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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The engagement for Tackling Peak-time Congestion ran from 11th July to 10th October 2016. This used an awareness-raising engagement model and was led by the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership.

- Respondents were asked to submit their opinions on eight proposals.

- In total, 10,970 officially logged responses were received. Of these, there were 803 paper survey responses, 8,770 online survey responses, 862 emails, and 8 letters, as well as 377 social media comments (through Facebook and Twitter) and 150 verbal communications (phone calls, briefing events etc.).

- There were three petitions submitted in reference to this consultation, with a total of 10,590 signatures.

- The respondents were situated across the whole of the East of England, as well as from areas further afield, such as Kent, Worcestershire and Surrey.

- The majority (27.3%) of respondents identified themselves as being between the ages of 35-44, followed closely by those aged 45-54 (26.3%). The age groups with the fewest respondents are the Under-17 (0.4%) and 75 and above (1.9%) groups.

- Of the respondents, 7,664 were categorised as Economically Active, 1,418 were categorised as Economically inactive, and 140 were categorised as Other.

- 7.3% of all respondents identified themselves as having a disability that influenced the way they travel.

- The majority of respondents identified themselves, and were thusly categorised, as Personal transport users (71.1%), closely followed by Active users (70.7%). Smaller numbers were Passengers (16.4%) and users of Other modes of travel (1.4%)\(^1\). Some respondents said they used multiple modes of transport.

- The most preferred proposal was the introduction of better pedestrian and cycling facilities with 43.8% of respondents saying it would improve their journey.

\(^1\) As respondents were able to tick more than one option, the percentages add up to more than 100% of total respondents.
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- The least popular options were the introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points and a Workplace Levy, with 64.5% and 40.6% of respondents respectively claiming it would worsen their journey.

- 68.3% of respondents said they would not change the way they travel in response to the proposals. 45.2% said they would change their behaviour in some way.

- The majority of respondents (32.5%) said that, if the proposals were introduced, they would change to public transport. 23.2% said they would switch to active modes of travel.

- 59.4% of respondents said the proposals would have an impact on their journey followed by 17.6% who thought the proposals would not impact their journey.

- Many respondents used the free-text questions to comment on the fact that there was some confusion in regard to some of the options given within the survey, including what the nature of Travel Planning and Smart Technology would be (Q2), as well as to suggest that a congestion charge should be introduced as a preferable alternative to the proposed options.

- Other forms of communication were analysed, including comments made verbally, via social media and through petitions. A range of topics arose, including concerns around pollution becoming more concentrated in residential areas, worries that people will be prevented from accessing/leaving their homes during peak times, and concern that the needs of disabled citizens have not been taken into account, to name a few.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

The engagement for Tackling Peak-time Congestion ran from 11th July to 10th October 2016. Engagement targeted businesses, commuters, stakeholder groups, and residents across the Cambridge Travel to Work Area.

Due to the wide target area, an awareness raising engagement model was used rather than a leaflet drop model. A total of 45,000 leaflets containing questionnaires were printed and distributed to over 330 pick-up locations (}
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Map 1). More than 237,000 postcards were inserted into 15 local newspapers over a week long period, directing people to the online information and survey. A range of other publicity was undertaken to complement these key channels, including advertising, emails, poster campaign, business briefings and public exhibitions (the latter two are shown in Map 2). A closer look at the location of the publicity events and leaflet drops in Cambridge City can be seen in Map 17, Appendix One.

In planning the engagement strategy, we sought to reach the widest possible audience and use a broad range of tools to achieve this. Our intention was to target a broad cross section of different audiences, including commuters, residents and hard to reach communities and the plans took the City Deal dialogue much wider than any previous exercises.

A copy of the paper questionnaire can be found in Appendix Two. It consisted of 11 questions, of which 3 questions had free-text “other” response options, and 1 free-text question. The content analysis has been incorporated within this report with the aid of a qualitative content analysis software package.

All percentages are quoted as the percentage of overall survey respondents, not the number of responses per question (i.e. when respondents can state multiple answers, these have been divided by the total number of survey respondents (9573), unless stated otherwise in the footnotes).

The Cambridgeshire Research Group (CRG), part of Cambridgeshire County Council, works closely with many service groups to provide information and data on a variety of information in relation to the people and economy of Cambridgeshire. The CRG were asked by the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership to provide a statistical and quantitative analysis report on the results of the Tackling Peak-time Congestion in Cambridge questionnaire that was conducted by the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

The Cambridgeshire Research Group have a set quality assurance process laid out in three stages which has been applied to this report. Stage one governs the commissioning of the work, ensuring that the brief is clear and the methodology is well designed in order to meet the clients desired outcomes. This would include quality assuring the proposed process for the consultation and reviewing the consultation wording and the methods used for collecting feedback. Stage two covers quality assurance of the data and tables drawn from that data, ensuring any data-entry has been carried out to the desired standard and that the text, charts, maps and tables included in the final report are a true reflection of the findings. The final stage is a peer or manager review of the final report to ensure that it meets the desired level of quality, accuracy and presentation. Any errors picked up at proof reading are corrected and a manager signs off the final report. In the case of this report the proof reading stage was broad with a number of people reviewing the content.

In terms of statistical significance the total number of logged responses, of 10,970, is far above the number required for the answers to be within plus or minus 3% of actuals at the 95% confidence limit, were this exercise a structured piece of market research. However, consultation results report the views of a self-selecting sample (people who have opted to respond rather than being randomly chosen) therefore it is more important to ensure that at there was sufficient coverage of publicity, media etc. to ensure that as many had the chance to respond as possible. Given the extensive publicity as described in section 1.1 and the different response channels available, together with the
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time available for responses, this consultation can be described as robust, meeting the criteria laid out in the County Council’s consultation strategy.
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Map 1 Location of leaflet pack distribution across Cambridgeshire for the Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge first stage of consultation
Map 2 Location of publicity events across Cambridgeshire for the Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge first stage of consultation
1.2 PUBLICITY

Engagement Included:

- 330+ pick up points for leaflets, including community centres, GPs, dentists, Park & Ride, Colleges and all Cambridgeshire libraries. The leaflets also highlighted the public exhibitions, the chance to arrange a phone call with the project team, as well as all contact details.
- More than 327,000 postcards in 15 local newspapers in and around Cambridge.
- Emails to all partner Councillors, plus emails to Councillors in nearby Councils.
- Emails to Residents Associations and Parish Councils in July (and a reminder email in September).
- Emails to all Cambridgeshire Head Teachers.
- Emails to everyone who had responded to any City Deal consultation so far and had requested to be kept up to date with City Deal projects, to highlight the engagement.
- Emails to business networks Cambridge Ahead, Cambridge Network, Cambridge BID, Visit Cambridge & Beyond, the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Chamber of Commerce requesting they highlight the engagement and cascade the option for businesses to have their own lunchtime briefing with a member of the project team.
- Parent Mail requests to all Cambridgeshire schools and information in the weekly schools newsletter.
- Over 9,000 leaflets were requested by local Councillors & Residents Associations, who then distributed them around their areas.
- Leaflets and posters to around 100 Parish Councils across the area as well as requests to highlight engagement in their newsletters, noticeboards, Facebook groups and websites.
- 34 lunchtime briefings held for local businesses, including presentations at business hubs e.g. St John’s Innovation Centre.
- Articles with information about “Tackling Peak-time Congestion” and regular updates were included in Cambridge Matters and South Cambridgeshire magazine, which are delivered to every household in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire by partner Councils.
- Posters displayed around the City Centre in billboards.
- Bus stop panel posters near proposed Peak-time Congestion Control Points and at transport hubs, i.e. the Busway, Train Station and Park & Ride sites.
- Adverts in local magazines targeting different groups, including: two editions of Velvet; Cambridge Magazine; Cambridge Edition, and Eastlife, as well as single editions of the Chamber of Commerce Business magazine ‘Connected’, The Varsity Student Newspaper, and Cambridge Business Magazine.
- Advert on the reverse of bus tickets on all Stagecoach buses from the Cambridge depot for two weeks during September and a further weeks’ advertising on buses based at the Huntingdon depot to cover the busway route.
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- Advert in the new Cambridge Independent paper first edition with, 5000 copies distributed by hand across the city centre and in other areas targeted by the paper.
- Advertorial in Cambridge Independent paper second edition, distributed to areas targeted by the paper.
- 20 public exhibitions across the Greater Cambridge area.
- Online information at www.gccitydeal.co.uk/congestion with further technical background available at www.gccitydeal.co.uk/access-study.
- A Business Breakfast Briefing held in conjunction with Cambridge Ahead. Invitations were sent to other business networks for cascading to their members / partners. An evening event for businesses was also organised by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Chamber of Commerce. Members of the City Deal Board and Project Team attended to give a presentation and answer questions on the proposals.
- Leaflets were distributed by hand on buses and at the bus station by Stagecoach.
- Regular Twitter and Facebook updates including travel stories and key messages with targeted boosted Facebook posts to extend reach. Also Facebook post requests were sent to admins of local group pages to raise awareness of exhibitions.
- Twitter webchat with the new City Access Study Team Leader.

1.2.1 ENGAGEMENT EVENTS

A series of 20 informal exhibitions were held at venues accessible to people and organisations in and around the Greater Cambridge area. The option of a lunchtime business briefing was made available to local businesses and 34 briefings were held. Additionally, a large Business Breakfast Briefing was held, in association with Cambridge Ahead.

