scheme will provide much benefit to those in Stapleford area. People would rather see connections to P&R and cycle routes

A: Preferred route will also incorporate a dedicated shared use path too and a lot of people will be nearer to a stop than they are to the current rail station at Great Shelford.

7. **Q:** (Geoff Hale) Does business case need to be re-assessed in light of COVID or a hold put on?

A: Number of stages to go through and so far just seeking recommendations before business cases drawn up and more stages to come, such as public inquiry and scrutiny by Department for Transport. Too soon to say what COVID will mean in relation to transport needs.

8. **Q:** (James Littlewood) Now that a preferred P&R site has been chosen and as the brown and the purple route are not so radically different, whether both options could be kept on the table for the EIA stage? Don't want a do nothing option for this scheme.

A: Business cases always need a low cost option. We further plan to refine proposals and detailed locations and a hybrid option and keen to work with stakeholders including yourselves on development the route.

9. **Q:** (John Latham) Hobsons Conduit Trust – want to engage and have discussions at an early stage. Please include and engage with us.

A: Will do.

10. **Q:** (Barbara Kettel) Being used at sacrificial lamb as scheme will not help people living in Great Shelford and Stapleford. Please then don't give us any bus stops as nobody here would use this service.

A: Buses will be direct into Cambridge. Providing stops as evidence proves this is what people want. If further modelling shows this is not necessary, then we'll review.

5. Phase 2 Public Consultation – Andrew Munro

No questions were received.

6. Phase 2 Preferred Option Recommendations – Michael Payne

1. **Q:** (John Burns) Concerns about cost ratio and little publicity in Haverhill and confusion over event location.
A: Apologies re: confusion. Andrew gives detailed answer into cost ratio. Three consultation events held in Haverhill

2. **Q:** (Robert Atwood) Discrepancy re: route into Babraham via Honey Suckle Lane.
A: Just a drafting issue as route yet to be determined

7. Next Steps – Jane Osayimwen

No questions were received.