

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party's Position Statement on the
Making Connections Consultation, December 2022

Overview

Public transport in Cambridge is broken, with Stagecoach cancelling key routes and bus cancellations causing huge disruption for many people: school pupils, families and workers alike. Congestion and pollution as well as the chaotic and expensive public transport system in Greater Cambridge all need urgent attention. The stress of the shortcomings of the current set up falls inevitably on those most economically precarious, and this cannot be allowed to continue. The people of Greater Cambridge want and deserve a fast, reliable, and cheap single-ticket means of travelling into and out of the city and around the region in their day to day lives.

The Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) proposed Sustainable Travel Zone is an attempt at a solution but in our view some amendments are needed to get the best outcome. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (CSG) Green Party have heard from residents who depend on buses and are desperate for action but we also hear from residents and businesses who are at their financial limit after facing a pandemic, the catastrophic Conservative mini-budget and the ensuing cost of living crisis. Any additional costs will inevitably create more financial difficulty, greater poverty and inequality in our already shamefully unequal city. In sum, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party hold that better transport connections are not only in urgent demand in our region, but a better, fairer funding solution is needed to provide them.

We have previously suggested that a Workplace Parking Levy¹ would help to ensure that large companies based in Cambridge, which benefit enormously from Cambridge's buoyant economy and international reputation, contribute fairly to the support and development of the transport network so urgently needed. The GCP claims that this (or higher parking charges) would not reduce traffic levels sufficiently or raise adequate funds for the other improvements needed. However, Greens think that a Workplace Parking Levy, that could be set in place relatively quickly, and at a low administrative cost, could provide interim funding for the bus network improvements. Subsequently, following a more careful re-evaluation and redesigning of the proposals, a Sustainable Travel Charge could potentially be introduced. The negative reaction to the perceived new charge for using cars within the city is indicative that more thought needs to be given to the size of the zone, the specific locations to be included, and the system for charges and exemptions.

Summary of Response by the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party

We believe that this proposal must be adjusted in order to:

1. protect those groups who would be adversely economically affected by the current proposal. This would be a terrible consequence of any 'transport improvements' post-covid, in a cost of living crisis in a city which already has significant inequality – to the extent that we have been branded the UK most unequal city²
- incorporate a Workplace Parking Levy as soon as is practically possible and to be considered as a possible ongoing revenue raising means, alongside the proposed Sustainable Travel Zone

1

https://cambridge.greenparty.org.uk/site/Cambridge/files/Green%20Party_%20Making%20Connections%20Response%20Dec%202021.pdf

2 <https://equalitytrust.org.uk/blog/tackling-poverty-cambridge-most-unequal-city-uk>

to engage businesses already benefiting from Cambridge's economy and ensuring that the wealthy make their fair contribution to improvement in our transport networks. Improved infrastructure will not doubt add positive effects to the revenue of our city's thriving enterprises.

We support the improvement of a bus network as in the short term, the core of the transport improvement strategy. We furthermore believe that improvement is not simply a matter of the reduction of ticket costs, welcome no doubt that this will be, but it is absolutely essential that all enhancements to the bus network result in one that is reliable, affordable, well-connected getting passengers where they need to go without needing to take two buses instead of one.

We also support the introduction of modal filters as these will enable a speedier and more efficient bus service.

We believe that the congestion charge can only feasibly be brought in once the bus service has been proven to our citizens that it is a viable alternative to the use of a car. We feel it would be unfair to bring a congestion charge in any earlier than 2027 as some residents are fearing. At present there is a clear lack of understanding of the schedule of introduction of the charge and the associated enhancements of the existing bus network; this has resulted in a significant and vocal reaction to the project as a whole.

The CSC Green party believe that this is avoidable through a better articulated illustration of the understanding of the problems people face and the time frame in which these problems will be addressed.

We would welcome further exploration of Very Light Rail as a medium or long term option for Cambridge.

The rest of our response is organised into three sections, mirroring the layout of the brochure for the 'Making Connections' Consultation produced by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council in Autumn 2022.

Section 1. Transforming the Bus Network

We would like to emphasize the benefits of an improved bus network in the short term with a tax on car-use in the long term; the interim period being made up of modal filters/bus gates which will do a great deal to help congestion and pollution long before any charging is put in place.