EXHIBITIONS

An array of 16 single- and double-width pop-up banners were used at events. These sought to explain the eight point package of measure aimed at tackling congestion in Cambridge. Board topics included:

- Each element of the eight point plan i.e. Peak-time Congestion Control Points, Workplace Parking Levy, Residents’ Parking Zones, etc
- Maps of City Deal proposals
- Information on how to provide feedback on proposals

Additionally, FAQs and reports showing traffic modelling and other technical background to the proposals were available at exhibitions. A mix of Cambridgeshire County Council officers, consultants from Mott MacDonald and officers from partner councils Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council officers were available at these events to explain the eight-point plan proposals and to listen to feedback. Comments books were also provided to enable people to record their comments in writing, to be utilised as part of the formal responses to the engagement.
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Two events were held prior to the summer holidays with the remaining 18 and the breakfast briefing being held after the school holidays in September and early October. Two events – one in the Grand Arcade outside John Lewis and one at Addenbrooke’s – were held to reach out to those who may not specifically choose to attend an event. Attendance was not taken at these exhibitions; however, an estimated 220 people were reached.

Over 400 people attended the other 18 events with an approximate total of over 620 exhibition attendees.

A summary of informal exhibitions is presented in Table 1.

1.2.3 BUSINESS BRIEFINGS

During the engagement process the project team attended approximately 34 lunchtime briefings that were booked by individual businesses. The purpose of these briefings was to raise awareness amongst employers and employees of the proposals to ensure they were aware of them and the process for having their say. The briefings ranged in size from those that were attended by in excess of 70 people to those that attended by a smaller group. Notes were taken at each briefing and again, these have been fed into the consultation process.

A Business Breakfast Briefing was organised as part of the engagement process on Monday 26th September. Organised in conjunction with Cambridge Ahead, this briefing was open to businesses and Cambridge Ahead, Cambridge BID, Visit Cambridge & Beyond, Cambridge Network, and the Chamber of Commerce. The Local Enterprise Partnership were asked to cascade the invitation to their members and partners to encourage attendance. The event was attended by approximately 70 people and the format of the briefing included a presentation on the proposals, a presentation about the Workplace Parking Levy in Nottingham by Sue Flack and a Q&A session that was independently chaired.

Notes were taken at the briefing and form part of the engagement feedback.

In addition, the Chamber of Commerce and the Local Enterprise Partnership arranged an evening Business Event, to which members of the City Team were invited to present the proposals and take questions from businesses in attendance.

Additionally, a seminar on bus reliability was held on Monday 19th September in the Guildhall, with guests including Professor David Begg (former Chairman of the Government’s Commission for Integrated Transport), Cambridge City Councillor Herbert (Chair of the City Deal Executive Board), and Andy Campbell (Managing Director of Stagecoach East) forming part of the panel for questions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>20th July 2016</td>
<td>17.30-20.00</td>
<td>St John the Evangelist, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 8RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Shelford</td>
<td>21st July 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>Memorial Hall, Woillards Lane, Great Shelford CB22 5LZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Arcade</td>
<td>6th September 2016</td>
<td>10.00-15.00</td>
<td>Grand Arcade, Cambridge CB2 3BJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbeach</td>
<td>7th September 2016</td>
<td>17.30-20.00</td>
<td>Waterbeach Primary School, High Street, Waterbeach CB25 9JU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histon</td>
<td>8th September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>Histon Baptist Church, Station Road, Histon CB24 9LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham</td>
<td>12th September 2016</td>
<td>16.30-19.30</td>
<td>Bottisham Village College, Lode Road, Bottisham CB25 9DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>13th September 2016</td>
<td>15.30-18.00</td>
<td>Meadows Community Centre, 1 St Catharine's Road, Cambridge CB4 3XJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourn</td>
<td>14th September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-19.30</td>
<td>Melbourn Village College, The Moor, Melbourn, Hertfordshire SG8 6EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>15th September 2016</td>
<td>16.00-19.00</td>
<td>Chesterton Community College, Gilbert Road, Cambridge CB4 3NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnham</td>
<td>19th September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>West Road Concert Hall, 11 West Road, Cambridge CB3 9DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swavesey</td>
<td>20th September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>Swavesey Village College, Gibraltar Lane, Swavesey CB24 4RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>21st September 2016</td>
<td>15.30-18.30</td>
<td>St Pauls, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpington</td>
<td>22nd September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>Trumpington Village Hall, High Street, Cambridge CB2 9HZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>26th September 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>The Old Library, Emmanuel College, St Andrew's Street, Cambridge CB2 3AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambourne</td>
<td>27th September 2016</td>
<td>17.30-19.30</td>
<td>The Hub, High Street, Cambourne CB23 6GW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterton</td>
<td>28th September 2016</td>
<td>16.30-19.30</td>
<td>Shirley Community Nursery &amp; Primary School, Nuffield Road, Chesterton, Cambridge CB4 1TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hinton</td>
<td>3rd October 2016</td>
<td>17.00-20.00</td>
<td>Cherry Hinton C of E Primary School, High Street, Cambridge CB1 9HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addenbrooke's</td>
<td>4th October 2016</td>
<td>11.00-14.30</td>
<td>The Concourse, Addenbrooke's, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 0QQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>4th October 2016</td>
<td>16.30-19.30</td>
<td>Linton Village College, Linton CB21 4JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comberton</td>
<td>5th October 2016</td>
<td>17.30-20.00</td>
<td>Comberton Sports &amp; Arts, West Street, Comberton CB23 7DU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4 FEEDBACK MECHANISM

All attendees at the consultation event were invited to sign the attendance book, with walk-ins tallied to ascertain numbers. The home postcode of respondents was requested in the questionnaire so that the spatial distribution of responses could be identified. Hard copy questionnaires could be submitted by sending them to a freepost address or handing it to a representative at one of the exhibitions or briefings.

Respondents were asked to consider whether Tackling Peak-time Congestion proposals would make a difference to their journey, their usual mode of travel, whether they would change mode, and which other form of transport they would consider. Free-text boxes were provided to understand whether people expected the proposals to have any impact on their journeys and for further comments on the proposals.

In addition to the leaflet questionnaires, a comments book was made available at each consultation event for attendees to write down their views on the proposals.

Alongside senior officers from the Transport Infrastructure Policy and Funding team (TIPF), note-takers were sent to the business briefings to summarise areas of concern and record particular issues. Details of telephone calls and a log of meetings between senior City Deal and TIPF team members were also kept.

The Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal website hosted online information about the engagement at www.gccitydeal.co.uk/congestion with information highlighted on the homepage banner. A formal response was encouraged by means of an online survey. This covered the same questions as the paper questionnaire.

People were also invited to submit their comments on the scheme to a dedicated email address set up for the Greater Cambridge City Deal (city.deal@cambridgeshire.gov.uk). Furthermore, comments were invited by telephone, post and social media (Facebook and Twitter). Details of these contact details were provided on the leaflets, postcards and on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website.
In total, 10,969 official logged responses were received. Of these, there were 803 paper survey responses and 8,770 online survey responses (9,573 responses in total), 862 emails, and seven letters. Meanwhile, 377 social media comments (either on Facebook or Twitter) and 150 verbal communications (phone calls, briefing event comments, etc.) were received.

There were an additional 3,868 online surveys partially completed (respondents who had started, but did not submit a survey). Whilst their engagement is noted, their views cannot be utilised as part of this feedback evaluation due to information governance constraints.

Of the 9,573 completed survey responses (online and paper responses), 57% (5,489) gave a contact email to remain updated with the progress of the project.

2.1.1 LOCATION

Of the 9,573 completed survey responses, 5,394 respondents gave a full identifiable postcode. The location of the respondents’ postcodes can be found in Map 3, with an enlarged map of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Region in Map 18, Appendix Three.

The majority of respondents were situated across the whole of East of England, with some respondents from as far afield as Kent, Worcestershire, Warwickshire and Surrey. A thematic (colour-coded) map of respondent count per district is shown in

---

2 Many respondents provided both an email address and a postal address.
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Map 4.
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Map 3 Point map of respondents’ locations, who gave a valid postcode.
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Point map of consultation respondents, with county labels.
A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
2.1.2 AGE PROFILE

The majority (27.3%) of respondents identified themselves as being between the ages of 35-44, followed closely by those aged 45-54 (26.3%). The age groups with the fewest respondents are the Under-17 (0.4%) and 75 and above (1.9%) groups, shown in...
Figure 1. When compared to the national age profile, it becomes apparent that the consultation received responses from a disproportionately high volume of the 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 age groups, and a disproportionately low volume of 17-24 year olds, those in the 75 and above age group, and, as would be expected, the under 17s (Figure 2).
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**Figure 1** Response to Q8: Respondent age breakdown

**Figure 2** A comparison of consultation respondent and UK population age breakdowns (UK population data from ONS, 2015).
2.1.3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Question 9 asked respondents about their employment status; a total of 9,222 answered this, several giving multiple answers. Consequently, the following values exceed the number of respondents. The majority of respondents identified themselves as Employed (6,627) followed by those identifying themselves as Self-employed (1,060) (Figure 3). The lowest number of responses was from respondents identifying themselves as Unemployed (41).

For the purpose of this report, the employment statuses have been grouped into three categories: Economically active, Economically inactive, and Other. The breakdown of the categories can be found in Table 2. The Economic active category took precedence in categorisation terms, so that respondents who gave multiple answers that included economically active sub-categories, to this question were categorised as Economically active (in total being 7,664 respondents). All the rest were categorised as Economically inactive (1,418 respondents) or, if they had only picked the option “Other”, Other (140 respondents) (Figure 4).

