



A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England.
Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF.
www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org
Contact: davidplank@hotmail.com

M11 J11 Park & Ride Engagement Group: access / egress concepts longlist

RESPONSE

Further to our Initial Response of 28th February 2018, the Trumpington Residents' Association (TRA) has now reviewed the longlist of access / egress concepts put forward by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) in light of our representative's meeting with your officers on 6th March and the meeting of the Engagement Group on 8th March. Our assessment of the longlist of concepts has now concluded and is given below. A summary is shown at the beginning followed by more detailed comment on each GCP longlisted option. A variant of the Purple option which relocates the new bus bridge away from the Junction 11 roundabout is recommended (see "Green").

This assessment is of outline concepts and, for that reason, is not informed by the critical detail essential to firm judgement. In particular, essential design and appraisal information will not be available until the next stage of the outline programme for the business case's development. Our comments should be read in this context.

With one exception explained below (see "Green"), the colours refer to those given in part 3, "Access / Egress Concepts", of the "Business Case Development 2018" presentation by Mott MacDonald on 13th February.

SUMMARY

In summary, the TRA:

- *Urges* the Greater Cambridge Partnership to include *a variant* of the **Purple** option for further assessment. This relocates the new bus bridge to the north of the congested Junction 11 roundabout and above its slip roads, leaving the agricultural bridge for its current use as a cycle / footpath and direct access to the southern part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park – thereby avoiding unacceptable harm

to either the attractive entrance to the Country Park or to the coprolite ponds within the Park, or both. It is recommended that this should be a two lane bus bridge. This is shown as **Green** in the detailed comments below.

- *Rejects* the **White**, **Yellow** and **Black** concepts which rely on use of the agricultural bridge because it has been established to our satisfaction that there is not a design solution capable of avoiding or significantly mitigating unacceptable harm to the southern part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and to the existing cycle / footpath on which the proposed Melbourn Greenway relies. Initially, we kept an open mind on use of the agricultural bridge pending information on a design solution to these issues. We are now persuaded that there is not such a solution.
- *Objects* to concepts which intrude into the northern part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park north of the agricultural bridge - and into the Green Belt open fields between the M11 and Hauxton Road (A1309) by cutting across them or running behind the bunds next to the agricultural bridge – these are the **Yellow**, **Black** and **Orange** concepts - subject to possible modification of **Orange** to remove the intrusion. (See also the comments on **White**). For this reason also the M11 southbound slip road should *not* exit before the agricultural bridge. If the peak time tailbacks on the M11 are so great as to warrant the slip road exiting before the agricultural bridge and subject to seeing the design detail, the TRA would prefer a modest extension of the bridge span to allow the slip road to exit under the bridge rather than diverting into the Country Park which would be unacceptable to us. Our opposition to the cross open fields route from the agricultural bridge to the Trumpington Meadows estate / Hauxton Road in the **Black** concept is total; it is entirely unacceptable.
- *Is very concerned* that the longlist concepts which rely on use of the M11 Junction 11 roundabout for general traffic and buses are likely to exacerbate its current congestion and delays. If that is the case we will object to these concepts. For this reason the concepts require thorough assessment of their potential effects in this regard to inform decisions to be made at a subsequent stage of the business case's development. We *recommend* that concepts which would worsen congestion and delays should not be short listed for more detailed assessment and public consultation. The concepts which rely on use of the roundabout are **Blue**, **Purple** and **Orange**; **Red** also which is entirely unsuitable because it simply would not work.
- *Recommends* that the County Council exercises its option on the GCP Executive Board's chosen site for the new Park & Ride (site D) for the whole of the site not just that part required for the P&R itself. This would allow the Council to give its firm assurance that no development will be allowed to take place on the remainder of the site and to undertake that active consideration will be given to extension of the Country Park in consultation with local interests.

CONCEPTS LONGLIST: DETAILED COMMENTS

Red:

EXCLUDE from further assessment.

This concept is not adequate and would not work even at the most minimal level. There is no bus priority and the general traffic access/ egress provision is grossly inadequate. There would be significant additional congestion on the A10 and the Junction 11 roundabout - with tailbacks on both the M11 northbound and southbound. As Niall O' Byrne, Chair Harston Parish Council, said at the Engagement Group's meeting on 13th February, "That would not work."

Blue:

KEEP IN for further assessment – subject to assessment of its effects on congestion and delays on M11 roundabout and slip roads.

