

Dear Dr Keiller

I have received your flier for residents in the Brunswick & North Kite Area. I am a member of the BruNK Committee and I would like to address the points you make.

First, I have a question: you say the BruNK flier is believed to be misleading by 'many local residents' – can you tell me how many is 'many' please?

Re your comments on the Core Scheme options:

Option A:

You say part-time bollards will have 'no significant impact on peak traffic flows'. In fact, the Council has produced modelling figures for this scheme which show that traffic on Maids Causeway would reduce by **29%** and on Victoria Avenue by **68%** in the 12 hours from 7am-7pm. This reduction would be achieved despite the fact that the bollards would be open in the direction that most traffic was travelling in the proposed 'rush hours' (6am-10am and 4pm-midnight – which incidentally gives a total of 12 hours out of 24 that the bollards would be open.)

You also query the information about the retail sector in Cambridge. May I refer you to the CEN 10 Jan 2006 which carried an article from which we gathered all the information about shopping in Cambridge. It had been issued during a press conference by the 'Love Cambridge Shopping' campaign which involves seven organisations: City Council, County Council, John Lewis, Land Securities (Bradwells Court), the Prudential (Grafton Centre), Arlington Securities (Lion Yard) and the Grand Arcade Partnership. We assume that they were sure of their facts before they announced them to the press. I have a copy of the article if you'd like to see it.

Option B:

I agree with your comments – 'traffic calming' would almost certainly result in stop-start traffic that would increase congestion and pollution.

Option C:

I'm not aware that the AJC has yet met to consider Options A, B and C – the purpose of the current consultation exercise is to inform them when they do meet to discuss the options.

'Do Nothing':

Regarding this, you may be aware that the County Council conducted its own survey of residents last November. It showed:

68% of residents thought there was a problem with the Maids Causeway-Victoria Avenue route

33% thought part-time bollards were the best solution

11% wanted improved pedestrian and cycle facilities

7% supported traffic calming to slow traffic down

7% wanted other improvements to manage the traffic more safely

I assume the AJC will take note of the findings of this survey, along with other consultation feedback.

You are right to say that BruNK has not agreed to recommend a particular option. As a Residents Association of seven years, we have regularly informed and consulted all residents on a wide range of issues including the ongoing traffic problems and the (slow) progress of the Core Scheme. Until the Council published its consultation leaflet two weeks ago, we did not know for sure what options they would propose. We regard it as our role to remind residents of the facts that did not appear in the consultation leaflet. As our flier says, every figure and fact is taken from City and County Council reports and other published sources. We will make those same points in our submission to the AJC.

Finally, I would like to ask you these questions:

Between Mitcham's Corner and East Road roundabout, the Victoria Avenue-Maids Causeway through route carries **32,544** vehicles per day. The Elizabeth Way-Chesterton Road through route carries **32,310** vehicles per day (**234 fewer**.)

Do you consider there to be any difference between the two roads that are in a City Centre Conservation Area and the two roads that are the Inner Ring Road?

As Cambridge and its suburbs are to have 47,500 new homes in the next 10 years (incl. 15,000 at the far end of Newmarket Road on Marshall's site) do you think everyone should be allowed to drive though the City Centre until these roads are gridlocked?

If not, what would you suggest is done about the significant extra traffic?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Wendy Andrews

CC Cllrs Rosenstiel and Huppert and the BruNK Committee.