Our view is that a bus network like this is what we really need as a city, and that the dropping of fares to £1 to go anywhere in the city of Cambridge or £2 in Cambridgeshire represents an opportunity to markedly improve the affordability of public transport and particularly benefit those who cannot drive (either due to age, health problems, or because owning a car is not affordable to them) and would make our city much more equal so that more people could afford to get to where they need to.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party feels that the main barriers to using buses at the moment are the poor frequency of service, poor reliability and poor connecting services. Bus journeys do not feel convenient to a citizen who is used to relying on their car. For example, currently travelling from near the station to Girton for a fitness class would take 51 minutes via two separate buses as opposed to a 20 minute journey by car.

Travelling by bus is even more complicated for those living on the outskirts of Cambridge. Buses departing only once or twice per hour mean that passengers have to organise their lives regarding education, employment or leisure around the bus times as opposed to the buses working for them. For people to feel that buses are there for them when they need it, the frequency would have to be every 10 or 15 minutes otherwise buses just don't feel like a convenient, realistic or even enjoyable option. We believe the number of proposed bus services needs to be much more prolific, particularly for rural services, otherwise this scheme will prove unworkable and unpopular.

Connecting the surrounding villages

The CSC Green Party is concerned that the proposed frequency of buses in rural areas such as in East Cambridgeshire covering villages such as Ely, Littleport, Sutton, Soham, Fordham, Burwell and Newmarket is insufficient and inadequate as a replacement to using a car. The proposed two key bus corridor services are not practicable for use by the majority of residents and the hourly run connecting rural services are not sufficient to make this a realistic or attractive option for someone who would normally drive. In addition, users of the Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) face multiple changes for their journeys as well as unpredictability in service. We do not believe that the proposed bus services will be a satisfactory alternative to cars making a congestion charge for these Cambridgeshire residents unreasonable, especially if these residents were priced out of the Cambridge City housing market in the first place and now are to be taxed for getting to their employment on time.

Addenbrookes

The CSC Green Party believe that transport options to Addenbrookes must be improved. We propose that if Addenbrookes remains in the Sustainable Travel Zone, that parking at the Park and Ride site, and use of the bus to get from the Park and Ride site and station are made free for NHS employees (with display of a clinic letter or a valid Addenbrooke's hospital badge, for example). We note that a similar policy is currently in place, with Addenbrooke's staff eligible for free bus travel if they are coming from the station, or from Babraham or Trumpington Park and ride site (although some staff report problems with some bus drivers not being aware of the policy).

When designing the system of exemptions, GCP should consider the particular needs of people travelling to Addenbrookes (whether staff or patients) to ensure the system is fair. In particular, there must be an acknowledgement in this scheme of the current poor pay of nurses and how their standard of living would be affected with an additional charge. Their recent strike action illustrates the financial hardship experienced by those who choose caring as a profession and the CSC Green Party believes that these vital services to society should be valued more highly.³

The inclusion of Addenbrookes in the zone must be balanced by full, fair and simple exemptions for patients and low paid staff. Under no circumstances should busy NHS staff be asked to make judgement calls on patients ability to travel by public transport to support discounts or exemptions.

3 <https://cambridge.greenparty.org.uk/news/solidarity-with-striking-nurses.html>

Bus franchising

There have been calls for bus franchising from several quarters. We take this to mean an arrangement under the Bus Services Act 2017 framework that complies with the subsequent Department of Transport guidance issued between 2017 and 2019, giving local authorities some measure of control over bus routes and fares. Given the potentially significant benefits to the local transport network to be obtained through bus franchising, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party support active exploration of ways and means by which this may be achieved. However, we understand that franchising is not a simple panacea and takes a great deal of work and time to set up and run effectively. It has been suggested by a transport officer that bus franchising could take about two and a half years but there are fears it could take more than four years to implement and yet longer if there were any legal challenges. For example, in Manchester, the franchising journey began in 2017 and is still not in place. While the public expressed their approval for the scheme in two consultations, there have been legal challenges from two bus operators which has delayed the process significantly, one of them being Stagecoach who currently run the majority of buses on our regional bus network.⁴

The CSC Green Party holds the view that if the journey towards franchising were to begin then challenges from bus companies must be anticipated and planned for as well as any other barriers so that the public can be given a realistic time-frame about if and when to expect a more efficiently run and streamlined service. Given that the public have been promised a much better bus service ahead of any congestion charges as a gesture to allow citizens the time to find buses a better alternative to using their cars, it is alarming to discover that a key part of this process – franchising – could take five years and counting, if the Manchester experience is anything to go by. It should be emphasised that the integration and coherence of the bus network that would be offered by franchising would add significantly to the user value obtained by Cambridge residents.