In our June 2017 position statement, the TRA said "... it is essential that ready access to and from the M11 is afforded without reliance on the already heavily congested Junction 11 roundabout." ["Park & Ride – The TRA's Position", 27 June 2017, page 2] For this reason we continue to favour a solution which does *not* entail this reliance – as the Blue, Purple and Orange concepts do appear to entail – to a lesser degree in the case of Purple and Orange. Nevertheless subject to the specific comments made on these concepts, we do support their progression to the next stage of the business case development as they are a clear alternative to access via other routes which are not reliant on use of Junction 11. To be assessed effectively it is particularly important that their impact on traffic volumes and delays on the roundabout, its access / egress points, including the M11 slip roads, and the A10 and A1309 are estimated thoroughly and the results shared with the Engagement Group.

If the traffic assessments show there would be adverse effects on congestion and delays for general traffic and buses, the TRA will *object* to these concepts.

Purple:

KEEP IN for further assessment.

See the comments for Blue which also apply to the Purple concept. The Park & Ride's intended interaction with the general traffic route via a tunnel from the M11 northbound and via a bus lane and bridge across the M11 need careful appraisal and sharing of results.

Below the TRA recommends assessment of a variant of this option to relocate the new bus bridge in between the M11 roundabout and the agricultural bridge. See Green.

White:

EXCLUDE from further assessment.

This concept relies on use of the agricultural bridge, a feature it shares with **Yellow** and **Black**. The comments made here concerning use of that bridge *apply to all three* of these concepts.

Clearly, the bridge in its present form is not suitable as a bus bridge in addition to its current use as a cycle/footpath. In light of this we have already asked for and been given the GCP's assurance "... that if the agricultural bridge is used, the existing cycle/pedestrian path would be replaced." [Notes of Initial Briefing meeting, 13 December 2017] The bridge and part of the proposed route to it on the western side of the M11 are within the southern part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and immediately next to an important entrance into the Park. The route is also immediately next to and passes between the small and large coprolite ponds which form an important historic and environmental part of the Park. For these reasons the TRA has opposed use of the agricultural bridge to date.

We understand the advantage of having a separate access and egress point for buses to the new P&R site which is not reliant on use of the A10 and the Junction 11 roundabout - as the **Red**, **Blue**, **Purple** and **Orange** concepts are to a greater or lesser degree. However, as far as the **White**, **Yellow** and **Black** concepts are concerned, we are not at all persuaded that it is possible to reconstruct the bridge as a combined busway and cycle/ footpath without unacceptable harm to the Country Park in its impact on the access to the Park, to one or both of the coprolite ponds, or to both of these.

To date in this round of engagement we have kept an open mind on the concept pending a detailed design proposal and appraisal at the next stage of business case development, if shortlisted. However, it is now clear to us from discussions to date that no design solution is possible which would not involve significant harm to the Country Park. Therefore, we *strongly oppose* use of the agricultural bridge and its further development as an option. As we have said, this strong opposition *applies to all of the concepts which rely on use of the agricultural bridge* for the access and egress of buses.

It should be noted that in these comments we are making the important assumption that the busway will need two lanes to operate effectively by avoiding the inevitable pinch point of one lane operation, which is a feature of the one lane guided busway access to the existing Trumpington Park & Ride. In this instance many more buses would be using the bridge as it would carry Park & Ride and other buses as well as guided buses. Therefore, two-lane operation would be even more important. This being the case, a re-designed bridge would need to be widened considerably on the coprolite ponds side, assuming a commitment to keep access to the Country Park via the cycle/ footpath and keep the bus lanes away from the Park as much as possible. This would almost certainly involve removal of a considerable part at least of the tree belt alongside the small coprolite pond which would certainly be problematic in landscape and possibly also in wildlife terms. Widening the agricultural bridge into the Country Park on the other side of the current accesses to the

bridge would meet strong resistance given its intrusion into the Park on both sides of the M11.

Any design solution to use of the agricultural bridge would also need to address satisfactorily redesign of the approaches to the bridge: i.e. from the east (Trumpington) side which is up / down a relatively steep incline to get from / to the M11 slip road / safeguarded strip; and from the west (Hauxton) side which is up / down a relatively steep incline followed by a right-angled turn between the small and large coprolite ponds to reach the proposed route into / from the new Park & Ride. To say the least, this does not sound straightforward, nor does it necessarily sound less expensive than a new bus bridge closer to the M11 Junction 11 (see **Green** concept proposed as a variant of the **Purple** concept below). It might also require filling in of part of the small coprolite pond which would encounter strong resistance.

