



Transport & Infrastructure Committee		Agenda Item
15 January 2024		3
Title:	Public Questions	
Public Report:	Yes	

Question 1 – from Lewis Jordan, Secretary, on behalf of ACORN Cambridge	
To	Transport and Infrastructure Committee
Question:	<p>The Cambridge branch of ACORN, the community union, would like more details about the public consultation on bus franchising: when and where will it take place, who is running it, and what form does it take?</p>

Question 2 – from Rod Hart, Secretary, on behalf of Peterborough Climate Action Coalition (CPCAC).	
To	Transport and Infrastructure Committee
Question:	<p>Bus services across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough are currently in a perilous position. Despite goodwill from across our region, the essential missing piece is funding.</p> <p>The 2023-24 mayoral precept provided a stop-gap, preventing the loss of local bus routes, at least for now. But our current bus infrastructure and quality of service continues to disappoint local people and discourage any increase in ridership.</p> <p>The evidence is clear that a shift from private car use to public and active transport must form part of a transition to net zero. Indeed CPCA's current Climate Action Plan sets out the goal to "Electrify transport and shift travel from the private car to greater levels of homeworking, active travel and mass transport solution". This clearly is not being achieved with business-as-usual bus funding.</p> <p>This is an awful situation to be in. We now seem to have lost the option for parking levies or "congestion charges". The lack of political will to support these measures leaves no source of future funding to improve bus services. The ideal solution, of transport polluters funding greener transport, is no longer available to us.</p> <p>Central government also continues to disappoint us and provides no other funding option for our buses.</p> <p>Unfortunately, it appears that the only way out of this perilous situation is via this Combined Authority. We will continue to lose bus routes if we have no mayoral precept. Our current routes and service levels *might* remain static if a 2024-25 mayoral precept is agreed at the level of last year (£12). If we want franchising, new routes, improved bus stops, increased services or transferable ticketing, we will need a larger mayoral precept.</p> <p>The members seated at this meeting today represent councils that all have tools to support their</p>

	<p>residents who find paying council tax an extreme hardship. A mayoral precept is just one element of a council tax bill. Robust council tax discounts can ensure that the most vulnerable residents are protected from increases.</p> <p>Therefore, my question is this:</p> <p>Given that truly equitable solutions to fund our buses are no longer available to us, will this Transport Committee commit to supporting an increased mayoral levy in the 2024-25 Combined Authority budget?</p>
--	--

Question 3 – from Chris Pointon, Cambridge Resident

To	Transport and Infrastructure Committee
	<p>Question:</p> <p><u>A10 Corridor Project</u></p> <p>Given the findings of the Combined Authority's Independent Climate Commission, and increasing global temperatures due to climate change, great weight must be given to the carbon burden of this project. The public benefit of this scheme demonstrably does NOT outweigh the scale of newly embedded carbon that would be created through this infrastructure project.</p> <p>If road building cannot be avoided, a secondary objective must be the prioritisation of public transport and car sharing. Provision of bus lanes and lanes dedicated to vehicles with multiple occupants is clearly preferable to the standard design of current A roads.</p> <p>Therefore,</p> <p>How does the Combined Authority propose to undertake the A10 Corridor Project while staying within the Authority's financed carbon emission reduction objectives and climate action plan?</p>

Question 4 – from Paul Hollinghurst, Secretary, Cambridgeshire Resident

To	Transport and Infrastructure Committee
	<p>Question:</p> <p>The Review of 'Ting' demand responsive transport paints a picture of a service which has been run with unclear objectives, a limited service specification, minimal key performance indicators and a poorly thought-out service zone. The operator described little incentive to build and refine the service based on feedback and performance. The recommendations suggest a restructuring of the service area including the partial use of a semi-flexible service which I believe could increase loadings and make the service more useful for getting to work and education.</p> <p>So the Ting service needs significant change to address these issues, then time to assess the effect of the changes if the lessons from Ting are to be incorporated in the four proposed new pilot schemes described in the "Future role of DRT in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough" report.</p> <p>What timescales are envisaged to incorporate recommended changes into Ting, assess the results, then procure the proposed four new pilot schemes, and how much flexibility will there be in the pilot scheme contracts to support the possibility of substantial ongoing changes to these linked to reviews and analysis by CPCA?</p>