Table 2 Categorisation of responses to Q8: Respondent employment status breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active</td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A home-based worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>In education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carer or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stay-at-home parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Response to Q9: Respondent employment status breakdown.
Figure 4 Categorised responses to Q9. Employment status.

Q9. Employment status (categorised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.4 DISABILITY

7.3% of all respondents identified themselves as having a disability that influenced the way they travel (Figure 5). This is much lower than the estimated number of people with a disability in England and Wales at 17.9%.³

Figure 5 Response to Q10: Do you have a disability that influences the way you travel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Response given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.5 METHOD OF TRAVEL

The majority of respondents identified themselves as car drivers (68.4%). This was closely followed by cyclists (42.0%), and pedestrians (28.8%) ⁴. The fewest respondents identified themselves as motorcyclists (2.7%), guided bus users (4.5%), or taxi users (4.6%). The breakdown can be found in

---

³ Percentage worked out using 2011 data counting people in England and Wales whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot and those whose day-to-day activities are limited a little. (ONS (2011) (QS303EW - Long-term health problem or disability [https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/summary.asp?reset=yes&mode=construct&dataset=532&version=0&anal=1&initsel] and ONS 2011 population data for England and Wales [https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011]). Comparison made with the data for the England and Wales due to some respondents living outside the county.

⁴ As respondents were able to tick more than one option, the percentages add up to more than 100% of total respondents.
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Figure 6.
For the purposes of this report the modes of transport have been put into five categories: *Public transport* (32.1%), *Passengers* (16.4%), *Personal transport* (71.1%), *Active users* (70.7%) and *Other* (1.4%). The category list can be found in Table 3, with the breakdown in
Figure 7. As respondents can choose multiple options, a total of 41.9% of respondents were both active users and users of personal transport.

Table 3 Categorisation of responses to Q8: Respondent mode of travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car as a passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal transport</td>
<td>Car as a driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active users</td>
<td>Walk/Run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A breakdown of respondents who answered the mode of transport question, defined by whether they reside within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone (WPLZ), can be found in Figure 8. Non-residents of the proposed WPLZ make up the majority of respondents; however, the mode of transport with the highest proportion of WPLZ resident users is active modes, followed by passengers (The percentages relate to the total number of respondents for each mode of transport, not the total number of survey respondents). WPLZ residency has been taken into account in the analysis of the data in order to gauge any difference in response behaviour as a result of residency within the WPLZ.
Figure 8 Mode of travel defined by whether the respondent resides within the Workplace Parking Levy zone

Respondent maps showing their usual mode of transport use can be found below. The locations of public transport users’ postcodes can be found in Map 5, passengers’ in Map 6, personal transport in Map 7, Active users’ in Map 8, and other modes of transport in Map 9. The count of respondents in these maps is lower than in the figures above, due to not all respondents giving an identifiable postcode. Maps showing all respondents across the East of England can be found in Appendix Four.
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Map 5 Greater City Deal Region map of postcodes of respondents who use public transport.
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Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater City Deal Region, who use public transport as their usual mode of transport. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 6 Greater City Deal Region map of postcodes of respondents who are passengers.
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*Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater City Deal Region, who are passengers (taxi, and car as passenger) as their usual mode of transport. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 7 Greater City Deal Region map of postcodes of respondents who use personal transport.
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Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater City Deal Region, who use personal transport (car as drivers, and motorcycles) as their usual mode of transport. A total of 5384 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Map 8 Greater City Deal Region map of postcodes of respondents who are active users.
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Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater City Deal Region, who walk, run or cycle (soft users) as their usual mode of transport. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 9 Greater City Deal Region map of postcodes of respondents who use other modes of transport.

Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge

Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater City Deal Region, who use other modes as their usual transport. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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When comparing mode of transport to employment status, *economically active* respondents more often identified themselves as personal transport users (2,206 respondents), whereas *economically inactive* respondents tended to use active modes of travel (1,131 respondents) (Figure 9).

**Figure 9 Categorised mode of transport (Q1) defined by respondents categorised employment status (Q9).**

2.2 PROPOSAL IMPACT ON JOURNEYS

The majority of respondents identified *The introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points, The introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy, and On-street Parking Controls* as options that would worsen their journey (64.5%, 40.6%, and 27.9% of respondents selected each option respectively). In contrast, the option that was deemed to improve respondent journeys was *Better pedestrian and cycling facilities* with 43.8% giving this response ( 
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Figure 10).
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2.2.1 BETTER BUS SERVICES AND EXPANDING THE PARK & RIDE

Most public transport users (18.7% of total respondents) thought Better bus services and expanded Park & Ride would improve their journeys, whereas the majority of users of all other transport types identified this option as having no impact on their journey (Figure 11).

Figure 11 Response to Q2: Impact of Better bus services and expanded Park & Ride defined by Q1. Mode of travel.
Most age groups thought better bus services and expanded Park and Ride would have no impact on their journeys, apart from the Under 17, 65-74, and 75 and above groups who all identified the option as one that would improve their journeys (Figure 12).

The majority of economically active respondents (40.3%) identified better bus services and expanded P&R as having no impact on their journey. In contrast, a marginally higher proportion of economically inactive respondents (6.3%) identified the proposal as more likely to improve their journey than having no impact at all (Figure 12).
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Figure 13).
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

**Figure 13** Response to Q2: Impact of Better bus services and expanded Park & Ride defined by Q9. Employment status

Employment status

**Figure 14** Response to Q2: Impact of Better bus services and expanded Park & Ride defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy Zone.

WPLZ residency appeared to have no effect on the responses (Figure 14).
2.2.2 BETTER PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING FACILITIES

Better pedestrian and cycling facilities was identified as improving respondent journeys by users of all modes of transport (especially active users with 49.8% respondents selecting this impact) apart from personal transport users, where the majority (34.1%) identified this option as having no impact on their journey (Figure 15).

Figure 15 Response to Q2: Impact of Better pedestrian and cycling facilities defined by Q1 Mode of travel.

All age groups identified the option as improving their journey apart from the 55-64 age group where the majority saw the option as having no impact (}
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Figure 16).
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Figure 16 Response to Q2: Impact of Better pedestrian and cycling facilities defined by Q8. Age.

The majority of respondents from all *economically active* employment categories identified the option (Better pedestrian and cycling facilities) of having the potential to improve their journey. With 35.7% of the respondents also categorised as *economically active*, 7.1% of the respondents also categorised as *economically inactive* and 0.51% of respondents categorised as ‘other’ selecting this as their answer (Figure 17).

Figure 17 Response to Q2: Impact of Better pedestrian and cycling facilities defined by Q9. Employment Status.
Non-residents of the proposed WPLZ make up the majority of respondents however, the highest proportion of WPLZ residents (39.4%) identified better pedestrian and cycling facilities as improving their journey (Figure 18). In contrast, of those who identified the option worsening their journey, 76.3% of these were non-residents of the WPLZ.

**Figure 18 Response to Q2: Impact of Better pedestrian and cycling facilities defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.**
2.2.3 IMPROVED STREETSCAPE AND PUBLIC REALM

Improved streetscape and public realm was identified as having no impact on respondent journey by the majority of the modes of transport, apart from Active users, where a marginally higher proportion of respondents (31.1%) identified the option as improving their journey (Figure 19).

Figure 19 Response to Q2: Impact of Improved streetscape and public realm defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

There was no change in pattern due to the age of the respondent. Respondents from all employment categories identified the option as having no impact on respondent journeys, followed by improving journey (
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Figure 20).
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Figure 20 Response to Q2: Impact of Improved streetscape and public realm defined by Q9. Employment status.

The majority of both WPLZ residents and non-residents identified this option as having no impact on their journey (Figure 21).

Figure 21 Response to Q2: Impact of Improved streetscape and public realm defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.
2.2.4 PEAK-TIME CONGESTION CONTROL POINTS

Figure 22 shows respondents’ usual mode of transport compared to their opinion on Peak-time Congestion Control Points (PCCP). A total of 18.8% of respondents were Active users who thought this proposal would improve their journey; however, 57.6% are personal transport users who feel these will worsen their journey.

Figure 22 Response to Q2: Impact of The introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

Comparing this option with age and employment do not show any change in trend. Non-residents of the proposed WPLZ make up the majority of respondents however, the highest proportion of WPLZ residents (39.6%) identified PCCP as improving their journey.
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Figure 23). In contrast, the highest proportion of WPLZ non-residents (70.9%) identified the option as worsening journey (}
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Figure 23. Although, in total, the majority of both WPLZ residents and non-residents identified this option as having the potential to worsen their journey.
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Figure 23 Response to Q2: *Impact of The introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points* defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.

**Q.2.4. The introduction of Peak-time Congestion Control Points** defined by whether the respondent resides within the WPLZ

- **Count**
- **Response given**
  - Improve my journey
  - No impact
  - Worsen my journey
- **Categories**
  - WPLZ Resident
  - WPLZ Non-resident
2.2.5 WORKPLACE PARKING LEVY

Personal transport users and passengers identified the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy as worsening their journey, whereas users of all other transport types thought it would have no impact (Figure 24).

Figure 24 Response to Q2: Impact of A Workplace Parking Levy defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

The majority of age groups identified the option as having the potential to worsen their journey. However, the Under 17, 65-74, and 75 and above age groups identified it as having no impact on their journey (Figure 25).