There is a further issue in this particular concept on the eastern side of the M11 which would make it necessary to appraise it with the access road to and from the bridge running in front of the existing bund, as well as behind it, as appears to be the intention. The busway running behind the existing bund would in our view be unduly intrusive into the Green Belt open fields between the M11 and Trumpington Meadows estate, and would be objected to. Locating it in front of the bund might well require moving the bund backwards which would also impinge on to the Green Belt open fields.

Green: VARIANT OF PURPLE CONCEPT

RECOMMEND INCLUSION for detailed appraisal as a variant of the **Purple** concept.

As will be seen, there are many probably insurmountable challenges in the **White**, **Yellow** and **Black** concepts in their reliance on use of the agricultural bridge. This is why the TRA *recommends* the concept of *a new bus bridge closer to Junction 11*, leaving the agricultural bridge and its approaches for its current use as a cycle way / footpath, which fits well with its Country Park location and intended role in the Melbourn Greenway. In essence, this is a variant of the **Purple** concept to remove its undesirable reliance on use of the M11 roundabout and slip roads by relocating its bus bridge to the north of that roundabout.

This is the position put forward in our policy statement circulated to members of the Western Orbital Local Liaison Forum last year, “Park & Ride – The TRA’s Position”, 27 June 2017 (page 2, third full paragraph). Our statement stressed: “... it is essential that ready access to and from the M11 is afforded without reliance on the already heavily congested Junction 11 roundabout. Our strong preference is for this to be via a dedicated bus route using the safeguarded strip alongside the Hauxton Road and linked with the new bus bridge across the M11.” ***The TRA asks that this access/egress concept is added to the short list for design development and detailed appraisal at the next stage of the outline programme.*** As stated before, the TRA is willing to assist development of ideas in this and other regards. [Email to Tim Watkins of 16.2.18]

This variation of the **Purple** concept has a further potential advantage in allowing consideration of a different alignment when crossing the M11 to assist its integration with the intended slip road alongside the M11 using the safeguarded strip - which is problematic in the agricultural bridge reliant concepts.

Yellow:

EXCLUDE from further assessment due to its reliance on use of the agricultural bridge: for the same reasons as given under **White** above.

An additional reason for exclusion is that the slip road off the M11 southbound exits *before* the agricultural bridge and runs behind the bunds on both sides of the bridge. These incursions into the north part of the Trumpington Meadows Country Park and the open fields between the M11 and Hauxton Road are unacceptable.

Black:

EXCLUDE from further assessment.

In addition to its reliance on use of the agricultural bridge, which we strongly oppose, this concept would take the busway across the Trumpington Meadows Country Park / open fields, which is entirely unacceptable to us. This was made clear in our Position document last June: "We are strongly opposed to any suggestion that access from the M11 should be across the Green Belt from the M11 ..." It is also not consistent with the assurance given in response to our representative's question at the Initial Briefing meeting on 13th December 2017 that access to Trumpington P&R would be via a slip road running alongside the M11 using the safeguarded strip (as recorded in the agreed notes under "New Site" Q&As). In addition, it would damage the approved Trumpington Meadows "high quality, clean (city) edge" at this point and would be highly controversial for that reason alone (being in potential conflict with the requirements of the Southern Fringe Area Development Framework planning guidance).

Our strong objection to use of the agricultural bridge is explained under the **White** concept above.

Orange:

EXCLUDE from further assessment.

This is for two reasons. First, it is for the same reason as **Yellow** with regard to the M11 southbound exiting to the north of the agricultural bridge and running behind both bunds, which are unacceptably intrusive into the north part of Trumpington Meadows Country Park and the open fields between the M11 and the Trumpington Meadows estate / Hauxton Road. Second, the concept appears to involve substantial reconstruction of the M11 roundabout through a wholly new arm on its south eastern aspect as well as provision of a dedicated bus bridge using the existing south east aspect. Without seeing an outline design

for this it gives the appearance of a spaghetti type junction of some complexity which would be unacceptably intrusive in this position as well as very disruptive during its construction.

If it is shortlisted, please refer to the comments on [Blue](#) which apply also to this concept. This refers to thorough estimation of the concept's impact on traffic volumes and delays on the M11 Junction 11 roundabout, its access / egress points, including the M11 slip roads, and the A10 and A1309.

