



Transport and Infrastructure Committee

24 January 2025

Title: Public Questions

Public Report: Yes

Question 1 – from Riva Elliott, Hemingford Hoppa Development Team

To Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Question:

Given the lack of access to local transport for the Hemingfords, can the Mayor commit to a community-led pilot that will show how we close the transport access gap for disadvantaged residents?*

There is an opportunity to consult with the Tiger on Demand and other disparate transport services to provide a more joined up public transport service that meets the need of the wider Hemingford community with reliable access to schools, healthcare, employment, shopping, leisure etc.

Our proposed pilot could be the solution. This is a community-led project to help overcome isolation and loneliness with sustainability built in.

** Up to 40% deprived in one or more dimensions, according to ONS census figures 2021. 15% free school meals at Hemingford Grey Primary School.*

Question 2 – from Tim Jones, Chair of Cottenham Parish Council

To Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Question:

Cottenham is one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire with nearly 7,000 residents and is only six miles north of Cambridge. It has had significant new housing development in the last few years that has added over 500 new homes with nearly 100 further, largely affordable homes currently approved or in the planning process.

Our transport concerns include

- The frequency (peak every 40 mins) and journey length of the existing Citi 8 service to Cambridge*
- The lack of bus connectivity to other destinations – e.g. Ely, train stations and other transport hub points*
- The changes to the proposed Sutton – Oakington busway route now bypassing Cottenham (as well as Haddenham and Wilburton)*
- The exclusion of Cottenham from the Cambridge e-scooter trial area and Tiger on-demand bus*

With this as background, what is the CPCA's approach to improving access to public transport and active travel options specifically for the residents of Cottenham and nearby villages?

Question 3 – from Annabel Sykes, Resident

To Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Question:

In relation to item 9 on the agenda

“At the SCDC Cabinet meeting on 14 January, Cllr Tumi Hawkins (Lead Cabinet Member for Planning) said “Unfortunately, East West Rail, in my view, has been frugal with the truth”. She went on to say that “there is a big concern that the idea of the route that goes and connects with Bar Hill and Northstowe and then comes down through to Cambridge North has not been serious considered, was not properly considered, and this has been made worse, especially with the in-person events..where East West Rail staff have admitted to community members that that route will be better, will be cheaper, but they cannot consider it now because of all the work that they have done [on the southern approach].” I would also add that a northern approach would be far better for freight because it does not send diesel freight through urban south and east Cambridge, including past one of the country’s leading heart and lung hospitals. I say diesel advisedly because discontinuous electrification does not work for freight.

The CPCA draft response implicitly endorses EWRCo’s proposed southern approach. Please will the CPCA amend it to respond to significant concerns that EWR has chosen the wrong route?”