Pollution and Clean Air Zones

The CSC Green Party would like to state we are aware of examples of cities that have introduced clean air zones such as Bristol, Edinburgh and Oxford. In addition, in Bath there is a Class C clean air zone where charging is linked to the type of vehicle so the charges only apply to taxis, private hire vehicles, vans (including pick-ups and some camper vans), light goods vehicles, buses, coaches and heavy goods vehicles that do not meet the required emission standard⁵. However, we do also realise the socio-economic implications of introducing a zero-emissions zone like this as it restricts movement to those who can afford an electric vehicle and if previous car-drivers ‘upgrade’ to an electric vehicle this is not getting them onto public transport or choosing active transport. Plus, this does not contribute to solving Cambridge’s congestion problem.

Getting to Cambridge: Medium to Long Term solutions

While the speed and extent of the planned growth of Greater Cambridge is not supported by the CSC Green Party, we recognise that planning for the possibility of significant growth is prudent. Between 2011 to 2031 the population of the greater Cambridge region is expected to increase by 120,000 (between 35 and 60%): it appears consensual that the growth debate has been resolved in favour of growth.⁶

4 ‘Bus franchising key to strategy – but how long could it take?’ p.10, The Cambridge Independent, 7- 13 December 2022

5 <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/bath-clean-air-zone>

6 <https://www.cambridge-connect.uk/>

The University of Cambridge's projection is that by 2032 infrastructure needs to support 44,000 new jobs, 33,500 new homes, 420 new apprenticeships.

Getting to Cambridge using the greenest means of transport is therefore a significant priority. The choices made in the short term for the transport network in Cambridge will have an impact on the choices available in future.

The Green party argue that any transport network into Cambridge aimed at drawing travellers away from cars should reflect as far as possible their preferences while delivering a sound ecological and financially viable system⁷. This means that any implementation of a new transport network must incorporate:

- frequency
- travel time
- safety
- punctuality/reliability
- costs
- staff behaviour
- on-board cleanliness and comfort.

The Cambridge Green Party supports the following principal aims for this part of the Greater Cambridge transport network. We hold that the proposal must show evidence that it will:

- i) reduce pollution, while increasing frequency
- ii) provide a significant capacity advantage over car use
- iii) reduce congestion
- iv) help keep separate lane for cycles and to have priority over cars
- v) create new or open mothballed stations to increase accessibility
- vi) enable local small businesses to replenish stock from outside Cambridge
- vii) be timely and good value for money, both in construction and maintenance
- viii) address inequality.

We therefore strongly oppose the planned extension of the Guided Busway, notably the proposed route between Cambridge and Camborne, as this approach:

- i) is not the least polluting
- ii)

⁷ Hansson et al. European Transport Research Review (2019) 11:38
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-019-0374-4>

- iii) at about £7m per km to build and with ongoing high maintenance costs represents poor value for money (est. £87m⁸)
- iv) will have significantly reduced speed limits and therefore capacity compared to the initial modelling (as a result of safety concerns).

We note that interest in a Light Rail back-bone, formerly abandoned, is now to be explored once more.

The proposal of a light rail solution for Cambridge fails our criteria for the following reasons:

- i) it is very costly at about £50m per km
- ii) it would be entirely inappropriate for transport within the city (providing few and expensive access points and therefore longer journeys to reach them, above the established limit of about 5 mins)
- iii) it has no evident funding source leading to a high level of uncertainty and therefore risk for any core transport strategy.
- iv) it would be very slow to expand to any significant degree within the Cambridge area leading to significant disruption long before any benefits to citizens was to be experienced.
- v) given its cost it would be directed at transport of the commercial and academic community, thereby excluding many of those most dependant on public transport

Instead, we support an option so far largely unexplored of Very Light Rail.