Figure 25 Response to Q2: Impact of A Workplace Parking Levy defined by Q8. Age.
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Most respondents (36.6%) in the *economically active* category identified the option as having the potential to worsen their journey. A lower number of responses were recorded for the other two categories (*economically inactive* and *Other*), however the majority of *economically inactive* (7.5%) and those who selected *Other* (0.7%) thought the option would have no impact (Figure 26).

Figure 26 Response to Q2: Impact of a Workplace Parking Levy defined by Q9. Employment status

Non-residents of the proposed WPLZ make up the majority of respondents; however, the highest proportion of WPLZ residents (44.9%) identified the introduction of a workplace levy as improving their journey, i.e. whilst the overall total of those who gave the answer *Improve my journey* was low, 44.9% who did give this as their answer were residents (}
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Figure 27). In contrast, the highest proportion of WPLZ non-residents (79.9%) identified the option as worsening their journey. Overall, the majority of residents of the WPLZ identified this option as having no impact, whilst the majority of non-residents thought the introduction of a Workplace Levy would worsen their journey.
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Figure 27 Response to Q2: Impact of A Workplace Parking Levy defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.

![Diagram showing impact of Workplace Parking Levy on journey improvement or worsening based on whether the respondent resides within the WPLZ.]

2.2.6 ON-STREET PARKING CONTROLS

The majority of users of all modes of transport identified on-street parking controls (including Residents’ Parking) as having no impact on their journey. In the cases of Public Transport users, passengers, personal transport users and Other, this is closely followed by Worsen Journey. In contrast, more active users thought the option would improve their journey than worsen (Figure 28).

Figure 28 Response to Q2: Impact of On-street Parking Controls (including Residents’ Parking) defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

![Diagram showing impact of on-street parking controls on journey improvement or worsening for different modes of travel.]
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Age did not impact the trend. In terms of employment status, the majority of both economically active and inactive respondents thought the proposal would have no impact on their journey. However, after no impact, a higher proportion of economically inactive respondents said this proposal would improve their journey than worsen it. In contrast, after no impact, a higher proportion of economically active respondents thought the proposal would worsen their journey (Figure 29).
Non-residents of the proposed WPLZ make up the majority of respondents; however, the highest proportion of WPLZ residents (49.9%) identified the introduction of on-street parking controls as improving their journey (Figure 30). In contrast, the highest proportion of WPLZ non-residents (75.3%) identified the option as worsening their journey. Overall, the majority of WPLZ residents and non-residents thought the proposal would have no impact on their journey; however, in the case of residents, this is closely followed by *Improve my journey*. For non-residents, the second most popular option was *Worsen my journey* (Figure 30).
2.2.7 SMART TECHNOLOGY

The seventh proposal put forward was *Smart Technology*. All transport categories stated that this would have no impact on their journey (Figure 31), with personal transport users having the highest proportion of users who think this proposal will worsen their journey (13.2%).

**Figure 31 Response to Q2: Impact of Smart Technology defined by Q1. Mode of travel.**

All age groups state the proposal will have no impact on their journey, with respondents aged 75 and above having the highest proportion stating the proposals will improve their journey.
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Figure 32).
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Figure 32. Response to Q2: Impact of Smart Technology defined by Q8. Age.

Employment status and WPLZ residency appears to have had no impact on the responses for this proposal (Figure 33).

Figure 33. Response to Q2: Impact of Smart Technology defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.
2.2.8 TRAVEL PLANNING

The majority of respondents stated that *travel planning* will have no impact on their journey, with the second most popular answer saying that it will improve journeys (Figure 34). However, more personal transport users stated that this proposal would worsen their journey over improving it (15% compared to 12.7%), with passengers having an equal number of worsen and improve responses.

Figure 34 Response to Q2: Impact of Travel Planning defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

Age and employment status showed no impact on the responses to this proposal. WPLZ residency appears to not have influenced the trend for this proposal (Figure 35).

Figure 35 Response to Q2: Impact of Travel Planning defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone
2.3 BEHAVIOUR CHANGES

2.3.1 CHANGE IN HOW RESPONDENTS TRAVEL

Respondents were asked if the proposals put forward would encourage any change in travel during peak period journeys. The majority (68.3\%) said they would not change their behaviour, with 45.2\% of respondents stating they would change their behaviour in some way. The majority of these respondents (23.7\%) stated they would make other choices and proffered suggestions, followed by 9.2\% who stated they would use the same mode of transport but choose a different route. The breakdown of responses can be found in Figure 36.

**Figure 36 Response to Q3: Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel for some or all of your peak period journey?**

![Bar chart showing responses to Q3](chart.png)

Whilst 68.3\% said they would not change the way they travel, proportionately, more WPLZ residents offered to change route, whilst more WPLZ non-residents offer to change the time they travel.  

---

5 Percentages are calculated from the total 9573 respondents. The percentages equal to over 100\% due to the question design. Respondents could use the free text box for ”other choices” as well as tick one previous option, and some respondents used just the free text option.
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Figure 37). Overall, however, the trend does not appear to have been influenced by WPLZ residency.
Figure 37 Response to Q3: *Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel for some or all of your peak period journey?* defined by whether the respondent resides within the proposed Workplace Parking Levy zone.

Figure 38 shows a cross-tabulation of question 3 (change of travel), and question 1 (respondents’ usual mode of transport). Of the respondents who said they would not change their travel, 72.3%⁶ of these were active users and, 68.4% use personal transport. Of respondents who said they would change their working pattern, 86% were personal transport users and 83.6% were passengers. Active users made up 86% of the respondents who would change transport.

Figure 38 Response to Q3: *Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel for some or all of your peak period journey?* Defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

---

⁶ Percentages are higher due to Q1 being a multiple choice answer
A map of respondents and their relative answer to question 3 can be seen in Map 10 (A map of all respondents in the East of England can be found in Map 24, Appendix Five).

Economic activity has no effect on the trend. See Figure 39

Figure 39 Response to Q3: Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel for some or all of your peak period journey? Defined by Q9. Employment status.
Map 10 Point map of respondents in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 3.

Point map of consultation respondents answers to question 3 “Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel...?”. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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OTHER COMMENTS

Using a sentiment analysis Software package, Nvivo 11 Plus, it was found that a total of 2265 respondents (23.7%) put a response into the free-text comment box “Yes, I will make other choices” to their peak-journey travel. Of these only 605 respondents (6.3%) chose only this option, with 1660 (17.3%) of respondents using this free-text box to either remark on the proposals generally or gave further explanation to their choice.

Of all the free-text comments from question 3, the most common themes are:

- Already cycling or using the bus, so they will not change
  “I already cycle so my journeys will be improved and not be made worse by the changes.”

- Respondents will change multiple factors of their journey
  “Combination of the 4 'yes' options”

- Other modes of transport are more expensive than driving
  “...buses are currently far too expensive, and it is cheaper to drive and park (even with parking charges to pay.”

- Removal of the Park and Ride parking charge
  “Remove the parking charge at the park and ride”

- Public transport is not available/reliable/direct/frequent/ near their home/work place
  “There are no public transport options available to me”
  “I can’t even get a direct bus from my village”
  “I will change but only if a very speedy and frequent bus service”

- Public transport will increase journey time
  “A bus would be the only option but would treble or quadruple my journey”

- Respondents will be unable to get to work, after school activities, nurseries and appointments (hospital, dentist etc.)
  “If the proposed road closures happen, I will be unable to get to work.”
  “I don’t know whether it would be viable to keep my job as a mum who also needs to do school runs”

- Respondents are unable to change their travel time due to job, time or contract constraints (e.g. teachers, health care professionals and parents, both working and non-working) or due to mobility issues (disabled or elderly)
  “Don’t have a choice - confined not only by work hours but also by school times”
  “I have no choice than to visit the area in my wheelchair accessible vehicle driven by my carer.”

- Lack of definition for “peak time”
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“it's hard to answer definitively, as "peak time" hasn't been defined yet”
2.3.2 CHANGE IN MODE OF TRANSPORT

Question 3, had a follow up question, asking the respondent what mode of transport would they be most likely switch to if the proposals were to be put in place. The highest response was switching to cycling (16.5%), followed by switching to using the bus (14.5%). A breakdown of this is shown in Figure 40.

Figure 40 shows how respondents would change the way they travel.

Figure 40 Response to Q4: If you would change how you travel, which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?

A total of 32.5% of respondents said they would switch to public transport, and 23.2% of respondents switching to be an active user (}
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Figure 41).
The majority of both economically active and inactive respondents (25.6%\textsuperscript{7} and 6.3% respectively) identified Public transport as the mode of travel they would choose to switch to. This is followed by Active modes of travel (economically active 19.2%, economically inactive 3.6%) (Table 3). The percentages add up to more than 100% of total respondents.

\textsuperscript{7} Percentage of people who are economically active and have chosen public transport. 25.6% of all respondent were economically active and chose public transport. As respondents were able to tick more than one option, some of which can be include in the same category (see Table 3), the percentages add up to more than 100% of total respondents.
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Figure 42).
Residents within the WPLZ were most likely (43.6%) to switch to active modes of travel whereas non-residents were more likely to opt for public transport (75.5%) (Figure 43).

Age and employment demographics do not show a change in trend for question 4.

The location of respondents and their change in transport mode can be seen in Map 11-Map 15, with maps of the East of England found in Appendix Six.
Map 11 Point map of respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Active users).
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“Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to walking, running or cycling (being a soft user) in response to question 4 “...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?” A total of 39 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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Map 12 Point map of respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Public transport users).

"Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to public transport in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode."
Map 13 Point map respondents' postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Passengers).
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"Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to being a passenger (taxi, or car as a passenger) in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode."
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Map 14 Point map of respondents' postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Personal transport users)
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Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to using personal transport (car as driver, or motorcycle) in response to question 4: "Which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?" A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 15 Point map of respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Other).

Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge

Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to other forms of transport in response to question 4 “…which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?” A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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2.4 OTHER IMPACTS

Over half the respondents (59.4%) thought that the proposals would have an impact on their journey; this was followed by 17.6% of respondents who thought it would not affect their journey (Figure 44).

Figure 44 Response to Q7: Do you expect the proposals to have any other impact on your journey and on tackling congestion in Cambridge?

Users of all modes of travel thought the proposals would impact their journey; however, the modes of travel with the greatest number of respondents were users of personal transport and active modes of travel (46.7% and 42.6% respectively) (Figure 45).

Figure 45 Response to Q7: Do you expect the proposals to have any other impact on your journey and on tackling congestion in Cambridge? Defined by Q1. Mode of travel.

Age, employment and WPLZ residency did not show any effect or change to the trend for this question.
A total of 5,276 respondents left free-text comments for question 7.

Using a content analysis software package, a range of figures were produced. Table 4 highlights the sentiment analysis results of all the sentences used in the free-text part of question 7. The software does not categorise sentences that are neutral, or that have a mixed sentiment (both negative and positive). There were a larger number of negative sentences in the free-text comments.

Table 4 Sentiment analysis of sentences used in question 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Other comments</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 46 shows a word frequency cloud of the top 100 words used (and their stem\textsuperscript{8}, please note that \textit{business} is a stemmed word for \textit{busy}). The larger the word, the more often it is used; the colours give no context except to provide clearer definition when reading.

\textsuperscript{8} An example is work, with its stemmed words being: \textit{works}, \textit{working}, and \textit{worked}. For some words, the pluralised form is used as the stem e.g. \textit{parks} is used as the stem for \textit{park}, \textit{parking}, \textit{parked}; \textit{schools} is the stem for \textit{school}, \textit{schooling}. It is important to note that the use of stem words in a text frequency search does not take context of the word into account. These words may have a different meaning depending on the context that they are used.
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Figure 46 Word frequency cloud of top 100 words (and their stems) used in question 7
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Figure 47 and Figure 48 show a tree map of the automatic theme categorisation, including the sub-themes; the larger the box, the more frequent that theme was mentioned. Unfortunately, due to a limitation of the software used, it is not possible to display the less common themes. More details on this and the number of references made to each sub-theme in free-text responses may be found in the graphs in Appendix Seven.

Many respondents used this free-text box to express their overall opinion of the proposals, and to give suggestions, instead of question 11. The most common themes coming out of comments were:

- **Mention of a Congestion Charge** (89 respondents mentioned the phrase “Congestion Charge”) in two ways:
  - Peak-time Congestion Control Points (PCCPs) being mistaken as a congestion charge
    “It’s going to cost me more money to drive to work. Because I live inside where the proposed congestion charge will be.”
  - Others wanted a congestion charge, instead of the proposed PCCPs
    “Congestion charging may be another option that would be preferable to closing city centre roads.”

- **Suggestions of moving business out of the city, and losing jobs** (52 respondents eluded to businesses moving as a result of the proposal)
  - “Would consider moving my business somewhere else.”
  - “I may lose my job as I could not get there on time”

- **Traffic eases in Cambridge during the school holidays** (38 respondents mentioned the words “holidays” or “vacation” in reference to schooling)
  “during school holidays there is no issue with traffic”

- **Respondents said the PCCPs (commonly described as “road closures”) will trap them in their homes** (30 respondents use the term trap and its stemmed derivatives)
  “These proposals will trap me in my house during peak periods”
  “Blocking residents in is equally not the answer”

Other comments include:

- **Proposals have no separation between commuters travelling into and out of Cambridge**
  “Your proposal is very one-sided. It seems to have in mind commuters into the city, completely neglecting the people that live IN the city and work OUTSIDE the city, where your proposal has a significant negative impact”.

---

9 Recurrent themes were identified qualitatively however quantitative data has been collected retrospectively via Boolean text searches consequently the values may only partly reflect the frequency at which the themes arose. They do however give some indication of the extent to which certain phrases were mentioned by respondents.

10 Text search carried out using the Boolean search: “business” AND “move”.

---
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Figure 47 Tree map of automatic theme recognition hierarchy, showing the most used themes, with proportional sized boxes for each sub-phrase used-Part 1
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Figure 48 Tree map of automatic theme recognition hierarchy, showing the most used themes, with proportional sized boxes for each sub-phrase used - part 2
2.5 TRAVEL IMPROVEMENT OPTIONS

2.5.1 BUS TRAVEL IMPROVEMENT FACTORS

The majority of respondents identified all the given options as having the potential to make them use the bus more, apart from Better Park & Ride where more respondents gave the answer No (41.4%) than Yes (28.7%). More frequent services was identified by the most respondents as an option that would encourage them to use the bus more, with 63.9% opting for this response. This is closely followed by Reduced fares (62.2%), More reliable services (62.0%), and Faster services (56.8%) (Figure 49). 27.7% of respondents gave written responses to the Other option.

Figure 49 Response to Q5: Thinking about public transport, what might make you use the bus more often?

Other was identified most often by users of all modes of travel apart from Public transport as the option that would encourage people to use the bus more often: Passengers (11.1%), Personal transport (49.5%), and Active users (51.6%), and Other (1.0%). Most of those who identified themselves as users of Public transport (25.5%) identified More frequent services as the option that would encourage them to use the bus more often. For all modes of travel, apart from Public transport users and Other users, this is then closely followed by More frequent services. The second most selected option by users of Public Transport was More reliable services with 25.3% of respondents opting for this whereas Other users selected Reduced fares (0.63%) (The WPLZ residency did not have an effect on the trend.)
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Figure 50).

The WPLZ residency did not have an effect on the trend.
A total of 2,620 respondents selected “Other” for question 5. A large proportion of these responses were repetitious of the question option choice. Of those comments that did not overlap with the options available, the common themes were:

- Removal of parking charge at the Park and Ride sites
  “Remove parking fee at Park and Ride”

- More direct buses
  “More direct routes. No 8 takes ages to double back round Histon”
  “… direct bus to the city centre rather than travelling via Addenbrookes and the station”
  “More services that run directly from external routes to for instance Addenbrookes would be helpful”

- Orbital/circular bus route

- Cycle parking at bus stops

- Increasing the number of bus lanes
  “there should be more bus lanes so that the buses can cut through the traffic.”

- Improve bus quality
  “Significantly more comfortable and higher quality buses need”

- Integration of different bus companies into one ticket/smart card
  “Integrated ticketing and schedule planning. Instead of having it be divided up among a confusing array of private bus companies, ... a single ticketing scheme using smart cards ...”
2.5.2 CYCLING IMPROVEMENT FACTORS

Respondents thought that all the given options would make them consider cycling more apart from Better facilities at your workplace including cycle parking and change facilities and Better facilities including cycle parking at Park & Ride sites, stations and bus stops, where the majority selected No as their answer (47.4% and 45.0% respectively). Overall, the majority of respondents answered Yes to all the other options, but the one with the greatest support proved to be More and improved off-road cycle paths, with 53.6% of respondents picking this option (Figure 51).

Figure 51 Response to Q6a: Thinking about cycling, what might make you consider these options more often for your journey?

The majority of respondents chose to give their own suggestion through selecting Other: Public transport (24.8%), Passengers (12.2%), Personal transport (53.5%), Active users (53.8%), and Other (1.0%)\textsuperscript{11}. This is then followed across the board by More and improved off-road cycle paths (Figure 52).

\textsuperscript{11} All percentages are quoted as the percentage of overall survey respondents, not the number of responses per question (i.e. when respondents can state multiple answers, these have been divided by the total number of survey respondents, unless stated otherwise in the footnotes).
It can be noted that for options Q6a.1, Q6a.3, and Q6a.6, very similar numbers of WPLZ non-residents answered Yes (2,662, 2,588, and 2,355 respectively) and No (2,464, 2,322, and 2,518 respectively). However, the difference in total count for these options can be attributed to the answers of WPLZ residents. Furthermore, in the case of option Q6a.6 More or better publically available general cycle parking, more WPLZ Residents selected Yes than No, whereas more Non-residents selected No rather than Yes (Figure S3).
OTHER COMMENTS

A total of 2,187 respondents selected “other” choices. Like in question 5, many respondents’ comments repeated the options given, especially for more cycle parking. The most common suggestions, which were not repetitious of the question, are the following:

- Many already cycle
  “I would like these things, but I already cycle as much as possible so it won’t make me cycle more”

- Lack of support for shared-used paths between cyclists and pedestrians
  “I ticked ‘yes’ for off-road cycle paths but this is conditional on them being non-shared use (cycle only, not pedestrians too)”

- Park and cycle facilities
  “Free Park and cycle facilities would be useful”

- Compliments for current facilities
  “Cycle facilities on my routes are already pretty good; it’s hard to see how they could get significantly better.”