It is hoped that this statement is clear, albeit complex.

David Plank
For Trumpington Residents' Association
19th March 2018



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 21 MARCH 2018

DECISIONS

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on Wednesday, 21 March 2018. The wording used does not necessarily reflect the actual wording that will appear in the minutes.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Kathrin John (01954) 713030 or Kathrin.John@scambs.gov.uk

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Kevin Price, Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, due to illness.

2. JOINT ASSEMBLY MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Board noted that Mark Robertson had stepped down from the GCP Joint Assembly where he acted as an academic representative on behalf of Cambridge Regional College.

The Executive Board **ENDORSED** the nomination from Professor Phil Allmendinger, on behalf of the University of Cambridge, of Jo Sainsbury from iMET (Innovation, Manufacturing, Engineering and Technology) to fill the resultant vacancy on the Joint Assembly and become a co-opted member..

It was noted that one more representative of the business community was needed on the Joint Assembly, and Claire Ruskin confirmed she was working on that.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Professor Phil Allmendinger declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to item 7 (Histon Road: Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements Final Concept) as a resident of Gilbert Road.
- Councillor Ian Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to item 8 (Western Orbital: Progress on additional Park and Ride capacity; and submissions to Highways England on Girton Interchange and M11 Smart Motorway) given that he was a County Councillor and the County Council owned a piece of land which might be available for use as a possible additional park and ride site.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Board held on 8 February 2018 were confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chairperson.



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** and responded to public questions as part of agenda items 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Councillor Mike Todd-Jones addressed the Executive Board, as Chair of the Local Liaison Forum, on item 7.

6. OVERVIEW FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** an overview report on the discussions from the meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly held on Wednesday, 28 February 2018.

7. HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS FINAL CONCEPT

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (1) Support the "Preliminary Concept" design shown in Plans 1-6 as a basis for public consultation and further detailed design work, including preparation of the business case.
- (2) Approve the revised budget that includes a new estimate of £6M in capital costs for delivery of this scheme.

8. WESTERN ORBITAL: PROGRESS ON ADDITIONAL PARK AND RIDE CAPACITY; AND SUBMISSION TO HIGHWAYS ENGLAND ON GIRTON INTERCHANGE AND M11 SMART MOTORWAY

Following approval of amendments to recommendations i and ii in the report, the Executive Board:-

- (1) **AGREED** unanimously that, in respect of any new Park & Ride (P&R) at M11 Junction 11 and associated public transport/vehicle access on and off the M11 and A10, further analysis should be undertaken and opinions sought, and brought back to a future meeting of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, in the form of an Outline Business Case for these or better options, for further discussion and a decision at that time whether or not to proceed. Any Public Consultation will be deferred until after that decision.

Such analysis should include, as a minimum:

- (a) the rationale for the scheme, including who it would serve and why there is a need for change from existing provisions;
- (b) Traffic modelling along the A10 and M11 including air and noise pollution;
- (c) dovetailing with the study currently being undertaken on the need to provide better transport links to Addenbrooke's, the new Papworth Hospital and the



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

— Delivering our City Deal —

growing number of jobs at Cambridge Biomedical Campus together with patients and visitors;

- (d) dovetailing with the potential interventions at Foxton, being greater car parking to serve the train station and/or a bridge/underpass for the A10 road to avoid the level crossing;
- (e) dovetailing with the emerging plans for a new train station at Cambridge South;
- (f) dovetailing with the emerging plans for the CAM Metro; and
- (g) a compare-and-contrast exercise as between (i) no new P&R; (ii) a new P&R immediately west of Junction 11; and (iii) expansion of the existing Trumpington Road P&R, either multi-level or on a larger site footprint; (iv) alternative transport options.

and such opinions should be sought, as a minimum, from:

- (h) Harston and Hauxton Parish Councils and Trumpington Residents' Association;
 - (i) Addenbrooke's, the new Papworth Hospital and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; and
 - (j) the Mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and/or the Combined Authority.
- (2) **AGREED** unanimously that, based on the ongoing analysis set out in the report, to delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, *authority to make* a submission to Highways England for the inclusion of Girton Interchange and the M11 smart motorway in the second Roads Investment Strategy and that the Mayor/Combined Authority be asked to support the submission.
- (3) **NOTED** the development of a "West of Cambridge" package of interventions to replace the previously described "Western Orbital" scheme.