This mode can:

- i) reduce pollution as a consequence of using rail rather than tyre
- ii) offer a significant increase in capacity over cars
- iii) provide safe and fast cycle and other active travel paths into the city
- iv) offer a cost of building comparable to that of the busway but with lower maintenance costs
- v) be safer than buses
- vi) offer lower installation costs and shorter construction times, enabling access to more parts of the city, specifically those areas more economically disadvantaged.

8 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cambridgeshire-60648403#:~:text=The%20guided%20busway%20links%20St%20Ives%20with%20Cambridge,the%20busway%2C%20which%20links%20St%20Ives%20to%20Cambridge.>

- vii) have the additional advantage over buses of being flexible in capacity (running nose to tail) and being suitable for driverless operation where this is found to be of value.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (CSC) Green Party favours integrating a VLR network with an appropriate intra-City travel network via ‘lollipop’ travel Hubs. This proposal has been developed by and is fully described by Smarter Cambridge Transport⁹

This design of travel network is preferred over expansion of the ‘Park ‘n’ Ride’ sites as they simply move the traffic problem slightly out of the centre rather than addressing the core long term objective of phasing out car use for the majority of journeys.

The travel hub will deliver the following benefits (taken from Smarter Cambridge Travel’s proposal) with the ability to integrate with a VLR network:

- to reach any destination in Cambridge requires at most one change of bus anywhere on the inner ring road
- to interchange between buses entails walking no further than the length of two bus bays, and does not require crossing a road.
- more of Cambridge would be within easy walking distance of a high frequency bus service, making bus travel attractive to many more people in the city. This reduces car traffic and increases demand, and hence revenue, to run the buses.
- removing bus – and potentially all large vehicles – from the city centre opens up opportunities to widen pavements, add cycle lanes, and pedestrianise more of the city centre.
- many streets would see a renaissance, either because they become more attractive places to be (e.g. Hobson St, King St, Round Church St) or to get to (e.g. the Grafton Centre, Sun St, Chesterton Rd).

Section 2. Investing in Sustainable Travel Schemes

CSC Green Party strongly supports proposals to increase active travel to help reduce the carbon footprint of Greater Cambridge residents. The IPCC report of 9th August 2021 demonstrates the very urgent need to reduce carbon emissions caused by petrol or diesel-powered vehicles, and the current congestion in the city makes it clear that even electric-powered vehicles will need to be limited in number. Active travel offers many additional benefits, including improved health and well-being through exercise and as a result of reduced pollution and noise, and through the creation of safer spaces for play, leisure and travel. Active Travel is an important part of meeting “Vision Zero” for carbon emissions, and also reduces deaths of pedestrians and motorists. It should be a core transport strategy. We are concerned at the lack of detail about, and funding allocated to, active travel in the GCP proposals.

A Dutch-style system for cycling with separate pathways for walking and cycling should be used, and in some areas additional streaming of separate cycle lanes for fast commuters, with slower lanes for leisure cyclists, people with children, disabled people with special needs and older people.

9 <https://www.smartertransport.uk/cambridge-city-bus-hub/>

The brochure states one of its aims as “making our city more accessible to those with different accessibility needs”¹⁰ but there is no mention about the scheme addressing women’s safety, which we feel is inadequate. Disabled people often have particular needs for routes that avoid traffic, and active travel infrastructure should be designed with the requirements of such users in the forefront, whether independent wheelchair users, disabled cyclists or users of mobility scooters. Disabled people have very varied transport needs and the GCP should be seeking their views, if not through this survey, then through other means such as advisory committees, in order to fulfil the Disability Act requirements. Consultation with this group should be based on the Equitable Leadership model, drawing on the direct daily experience of members of this community.

Similarly, the GCP should be taking specific advice from women’s groups on how to improve active travel safety, as well as making sure that local police are involved. This will enable women to participate fully in all active transport options, and help to decrease their use of private transport.