- More cycle training to increase safety
  “Provision of safe cycling and ‘return to cycling on streets’ courses.”
  “I do not feel safe cycling”

- Ability to take cycles on public transport
  “Cycles need to be able to be taken onto buses”

2.5.3 WALKING IMPROVEMENT FACTORS

In general, respondents didn’t think any of the given options would encourage them to consider walking more especially the Better facilities at your workplace for pedestrians including changing facilities option with 52.4% of respondents giving No as their answer. The most popular option was Higher quality footpaths with 35.8% of respondents choosing Yes. However, this is exceeded by the 39.6% of respondents who gave No as the answer to this same option (
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Figure 54).
In general, *higher quality footpaths* was the favoured option by users of all modes of travel: Public transport (15.8%), Passengers (7.0%), Personal transport (20.1%), Active users (37.3%), and Other (0.4%). The least favourite was *better facilities at your workplace for pedestrians including changing facilities*: Public transport (6.5%), Passengers (2.7%), Personal transport (8.7%), Active users (15.0%), and Other (0.2%) (}
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Figure 55).
Tackling peak-time congestion in Cambridge

Figure 55 Response to Q6b: Thinking about walking, what might make you consider these options more often for your journey (defined by Q1. Mode of travel)?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q6b options, with bars indicating the count of responses for each option.]

When respondents are defined by whether they reside within the WPLZ, it becomes apparent that this factor may have an influence on the overall trend. For options Q6b.1 and Q6b.2 more Residents of the WPLZ answered Yes than No whereas Non-residents selected No in preference to Yes in both cases (Figure 56).

Figure 56 Response to Q6b. Thinking about walking - what might make you consider these options more often for your journey? Defined by whether the respondent resides within the WPLZ.

![Bar chart showing responses to Q6b options, with bars indicating the count of responses for each option, differentiated by WPLZ residency status.]
OTHER COMMENTS

The number of “Other” comments was 1,299. A large number of respondents gave suggestions of how to improve pedestrian crossings:

- Reducing the number of pedestrian crossings
  “We actually need fewer pedestrian crossings (and I say this as a pedestrian)”

- Change waiting times and crossing priority
  “Shorter waiting cycles at pedestrian crossings”
  “Zebra crossings; improving the priority & length of pedestrian phases at existing crossings”

- Changing cyclists’ behaviour at and around pedestrian crossings
  “Cyclists stopping at pedestrian crossings would be a good idea to implement”
  “Stopping cyclists from riding on the pavements, they are a hazard for pedestrians.”

- Improve lighting of footpaths
  “Better street lighting”

- Improved provisions to make walking to work viable
  “Make property prices in Cambridge lower so I can live within walking distance.”
  “Free parking on outskirts of town for walkers and runners”
2.6 FURTHER COMMENTS

In total there were 5,991 answers for question 11 “If you have any further comments to make on our proposals, please use the space below”.

Table 5 shows the sentiment analysis of the individual words written in question 11 which asked for further comments on the proposals. In total there were 19,420 words.

Table 5 Sentiment analysis of words used in question 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11 comments</td>
<td>3965</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many words that appear frequently in question 7 also appear in question 11 (Figure 57).

Figure 57 Word frequency cloud of top 100 words (and their stems) used in question 11

The automatic theme categorisation tree map for question 11 was very similar to
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Figure 47, with roads being the top theme; however, buses was the 2nd top theme (compared to 6th in previous figure).

Some common suggestions\textsuperscript{12} that related to the proposals include\textsuperscript{13}:

- Introducing a congestion charge instead of PCCPs (343 respondents used the term “Congestion charge” in their response to Q11)
  “please use the system the congestion charge in London uses”
  “I would prefer to see a congestion charge for the whole of the city of Cambridge”

- More explanation for the proposals of Smart Technology and Travel Planning (28 respondents mentioned Smart Technology and/or Travel planning in their response)
  “What is "smart technology" and "travel planning"? After looking through the leaflets and website, I’m none the wiser”
  “I have questions marks "Smart technology" and "Travel Planning", because there is no adequate explanation here of what these teams will involve”

- Restrict delivery vans to non-peak times (232 respondents use the term delivery and its stemmed derivatives, 30 of these were returned when searching for the terms: “delivery” Near “Vehicle” AND “ban”)
  “ban all delivery lorrys between the hours of 8am and 7pm”
  “commit delivery lorries to overnight not blocking up raoads around town. Exclude them during the daytime”

- Others feel small businesses will be impacted (28 respondents used the term “small business”)  
  “You totally ignore the needs of small businesses trying to function in centralCambridge, including builders and maintenance firms, cleaners, carers, deliveries”
  “As a small business on Mill Road, reliant on access to my premises for deliveries at peak periods and throughout the day, the proposed control points would make it exceptionally difficult to service our business”

- Others feel elderly, disabled and carers have not been taken into account (422 respondents mention the terms “disabled”, “elderly” or “carers” and/or their stemmed derivatives)
  “As an elderly resident i am concerned that carers may be prevented from attending vunerable people and that volunteer drivers could be denied access to the people they are trying to help”

\textsuperscript{12} Comments and suggestions are published as originally supplied by respondents.

\textsuperscript{13} Recurrent themes were identified qualitatively; however, quantitative data has been collected retrospectively via Boolean text searches. Consequently the values may only partly reflect the frequency at which the themes arose. They do however give some indication of the extent to which certain phrases were mentioned by respondents.
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“Provision must be made for persons holding a disability blue badge to be able to drive around Cambridge during peak periods, they cannot cycle or use public transport due to their mobility.”

- Many respondents wanted more school buses (78 respondents use the terms “school bus” and “more”)  
  “Get schools to lay on suitable school bus”  
  “The way to bring down congestion is to stagger the starting and finishing times for the private schools, or help schools with setting up school buses across a variety of routes. When the schools are on their holidays, there isn’t any problem with congestion”
3 OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

These include letters, emails and comments written in the comment box at publicity events. In total there were 870 communications (8 letters, and 862 emails). The sentiment word analysis for the written communications is Table 6.

Table 6 Sentiment word analysis for additional written communications (emails, letters and comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communications</th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the letters and emails started with a complimentary statement of supporting the need to tackle congestion:

- “agree congestion needs to be tackled”
- “We support the change but...”
- “We are fully supportive of the objective of tackling congestion, as we are a local business that has committed its future to Cambridge.”

A key theme that came out of the written communications, which was not covered in the free-text comments in the consultation, was regarding access (535 respondents used the term “access” or a synonym of it in their correspondence):

- To residents homes
  “Can you let me know whether your proposals are restricting access (via car) to my home at certain times (as a resident), or whether I will have access at all times, regardless of where your control points are situated?”

- To certain commercial buildings
  “Not allowing people free access to parts of the city at particular times is likely to affect businesses, charities and public bodies such as churches in a negative way.”
  “Children’s centres, GP surgeries and women’s homes and need free access to the roads system to ensure women and babies care and safety are not compromised.”

- For the disabled
  “Disabled access needs to be considered.”

- Access to main roads (eg M11, Perne Road)
  “Girton has no immediate access to the M11, and there is no other way round Grange Road/Queens Road”
  “Ensure any congestion control points still allow unhindered access to Mill Road via Brooks Road and Perne Road (A1134).”
Many of the communications commented on the impact to businesses and the local economy (191 respondents used the word “business” in their correspondence whilst 33 respondents used the word “economy”):

“If this system was introduced, wouldn’t this introduction immediately choke the current local economy, by increasing business working overheads and have a major impact on how the City is viewed by new interested business and investment opportunities?”

SOCIAL MEDIA

Twitter and Facebook posts were recorded and analysed, with a total of 377 comments (167 tweets and 210 Facebook comments). Overall, there was a mixed sentiment from the comments, shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Negative</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Negative</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Positive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the themes stated above also appear in the analysis of the social media content. Other notable themes, not mentioned above are:

- The use of Powered Two Wheelers (PTWs) such as motorbikes, should be encouraged and allowed to use the bus lane (71 respondents referred to this mode of transport)
  “Think it’s about time Motorcycle members petitioned to use the bus lane just like busy London.”
  “Not everybody is fit or able enough to ride a bike this distance but a PTW provides an excellent solution… they need are better provisions in Cambridge e.g. more dedicated parking, use of bus lanes etc”

- Installation of smart traffic lights or changing the traffic light timings (3 respondents referred to this)
  “How about something more practical and evidence-based such as looking at the number and phasing of traffic lights outbound?
  “What happened to the idea about smart traffic lights which would take account of the traffic flow at different times of day and respond accordingly?”
VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS

A total of 150 verbal communications were logged: 5 phone calls, 59 calls to the contact centre, 32 conversations at lunchtime briefings and 54 verbal comments. The sentiment word analysis is in Table 8.

Table 8 Sentiment word analysis for additional verbal communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Negative</th>
<th>Moderately Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main themes arising from the verbal communications are:

- Wanting the Park and Ride parking charges to be free (8 respondents used the terms “park and ride”/“P & R” and “free”)
  “Park and Rides are unfair – the £1 charge means that it is cheaper to drive in and find a free parking space along residential streets.”
  “scrap of the £1 parking charge at the Park and Ride”

- Bus tickets need to be cheaper (9 respondents refer to this)
  “if a parking space is cheaper than the bus, why should I bother to get the bus?”
  “I will be forced to actively start looking for a new job elsewhere out of Cambridge because it simply isn’t financially or personally viable for me to travel in and get the park and ride, take two buses and then have to walk to work from wherever that drops me off.”