9. CITY ACCESS UPDATE INCLUDING MODE SHIFT AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- (1) To support the development of options for managing traffic demand in Cambridge and to agree that proposals which best meet the objectives set out in paragraph 8.7 are prepared for the Executive Board in July 2018 with the aim to continue the demand management aspects of the "Big Conversation" with



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

stakeholders and the public in Autumn 2018.

- (2) That the GCP engages, with partners, including the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure alignment with the strategic transport plan, and to provide the opportunity for others to shape/comment on the possible approaches for managing demand and reducing congestion.
- (3) To support the principles of an electric bus pilot and to delegate approval of the pilot to the Director of Transport, in consultation with the Executive Board Chairperson.

10. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT, INCLUDING BUDGET SETTING 2018/2019

The Executive Board:

- (1) **NOTED** the progress across the GCP Programme.
- (2) **AGREED** unanimously the proposed 2018/2019 Budget (as set out in Appendices 1 and 1A to the report).

11. GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP FUTURE INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Executive Board unanimously **AGREED**:

- (1) The core Future Investment Strategy (FIS) principles and focused themes set out in the submitted paper.
- (2) To ask officers to work in collaboration with the Combined Authority to ensure that the GCP's future investment priorities are aligned with the Combined Authority's Prospectus and Four Year Plan.
- (3) That officers continue to work on the process and criteria for the prioritisation of FIS schemes and projects and to develop plans for wider engagement later in 2018.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting will take place on Wednesday, 4 July 2018 at 4.00pm in Committee Rooms 1 and 2 at the Guildhall, Cambridge.

13. COUNCILLOR FRANCIS BURKITT - GCP EXECUTIVE BOARD CHAIRPERSON

The Vice-Chairperson noted that this would be the last meeting attended by Councillor Francis Burkitt, the Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board.

Members of the Executive Board placed on record their thanks to Councillor Burkitt for his significant contribution to the work of the Board and wished him well for the future.



Growing and sharing prosperity

————— Delivering our City Deal —————

From: David Plank [mailto:davidplank@hotmail.com]

Sent: 03 April 2018 18:40

To: South Trumpington Parish Meeting

Subject: Re: M11 J11 proposed Park & Ride - longlist of access / egress concepts: TRA Response

Dear Ben

Thank you. I mentioned the GCP Executive Board's "recent decision" in an earlier email. This is highly relevant to your next agenda as it has put significant expansion of Trumpington Park & Ride back on the agenda. The TRA objects most strongly to this for reasons given in our position statement last year. A copy of the Board's decision note is *attached*; see minute 8 and 8(g) in particular.

We had thought that as a result of previous decisions made by the Board that this was no longer a live option and remained under consideration only theoretically as a government requirement for the development of a business case for the new site west of the M11 to gain access to City Deal funds. The TRA is treating this decision as making it a live option again and, therefore, a real threat to our community. This decision is due to lobbying by the Harston and Hauxton interests to whose representations Councillor Francis Burkitt, the Chair of the Executive Board, as the South Cambridgeshire District Council representative on the Board, is particularly sensitive.

I recommend that your Meeting gets itself added to the bodies whose opinions are to be sought - see minute 8(h). I also recommend that your Meeting's representative attends meetings of the GCP's M11 Junction 11 Engagement Group in which I am heavily outnumbered by said interests - but not outgunned.

I will share with you subsequent correspondence I have had with the Project Manager of which your Meeting needs to be aware.

As I said, if you would find it helpful for me to attend a meeting I am happy to do so subject to dates.

Best wishes

David

For Trumpington Residents' Association

From: David Plank [mailto:davidplank@hotmail.com]
Sent: 03 April 2018 19:03
To: South Trumpington Parish Meeting
Subject: Fw: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Dear Ben

This is the correspondence I mentioned. I have highlighted the most important points and hope this is helpful. Tim Watkins is the GCP's Project Manager.

Best wishes

David

For TRA

From: David Plank <davidplank@hotmail.com>
Sent: 29 March 2018 20:32
To: Andrew Roberts; David Newcombe
Subject: Re: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

P.S. The underground costs include diversion of an existing local high pressure gas main as well as a high voltage power cable which would be costly and very disruptive, as you may imagine. The above ground option would involve loss of spaces during construction, sections of the site needing to be closed to construct foundations - temporary closure of the whole site is a possibility - requiring temporary park & ride facilities (but where?). [same source]

Continuing to limber up!