The development of good cycling infrastructure requires both long term and short term thinking. It must include provision of safe cycle parking for people shopping, commuting to work or taking periods away from home, and cargo bike and specialist disability transport. This means thinking about luggage storage and good links to public transport. For example, the lack of lifts at Cambridge Railway Station multi-story cycle park makes the upper floors inaccessible to many. It is usually impossible to find suitable parking on the ground floor which has very limited space for cargo bikes and specialist cycles, particularly those designed for people with disabilities. Furthermore, many people are not strong enough to raise their bikes onto the higher level of the 2-rack system (often the only spaces available) and may be unable to push their bikes up the ramps to the 2nd and 3rd floors. Locations for safe and legal parking of cycles in surrounding streets are extremely limited.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party suggestions for targeting of secured funding:

Since this is a response on behalf of all members, we have not prioritised any one of the 13 possible new corridors. However, we consider high priorities for use of the funding to include:

- i) Routes to be designed and built to the highest standards, with separate cycle and pedestrian pathways, and routed to be “Off Road”
- ii) Priority given to routes that will ensure children can travel to school off-road and using active transport
- iii) Regular maintenance of all existing routes and the new ones to be assured (many existing routes are not adequately maintained – for example many recently constructed cycle paths are now in a bad state of repair as a result of root growth (e.g. busway cycle path to Trumpington; the beginning of the Tins etc)
- iv) Dropped kerbs to be put in place wherever needed; in many parts of the City these are absent but are vital for independent wheelchair users, people carrying luggage and parents with buggies;
- v) Good connections between cycling/pedestrian routes and public transport access points to be ensured;

10 p.15, Making Connections Brochure, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council, Autumn 2022

- vi) Where active transport routes have to cross roads or other active transport routes, crossings must be carefully designed,.
- vii) Major improvements are needed to awareness-raising materials and signage for “off road” safe routes, and these should be kept up to date. The information should be presented in different formats, including signage, Apps (such as Cambridge’s Cycle Streets), paper form and updated Google Maps, and should be widely distributed to schools, parents and active users of the system and in public places. Many people are unaware of existing active travel routes. The current cycle maps are out of date and do not show the active travel routes that have been added in the last few years.

Section 3. Creating a Sustainable Travel Zone

The proposed approach will result in a real risk and increased costs to those that need greatest support during this post-covid, cost of living crisis. We are particularly worried about the following groups and we believe they have some very real fears that must be taken seriously:

1. Those with disabilities

There is insufficient consideration of disabled residents’ travel issues in this consultation. This area is very complicated and we propose that it would make sense to do a separate consultation response on disability and travel alone.

There are proposed exemptions for blue badge holders (up to two vehicles always exempt) and income-based discount of up to 100%. However, numerous residents have reported that this proposal would be unviable for them financially, especially in the current cost of living crisis.

We note that the so-called “Green Taxi exemption” will potentially benefit people with disabilities and consider this an important aspect of the proposals to retain. Blue badge exemptions are usually held by a comparatively small number of people with disabilities and their families. Some people with disabilities cannot drive with safety or cannot afford to do so. The most popular and accessible form of transport for people with disabilities is a taxi, usually a wheelchair enabled vehicle or WAV. The passenger in a WAV may not use a wheelchair but if that WAV is a licenced Cambridge taxi will know that the driver has had training in supporting passengers with a wide variety of disabilities and has chosen to make their car a WAV which does add additional costs.

2. Low-income groups

We are not convinced by the claim that the impact of the congestion charge will not be felt by those on low incomes because they are the ones already using public transport. ONS research shows that a third of those in the bottom 10% earning decile in the UK owned one car. And although it’s true that the more people in the UK earn, the more likely they are to own more

than one car, it's not true to say that those who earn the least don't drive¹¹. Furthermore, the congestion charge as it is currently proposed overlooks the fact that the charge is on journeys not on car ownership, therefore those with poor bus services and reliant on their car, will be disproportionately affected by the charge. The charge risks resulting in, for this group more than others, a choice between the least bad rather than the best mode of transport.

The brochure states that this group will be able to claim exemptions of 25%-100% reduction in cost but will they easily be able to claim these discounts? It is not going to help affordability if the exemptions are put into effect retrospectively while this groups foots the bill in the short-term.