- Clarification of motorcycle exemption from PCCPs (31 respondents referenced “motorcycles”)
  “He wants to know if motorcycles be exempted”

- Need for more cycle parking (3 respondents directly referenced “cycle parking”)
  “Add secure cycle parking facilities at park and ride sites”
  “There is a need to address the cycle parking issue on St Andrews Street”

- Need for more school buses (3 respondents directly referenced “school buses”)
  “Students & school children should go on buses rather than taken to school by parents”

14 Recurrent themes were identified qualitatively; however, quantitative data has been collected retrospectively via Boolean text searches. Consequently the values may only partly reflect the frequency at which the themes arose. They do however give some indication of the extent to which certain phrases were mentioned by respondents.
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**PETITION ANALYSIS**

A number of petitions\(^{15}\) were submitted in response to the ‘Tackling Peak-time Congestion’ engagement. These included a change.org petition, “Stop the Cambridge City Deal”, which had 10,013\(^{16}\) responses/signatures; “Keep Cambridge Open for Businesses”, which had 507 responses/signatures; and a “Statement of Owners of Businesses and Carer of Enterprises in the Kite Area between Burleigh Street, East Road, Parkside and Emmanuel Road”, which had 70 signatures.

When signing the petitions a large number of people left comments. A dip sample of 10% (375) of the comments was taken for analysis of the general sentiment expressed. Broadly the comments could be sub-divided it into four general categories. These were:

- Short negative responses (37%);
- Concerns about gaining access to the city (41%);
- The impact of the changes on businesses (16%);
- Requests for improvements in public transport (6%).

Within the sample of 375 responses, there were 140 (37%) short negative responses objecting to the proposals. Some examples are:

- “The growth in Cambridge was supposed to be of benefit to the people of Cambridge - this clearly isn’t....”
- “I believe that the proposed traffic restrictions are counterproductive!”
- “This is a ridiculous idea. Those who work in the centre of Cambridge would not be able to get to work without spending half their wages in travelling fees. Cambridge is a tourist destination for a reason, cutting it off from all angles will reduce all of that and residents going into town and spending money. Whoever’s idea this is needs to rethink and re-evaluate”
- “Please don’t do this. It’s such a bad idea!”

Within the sample of 375 responses, there were 153 (41%) concerns regarding access to the city. Some examples are:

- “I’m signing because with these road closures I will be locked into my home area (or locked out of it if trying to return home) during closure hours. My street will be sealed off by East

---

\(^{15}\) There are a number of petitions on-line that reference the City Deal that have been created at different points in time. Within this analysis we’ve focused on those that refer specifically to the congestion consultation and / or were formally submitted to the City Deal team as part of the consultation.

\(^{16}\) Number of responses as of 16\(^{th}\) November 2016.
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Road and Coldhams Lane being no-go roads. There will be no way to get in or out by car to or from my home parking space during closure time. It’s a ridiculous proposition.”

• “Cars avoiding main roads to circumnavigate the blocked roads will just lead to congestion elsewhere and dangerous conditions for cyclists and pedestrians who already use smaller roads.

• “As a Trumpington resident, I’m deeply concerned by these plans to close key roads around the city at peak times. If Hills Road is closed, traffic on Trumpington Road will be even worse than it is meaning that it’d be at a complete standstill. How is this plan going to help traffic congestion?? Traffic will simply be moved to the alternative routes! It’ll be a mess. Buses are expensive and not a viable alternative for everyone for lots of good reasons other people have already mentioned: disability, carrying shopping or heavy items, couriers and builders, not having a direct route to somewhere, too expensive, etc.”

• “This is a deeply flawed initiative which will involve catastrophic congestion in the roads which are to be left open. It also takes no account of disabled drivers who cannot easily transfer onto Park and Ride buses which may drop them at an inconvenient spot. This is so short sighted - do they really think that an emergency plumber or electrician is going to carry all the tools and equipment by bus? I don’t think so. A re-think, at very least, is needed here.”

Within the sample of 375 responses, there were 58 (16%) concerns about the impact on businesses. Some examples are:

• “It will cause an absolute nightmare in Cambridge roads it will keep people away and businesses and shops losing customers and closing down everyone will go elsewhere. It will not solve the congestion, At all it will make everything much worse.”

• “The proposals will seriously affect my business, make journeys longer and increase pollution in some residential areas.”

• “A lot of businesses will suffer. Builders, etc. won’t be able to get to and from jobs. In the times in between, there will be chaos in the roads! Trumpington Road is already far too overstretched and this crazy scheme will only make matters worse!”

Within the sample of 375 responses, there were 24 (6%) requests for Better Public Transport. Some examples are:

• “The alternatives people are supposed to use don’t exist. I use the train from Newmarket. It is rammed full and only one per hour. There are a couple of buses, also already full. No services to the east Cambs villages and no evening buses at all. Fix all that and road closures won’t be necessary! People don’t drive in Cambridge for fun. Buses from Newmarket area are terrible, they were better twenty years ago. Make them cheaper, more frequent, run seven days a week from the villages and later at night. It wouldn’t cost 500 million!”
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- “Take all restrictions and charges off Park & Ride; offer incentives to people who work in Cambridge for using Park & Ride/public transport, such as vouchers provided in partnership with local businesses for entry to local attractions that want to increase foot traffic (cinemas, museums, shopping centre etc.)”

- “Cambridge has no true "public" transport. I wouldn’t mind paying money to the Cambridge City Corporation Bus Company, if it existed, but I have no interest in paying Stagecoach, a private company, to get me to work. The money doesn’t get pumped back into the city, it goes to Stagecoach's shareholders. To add insult to injury, it’s more expensive to get the bus than it is to drive! 1) The council should take over the running of public transport 2) The ticket prices need to go down, down, down 3) The congestion will vanish has the council never heard the fable of the North Wind and the Sun?”

- “Others have said it, but the traffic flows absolutely fine when schools are off, it is clearly school runs which should be targeted and not all motorists. Cough up for school busses instead of trying to fleece shoppers and residents and force everyone onto terrible P&R services unfit for purpose even now.”

4 ORGANISATIONS’ RESPONSE

Members of the Transport, Infrastructure, Policy and Funding Team gave presentations at 34 business briefings at locations in and around Cambridge. Most were for individual companies or organisations; however, some were open to all those based at a particular site, e.g. one at St John’s Innovation Centre.

Concerns were broadly in line with those expressed by the general public, with a focus on Peak-time Congestion Control Points and the Workplace Parking Levy. The existing level of bus services, together with individual experiences of the transport network, were regular topics of conversation. The better use of smart technology was also highlighted. Access for delivery vehicles was of considerable concern to business owners and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefings at Employment Hubs with Multiple Attendees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple attendees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 Count of businesses (categorised) that sent replies during the consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club/Social Group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name not Given</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Council</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to the business briefing engagements, quotes from the comments made by businesses and organisations in response to the ‘Tackling peak-time Congestion in Cambridge’ questionnaire were recorded. In total 30 businesses/organisations talked about pollution/air quality and 14 talked about congestion charging.

POLLUTION/AIR QUALITY RESPONSE QUOTES BY ORGANISATION CATEGORY:

Charity

- "Additional measures might include: impact on traffic noise levels, air pollution, and quality-of-life"
- "We recognise that diesel buses are a contributor to air pollution – although less than the pollution from the dozens of diesel cars needed to transport the same number of passengers. We would therefore like to see the City Deal bring forward plans for greening the city’s bus fleet"
- "We support improvements to public spaces and air quality, and we believe that proper cycling infrastructure can enhance both of those"
- "Improved air quality can provide benefits for health and biodiversity"

College

- "It is acknowledged that there are congestion and air quality issues in Cambridge which need to be resolved"
- "Will air quality really improve by access control? Because there will be longer detours"

Councillor

- "If resident parking were to be adopted for Coleridge, Petersfield and Romsey, then a single ‘Peak-time Congestion Control Point’ at the swimming pool would stop through traffic into the city on Mill Road at peak-times - provide a safer Mill Road for walking and cycling, and considerably reduce pollution"

Other

- "Of course, we also support the principles of travel planning and improving public space and air quality"
- "Enhanced public space and air quality - we fully endorse this ambition" "To improve air quality we must reduce the number of motor vehicles, especially diesel-powered, entering the city and villages"
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Parish/Town Council

- "[Peak-time Congestion Control Points] will increase risk of accidents, noise and air pollution in the village"
- "Subsidised alternative transport should already be in place together with extensive traffic and pollution monitoring in Cambridge"
- "This will also increase pollution because of longer journey times"
- "The reduction in congestion and, in particular, car travel will improve air quality considerably"
- "Full support for any improvements to public space and air quality"

Professional Services

- "Children, older people, and people with chronic health problems are among the most vulnerable to air pollution" "The report also makes clear there are no safe lower limits for pollution exposure"
- "there should be a greater emphasis in the 8 point-package on measures to reduce vehicle emissions and to improve air quality in Cambridge city centre"

Public Sector

- "People travelling further to avoid the ‘Peak-time Congestion Control Points’ will be generating more pollution and therefore air quality will be reduced"
- "Tackling congestion and improving travel options should provide benefits to everyone, including potentially improving air quality with the significant health benefits that could bring"

Residents Association

- "The reasons we don’t like ‘Peak-time Congestion Control Points’ are several fold: the major increase in air pollution of the cars diverted into North Newtown will go onto the residents and children from six schools in the area"
- "We fully agree that tackling peak-time congestion is now an urgent priority for the city. People are spending too long in traffic queues, journey times are unpredictable and growing congestion increases air pollution, with consequent risks to human health"
- "Adding a large volume of traffic will reduce safety and increase pollution"
- "Better bus services should be accompanied by significant reductions in the air pollution the current fleet produces"