David

From: David Plank <davidplank@hotmail.com>
Sent: 29 March 2018 20:21
To: Andrew Roberts; David Newcombe
Subject: Re: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Indeed. Which is why the clarification is so useful. It means that the decision does not necessarily bring sites A, B & C back in to the frame for a new P&R (site B being the "sporting village" land) and introduces a patently ludicrous expansion alternative which has no realistic chance of standing up. Tim's observation in his last paragraph is telling - and consistent with what he told us when we met last year - hence my question to him.

Therefore, "multi-level" expansion remains as the main threat / risk and we know it has a high price tag which the GCP would be hard pressed to meet let alone justify: £97 million for a full basement option (two levels to meet additional places requirement); and above ground decking £50 million (two levels again to meet additional spaces requirement). Compared with £8 million for a new site west of the M11. [Skanska /Atkins]

"End of Stage Summary Report", 2017] As I recall, all of these costs exclude cost of access/egress provision which is a potential wild card - but cost of slip roads and getting traffic back to the M11 / A10 in the underground and above ground options would also be substantial.

As you will see. I am limbering up!

Best wishes

David

From: Andrew Roberts <andrewroberts53@hotmail.com>
Sent: 29 March 2018 14:29
To: David Plank; David Newcombe
Subject: Re: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

the idea of expanding the site (school football pitch!!!) is clearly a non-starter even if it has to be looked at in the analysis

Andrew

From: David Plank <davidplank@hotmail.com>
Sent: 29 March 2018 13:15
To: Andrew Roberts; David Newcombe
Subject: Fw: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Dear Andrew & David

Subsequent to the Executive Board's decision which I circulated earlier this week, I sought and have received useful clarification from the Project Manager. This is shown in the exchanges of correspondence below.

I am considering next steps. Unfortunately, I feel the need for another position statement coming on. I will pause on this for a while pending any communication that might go to the Engagement Group in the next week or two ... but not for too long.

Best wishes

David

From: Watkins Timothy <Timothy.Watkins@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 March 2018 21:22
To: davidplank@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Hi David

Yes that does mean CPO if other land, but I don't think it would mean the site of the former sporting village application land as that would not be able to extend the footprint of the site without a clear separation. Thus making it a new site.

Technically it would mean CPO ing land that is currently in use such as John Lewis, the School or housing. I would not want to pre judge this evaluation within costing or legal advice. However, I think it is fair to say that land with a business or residential use is significantly higher than agricultural land. CPO also requires there to be no other deliverable alternatives. Again it is factually true to say there are alternatives.

Kind regards

Tim

Sent with BlackBerry Work

(<https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=www.blackberry.com&data=02%7C01%7C%7Caf9891c4959048bc8ad808d594e99313%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C636578653265549206&sdata=ld1hVfcExaxq%2BowE9F7pU%2BDXR4fCrPObmqYwwAgTJMk%3D&reserved=0>)

From: David Plank <davidplank@hotmail.com>

Sent: 28 Mar 2018 4:59 p.m.

To: Watkins Timothy <Timothy.Watkins@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision; 21 March 2018

Tim. Many thanks.

Does that mean procurement of land / possible CPO from Grosvenor east of the M11, i.e. the mooted "sporting village" site? If so, how would this stack up in CPO terms if challenged given the option on the land west of the M11?

Best wishes

David

From: Watkins Timothy <Timothy.Watkins@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>

Sent: 28 March 2018 16:50

To: 'David Plank'

Subject: RE: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Hi David

I think the two items you have highlighted in yellow are to be included within the main instruction of point (g) a compare-and-contrast exercise. A larger site footprint would involve procurement (possibly CPO) of land and alternative transport options is to be interpreted as rail and interactions with the Mayor's CAM proposals.

Kind regards

Tim

From: David Plank [<mailto:davidplank@hotmail.com>]
Sent: 28 March 2018 16:39
To: Watkins Timothy <Timothy.Watkins@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>
Subject: M11 J11 Park & Ride: GCP Executive Board decision, 21 March 2018

Dear Tim

I have read the Executive Board's decision which seems clear with two exceptions in 1 (g) which are highlighted below:

(g) a compare-and-contrast exercise as between (i) no new P&R; (ii) a new P&R immediately west of Junction 11; and (iii) expansion of the existing Trumpington Road P&R, either multi-level or on a larger site footprint; (iv) alternative transport options.

It would be appreciated if you could explain what these mean? Thanks.

Best wishes

David