3. Carers

We would like to see carers added to the list of those exempt from the charges as these people are essential to ensure the wellbeing of our sick and elderly in a cost-of-living crisis. We need to double the care of the most vulnerable people and this is not going to happen if those who are caring for them cannot afford to get to their home.

4. Those who run small, local businesses

In Cambridge, there will be increased costs, not just as individuals, but for the diverse range of local businesses, many of whom rely on LGVs for work or re-stocking – all targeted under the current proposals. On the doorstep, many of our residents who rely on cars and vans for their work have a very real fear that they might be put out of business or have to relocate outside of Cambridge altogether to address what is a perceived future of higher costs and lower 'footfall'. As a minimum, we want to see businesses that are entitled to small business rate relief exempted from the charge. Additional arrangements would need to be made for key small home based businesses such as plumbers, electricians and other building services which do not pay business rates. A specific proposal for the challenge of re-stocking has been a recurring concern of small businesses.

5. Those who were priced out of Cambridge and now travel into the city for work/education

The recent Stagecoach bus route cancellations have hit people living on the outskirts of Cambridge the hardest. Not only have people earning less than £100,000 (the average earning for Cambridge being £36,000¹²)¹³ not been able to afford a half a million pound house in Cambridge and had to move out to the villages, those who are trying to use transport sustainably for the good of congestion and pollution or who cannot afford to run a car have often been left stranded these past autumn months struggling to travel to their jobs or their education. The Conservative-led privatisation of our bus networks fifty years ago has produced this dire situation and it is impacting our citizens lives on a very personal level. Those who are now resorting to travel by car are now going to penalized even further for not being able to afford to live in Cambridge. The distances also mean that cycling the

11

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/expenditure/datasets/percentageofhouseholdswithcarsbyincomegrouptenureandhouseholdcompositionuktablea47>

12 <https://www.payscale.com/research/UK/Location=Cambridge-England%3A-Cambridgeshire/Salary>

13 <https://www.gocompare.com/home-insurance/salary-to-buy/>

route is unrealistic. It is vital that, as the necessary short term transport solution, buses taking passengers in and out of the villages are reliable otherwise suggesting the car owners take the bus as an alternative to paying the congestion charge is unhelpful and unreasonable.

6. Families with babies and young children

It is increasingly difficult to visit a growing proportion of local leisure attractions and rural pubs and restaurants located on the outskirts of the city by public transport, particularly with small children. We believe that, without careful re-consideration, the introduction of a congestion charge for families with young children would reduce their accessibility to leisure opportunities which is linked to mental health and wellbeing. This is especially concerning for low-income families whose wellbeing is more at risk. We propose, therefore, that specific routes suitable for bus and/or active transport be identified for improvement as a priority consequence of the charge.

The Coexistence of a Workplace Parking Levy and a Sustainable Travel Zone:

We are aware that a Workplace Parking Levy requires a separate approval by the secretary of state for transport. We are also aware the GCP has found that congestion-pollution-revenue raising regulation has not been a popular option in the consultation. However, the GCP have not done any work on blending both WPL and congestion charges.

The statement in the brochure '*... the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy would not reduce traffic levels sufficiently to meet the objectives, even if the charges were higher than those proposed for the Sustainable Travel Zone*'¹⁴ suggests that any costings that were carried out, did not look at the option of the simultaneous use of a Workplace Parking Levy and a Sustainable Travel Zone – the former able to be brought in relatively quickly, the latter once the bus system has been improved. We believe the revenue from both Workplace Parking Levy and a Sustainable Travel Zone would of course be higher than that generated by a Sustainable Travel Zone alone. If there are practical reasons why the two could not co-exist they should be set out in detail within the proposal.

If there are objections to the long-term imposition of a Workplace Parking Levy, it could potentially be phased out once the Sustainable Travel Zone is introduced. Notwithstanding the outcome of this review it is undeniable that it would result in additional revenue to invest in visibly beneficial improvements in the transport infrastructure before the Sustainable Travel Zone can be put in place.

It should be noted that a Workplace Parking Levy would reduce traffic in the centre and thus reduce the congestion charge revenue base. It would therefore would become increasingly valuable to support the system. The modelling of the income derived from the two options would require detailed exposition.

14 'Making Connections' Brochure, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council, Autumn 2022

END