Retail
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- "Encourage people to switch to low emission cars thereby reduce pollution"
- "supports the need to ensure traffic congestion is reduced and levels of pollution are reduced"

Trade

- "Is any of City Deal being done to target air pollution, or to cut pollution"

University

- "We are concerned about the effect current traffic control points have on funnelling traffic from the West and the South into Cambridge, with significant impacts on air pollution"
- "'Peak-time Congestion Control Points’ mean that there will be more air pollution created as motorists need to take longer journeys"
- "support measures that will make improvements to air quality"

Unknown

- "Heavier traffic on roads is likely to increase congestion, pollution and danger, especially to pedestrians needing to cross busier roads"
- "Pollution doesn’t cause me problems"

CONGESTION CHARGING RESPONSE QUOTES BY ORGANISATION:

Charity

- "There is an alternative package based around a congestion charge"
- "If ‘Peak-time Congestion Control Points’ are ineffective we would urge the City Deal to reconsider a congestion charge” "A peak hour congestion charge has the potential both to discourage car usage and to provide income"

Councillor

- "I don’t understand why this option [congestion charge] is not at least out for consultation"
- "Here is a link to how the London congestion charge manages this scheme, with nominated cars, and the option to change these for short-term cars, but only ever with two cars in use per day. I see no reason that we cannot do likewise"

Professional Services

- "Instead of closing the roads why not instigate a congestion charge zone similar to London"
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- "The ‘school holiday’ effect is well documented and we would expect that a congestion charge could deliver a reduction in traffic similar to that"

Residents Association

- "The [ANPR] technology could support a congestion charge for the city" "The congestion charge for Cambridge would be on a much smaller scale than the London charge"
- "Many residents have asked why the City Deal has not consulted on a congestion charge, believing it to be a more satisfactory way to reduce congestion"

Retail

- "What would be better though would be to introduce congestion charging for polluting cars"

Trade

- "Would a congestion charge not achieve most of what you want with a much lesser detrimental effect on those who need to travel in the city?"

University

- "Surely it would be a good idea to entertain the idea of a congestion charge"

Unknown

- "It seems that after years of talking of possible congestion charges they would be generally accepted"
- "Congestion charge would be better because it would target the right people"
- "What about the congestion charge that was mooted, why was it decided that this would be a better option"

Of the businesses/organisations that mentioned congestion charging, the highest known category was Professional services (3 responses), Charity, Councillor and Residents Association (2 responses each) and then Trade, Retail and University with one response each
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APPENDIX ONE

Map 16 Enlarged inset of Map 1 - location of leaflet pack distribution and events across Cambridge City
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Location of leaflet pack distribution and events across Cambridge City
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Map 17 Enlarged inset from Map 1, showing the publicity events and leaflet distribution areas within Cambridge City.

Legend
- Public Exhibitions Drop-In Events
- GPs, Dentists and Opticians
- Community Hubs, Bike shops and P&R sites
- Libraries
- Lunchtime Briefings at Businesses

© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 OS 100023205
# APPENDIX TWO

Figure 58 Photocopy of the paper questionnaires respondents could complete

---

## Questionnaire

If you would like to be kept updated on the progress of this project, please provide your contact details. Your details will only be used to improve Council services and will be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act.

**Contact Details (optional):**

- **Name**
- **DOB**
- **Address**
- **Postcode**
- **Email**

Please keep me updated with City Deal projects

---

**1. If you travel in or around Cambridge in the morning or evening peak periods, how do you currently travel? Tick all that apply:**

- [ ] Walk/Run
- [ ] Cycle
- [ ] Bus
- [ ] Guided Bus
- [ ] Park & Ride
- [ ] Train
- [ ] Taxi
- [ ] Car as a driver
- [ ] Car as a passenger
- [ ] Motorcycle
- [ ] Other

---

**2. Do you think our proposals will make a difference to your journey?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve my journey</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Worsen my journey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better bus services and expanded Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better pedestrian and cycling facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved streetscape and public realm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of Peak-Time Congestion Control Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Workplace Parking Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street Parking Controls (including Residents’ Parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**3. Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel for some or all of your peak period journeys?**

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes, I will change to a different mode of transport
- [ ] Yes, I will use same mode of transport, but travel at a different time
- [ ] Yes, I will use same mode of transport but choose a different route
- [ ] Yes, I will change my working patterns – this might include working from home more often
- [ ] Yes, I will make other choices (please set out below)

---

**4. If you would change how you travel, which form of transport would you be likely to switch to? Tick all that apply:**

- [ ] Walk/Run
- [ ] Cycle
- [ ] Bus
- [ ] Guided Bus
- [ ] Park & Ride
- [ ] Train
- [ ] Taxi
- [ ] Car as a driver
- [ ] Car as a passenger
- [ ] Motorcycle
- [ ] Other

---

**5. Thinking about public transport – what might make you use the bus more often (tick all that apply):**

- [ ] Faster services
- [ ] More reliable services
- [ ] More frequent services
- [ ] Longer operating hours
- [ ] Reduced fares
- [ ] Express services
- [ ] Service from where I live
- [ ] Better Park & Ride
- [ ] Better waiting facilities including information
- [ ] Other (please indicate)

---

**6. Thinking about walking and cycling – what might make you consider these options more often for your journey?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality on-road cycle paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More and improved off-road cycle paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cycle crossing facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better facilities at your workplace for cyclists including cycle parking and changing facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better facilities including cycle parking at Park &amp; Ride sites, stations and bus stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More and better publicly-available general cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please indicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Walking / Running** | | |
| Higher quality footpaths | | |
| Improved pedestrian crossing facilities | | |
| Better facilities at your workplace for pedestrians including changing facilities | | |
| Other (please indicate) | | |

---

**7. Do you expect the proposals to have any other impact on your journey and on tackling congestion in Cambridge?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t know

If you answered yes, please provide anything you wish to add below

---

**If you answered yes, please provide anything you wish to add below**
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8. What is your age?
   - Under 17
   - 17-24
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
   - 55-64
   - 65-74
   - 75 and above
   - Prefer not to say

9. Are you:
   - In education
   - Employed
   - Self-employed
   - Carer or similar
   - A home-based worker
   - A stay-at-home parent
   - Unemployed
   - Retired
   - Other
   - Prefer not to say

10. Do you have a disability that influences the way you travel?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Prefer not to say

11. If you have any further comments to make on our proposals please use the space below.
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APPENDIX THREE

Map 18 Enlarged Inset from Map 3 - Point map of respondents’ postcode locations who gave an identifiable postcode
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Point map of consultation respondents within the Greater Cambridge City Deal region. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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APPENDIX FOUR

Map 19 Map of postcodes of all respondents who use public transport.
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Point map of consultation respondents, with county labels, who use public transport as their usual mode of transport.

A total of 3984 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 20 Map of postcodes of all respondents who are passengers.
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Point map of consultation respondents, with county labels, who are passengers (taxi, and car as passenger) as their usual mode of transport. A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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Map 21 Map of postcodes all respondents who use personal transport

Legend
- County (national)
- Cambridgeshire County (Greater Cambridge City Deal in inset)
- Proposed Workplace Levy Zone
- Personal Transport (3965)
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Map 22 Map of postcodes all respondents who are active users.
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Map 23 Map of postcodes all respondents who use others modes of transport.
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Map 24 Point map of respondents’ postcodes and their answers to question 3.
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Point map of consultation respondents answers to question 3 "Will our proposals encourage you to change how you travel...?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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Map 25 Point map of national respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Active users).
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Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to walking, running or cycling (being an active user) in response to question 4 “… which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?” A total of 5,394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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Map 26 Point map of national respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Public transport users).
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Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to public transport in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 27 Point map of national respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Passengers).
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Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to being a passenger (taxi, or car as a passenger) in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
Map 28 Point map of national respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (personal transport users).
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Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to using personal transport (car as driver, Lincolnshire or motorcycle) in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to?". A total of 5394 respondents gave a valid postcode.
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Map 29 Point map of national respondents’ postcodes in the Greater City Deal Region and their answers to question 4 (Other).

Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge
Point map of consultation respondents who would switch to others modes of transport in response to question 4 "...which form of transport would you be likely to switch to gave a valid postcode."

Legend
- County (national)
- Cambridgeshire County (Greater Cambridge City Deal in inset)
- Proposed Workplace Levy Zone
- Other Modes of Transport (1961)
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APPENDIX SEVEN

(NB Some sub-themes are duplicated as similar words have been picked up by more than one theme during the coding process e.g. bus service appears under both bus and service.)

Figure 59 Breakdown of themes and sub-themes that were present in the free-text responses to question 7 – Part One.
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Figure 60 Breakdown of themes and sub-themes that were present in the free-text responses to question 7 – Part Two.
Figure 61 Breakdown of themes and sub-themes that were present in the free-text responses to question 7 – Part Three.
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About the Cambridgeshire Research Group

The Research Group is the central research and information section of Cambridgeshire County Council. We use a variety of information about the people and economy of Cambridgeshire to help plan services for the county. The Research Group also supports a range of other partner agencies and partnerships.

Subjects covered by the team include:

- Consultations and Surveys
- Crime and Community Safety
- Data Visualisation
- Economy and The Labour Market
- Health
- Housing
- Mapping and Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
- Population
- Socio-demographic research