

## Appendix C

### Rural Travel Hubs Engagement Event – 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017

#### Workshop Summary

##### Q1. What are the factors that influence public transport usage in rural areas?

- Destination is crucial.
- Most buses only go to central Cambridge.
- Milton – majority go North, CBC, East to Marshalls.
- Time and cost both important. Need viable alternatives.
- Issue – existing infrastructure. Broader problems not highlighted because hub is next to existing transport.
- Bus/rail need to be linked.
- Frequency/time. Busway buses full by the time they get to Oakington.
- Bus from Willingham takes over 1 hour.
- Original suggestion was for bus to come off busway loop through village then back onto busway.
- Change buses is off-putting.
- Shepreth people going other way into London.
- On street parking an issue – Shepreth and Foxton.
- Bus connections to Whittlesford.
- DDA compliance of buses.
- Network of routes should not look like a star with Cambridge the centre. The routes should be joined up like a spider web around Cambridge.
- 700 cars per day park at Whittlesford.
- Tram stations.
- Cycle routes.
- Frequency and reliability of service.
- Car usage (acceptance of car usage in rural community).
- Signage and passenger information.
- Example of good signage – Addenbrookes.
- Payment methods.
- Single travel card.
- Overall view of transport integration.
- Park and ride facility.
- Quality and reliability.

Cottenham – stats from neighbourhood plan survey (1000 people):

- 71% shorter journey there
- 48% service to guided bus
- 44% cheaper
- 32% reliable
- 28% frequent to Ely
- 23% Waterbeach
- 21% to north of village
- 19% frequent
- 30 mins to Cambridge for commuters
- Some people happy for longer journeys

Rampton

- There isn't any public transport.
- Can't even get to Cottenham.

Gamlingay

- Having reliable buses where they want to go.
- Not just to Cambridge e.g. Bedford, St Neots.
- Buses not running to the right places.
- Reasonable speed/time, sprint services.
- No changes.
- Cost - Really expensive, much cheaper to drive.
- Need clarity over who will use it.
- View that it should be for people who don't have alternative transport.
- Should be small sprinter buses and link with rail.
- Rural villages - connection points - some people will change if only option.
- Don't have a car park – want to reduce car.
- Hub for buses, cycles and walking.
- An 'intersection'.
- Don't just focus on buses, look at trains.
- Swavesey – Use a mini-bus – most frequent community car scheme trip is one end of village to another.
- Need 30 – 40 Cycle boxes – nominal fee for rent £5 - £10 per month.
- Bus frequency = input need to up frequency.
- Sites must be secure.
- Must level a local network of walking or cycling routes, to get to bus from the village,
- Get taxi info/hot-line payphone.
- Foxton lacks car parking at station, plus bike parking.
- Weather.

## **Q2. What are the factors that influence cycle usage in rural areas?**

- Expensive but good idea to provide safe cycling routes to get to a hub. Currently its dangerous to cycle between villages.
- Ticket machines – need contactless payments.
- Travel to Hub from Swavesey – walked from home or from on-street.
- Safe and direct cycle routes.
- Safe and secure cycle storage.
- 'Greenway' – designated cycle route.
- Safety including lights.
- Lack of public transport.
- Congestion.
- Safe and easy access to cycle paths e.g. busway cycle path.
- More rural cycle ways, off-road would encourage.
- If no buses late in evening.
- Weather.
- Distance to destination.
- Parking.
- Age of cyclist (younger generation apparently more likely to cycle).

### **Q3. What services and facilities would you like to be provided at Rural Travel Hubs?**

- Free car park.
- Café.
- Mobile van – providing space allocated.
- Rent space as a revenue stream.
- Electricity/water supply including electricity charging point.
- Improved signage.
- Designated cycle/pedestrian facilities and NMV (no motor vehicle) routes.
- DDA compliance including Disabled parking.
- Live video stream.
- Toilets – further provision required.
- Suitable residents parking.
- Amazon drop off box.
- Shopping drop off.
- Serviced offices – satellite office.
- Lift.
- Taxi drop off/pick up.
- Bus turning head.
- Secure cycle locking.
- Seating.
- Lighting.
- Staff to use.
- Don't need lots of infrastructure.
- Information about other services.
- Need to be clear what services you are accessing.
- Need an integrated payment system – Zone £1, Zone £2 etc. 'Cambridge Oyster Card'.
- Should be a limited number of stops when you are on the bus – quickly get to Cambridge.
- Buses.
- Shelters for when it rains.

### **Q4. Potential strengths and weaknesses of the Rural Travel Hub concept.**

#### **Strengths**

- More sustainable transport.
- Support rural bus services.
- Reduction in car journeys.
- Encourages local economic growth.
- Car park next to a bus.
- More opportunities for access.
- Could work if done properly could take to a wide selection of destinations.
- Good idea – do pilots and learn.
- Shuttle between hubs (minibus size).
- Villages with traffic problem, hubs could reduce traffic. Benefit to village.
- Avoid movements through a village to the hub. Hubs before traffic or other side of road.

## **Weaknesses**

- Potential increase in traffic.
- More traffic in host villages (perception).
- Not enough Buses anyway.
- Unlikely to lead to modal shift.
- Only for those who can drive anyway.
- Not going to help those who need it.
- Must be part of behaviour change for travel.
- Make sure it doesn't just focus on parking.
- People will use car as an overcoat if convenient.
- Make car park available only for disabled parking.
- Need a total transport service.
- Don't create extra traffic or rat-runs.
- Don't rely on volunteers – must be publicly funded.
- Worry of being stranded.
- Users don't want to go into Cambridge; they want to go to Hertfordshire, Royston, Huntingdon etc.

## **Other comments:**

- Must take growth into account.
- Investing in sprinter service and radial routes would be better investment.
- Don't replicate Swavesey – instead needs to be a network that allows you to get to a variety of locations not just Cambridge.
- What is the question we are trying to solve?
- Method used to prove the concept are not good as an assumption on how to solve the travel issues in the district rather than a full investigation into the problem first. The congestion needs relief; this may not be the answer.
- Need different bus services – regular, use little buses not big double decker's.

## **Other observations from the evening:**

- Buses are an issue in our district and we should be looking at making these work much better for our communities before looking at travel hubs.
- Who looks after travel hub infrastructure, insurance trips etc. lock ups? Is it the Parish Council?
- It's not just about Cambridge, as many other destinations want to be journeyed to. Additionally many users would like to go simply to the next village, to the GP surgery and cannot even do that as things stand.
- Costs on setting all this up could be used to improve bus services.
- Liked the idea over each travel hub being bespoke, this is true as all sites and demographics would be very different. No one size fits all.
- It's impossible to separate the RTH discussion from that of the general state of bus services in the District. Everyone thinks bus services are poor. Everyone wants a better service; not just to Cambridge but between villages; and, specifically, more buses are needed on the guided busway.