

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (5th March 2024)

PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

N o.	Question / Commen ts from:	Item	Question / Statement
1.	Ms Lynda Warth on behalf of Warboys Bridleway Group	Item 4. Puddock Road Safety Scheme	<p>In 2021 on Ramsey Road, Warboys, within the 30mph limit, a horse and its rider were involved in a serious hit and run accident. The rider was knocked off her horse and left lying in the road. There is a clear need for safety improvements in the area.</p> <p>Station Road Hill (where Puddock Road meets Station Rd) links to a number of footpaths and bridleways. We have been trying for many years and have just been granted, a 40mph buffer zone along into the village for the safety of walkers and horse riders. Currently there is no speed restriction once outside the 30mph of the village.</p> <p>Cars come round the blind bends at speeds up to 60mph and cut the corner which is dangerous for all road users. Going from 30 mph on Puddock Rd to 40mph up the hill round the blind bends then back to 30mph into the village would not improve safety. We would like to make a case for the 30mph on Puddock Road to extend right up the hill to the village entrance on Station Road.</p> <p>It appears the TRO will only apply to the piece of road from Ramsey 40ft to Ramsey Hollow Road and not along the long stretch of road up to the village that we use to access the bridleway network, which is a shame. The speed reduction needs to be applied to the full length of the Puddock Road right up to Station Road.</p>

			<p>Response:</p> <p>The proposals set out in this report are specifically aimed at addressing the pattern of fatal accidents which occurred in the section identified above. The addition of the 40mph buffer zone to the south of this section was a suggestion that came from the road safety audit on the 30mph limit. This is appropriate in ensuring that northbound speeds are reduced before the 30mph limit, to encourage greater compliance with the 30mph limit. The section being treated is very narrow which is a speed reducing feature. The other sections of Puddock Road referenced are significantly wider and therefore do not have the same speed reducing feature.</p> <p>Introducing a lower speed limit on the other sections of Puddock Road is unlikely to amount to reduced speeds without additional measures such as raised cushions or narrowing's as the road is straight with a clear view. Vertical measures such as those mentioned above would not be suitable as there is a risk of deflection and loss of control which could increase the risk of a vehicle entering the water course.</p>
2.	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcyle	Item 4. Puddock Road Safety Scheme	<p>Camcycle welcomes the safety improvements proposed for Puddock Road. The use of automatic number plate recognition to limit access to certain routes is a useful tool, and we hope the County will continue to consider it in future schemes.</p> <p>By deterring through traffic and reducing speed, the County has inadvertently created a new rural cycle route. Improvements to Puddock Road will enhance journeys between Ramsey and Chatteris and Warboys and Chatteris, as well as providing a new connection in the County's long-distance cycle network.</p> <p>Policy AT07 states that all highway improvement schemes must consider active travel. Therefore, we urge the highway authority to review this scheme to see how it can be further improved for active travel users. For example: could the centre lining be removed</p>

			<p>which helps to reduce speed, is there a missing link to the route that restrict connections between communities, could you use quiet lane signage to raise awareness of vulnerable road users?</p>
			<p>Response: There is only a short length of the scheme at the southern end where there is a centre line because the road is of sufficient width. As this covers two junctions with side roads, the centre line is an important road safety feature and will be retained. For the remainder of the length of Puddock Road, the proposals do not have a centre line as the existing width is too narrow. In reducing the speed limit, introducing access controls and trialling the measures to fill the rutting at the side of the carriageway active travel is being improved. Officers believe that it is better to let the new speed limits and access only (for motorised vehicles) controls become established before further promotion of this road as an active travel route.</p>
3.	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcycle	Item 5. BP Witchford Roach Non- Motorise d User Crossing	<p>Camcycle welcomes the recommendations outlined for the next steps regarding the BP Witchford Roundabout crossing. We note that in section 2.5, a grade-separated solution is acknowledged to be appealing from a highway safety perspective, albeit at a higher cost and with greater carbon impact than a signalised crossing.</p> <p>To expand on this point; not only would a well-designed grade-separated crossing be safer, but it would also significantly improve convenience, directness, comfort, and attractiveness, all of which are core design principles in Local Transport Note 1/20, the national cycle infrastructure design guide. This document is then noted as a key design document in the County's Active Travel strategy.</p> <p>Whilst considering carbon emissions is important, we should not only consider it in terms of construction emissions but also in the potential carbon savings from increased levels of mode shift. A high-quality grade-separated junction would encourage more cycling, fewer car trips, and likely have a far greater impact on emissions over its lifetime.</p>

			Will the County ensure this is taken into consideration?
			<p>Response:</p> <p>As part of the Options Appraisal Report, and aligned with national and policy requirements since 2021, the shortlisted options were specifically evaluated in relation to their carbon impacts. At the early stages, this assessment has been driven by construction impacts, however, once more detailed trip modelling is undertaken a better understanding of reduced journeys as a result of the provision of an overbridge could take place. We will also consider in the next feasibility phase, the use of construction materials with a lower overall footprint for instance timber. The feasibility stage will consider the three shortlisted options against a number of further detailed assessments including carbon, transport modelling, cost and environmental assessment alongside further consultation.</p>
4.	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcyle	Item 6. Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Toolkit	<p>Camcyle commends the recommendations to approve the adoption of the draft Active Travel Toolkit. Embedding the road user hierarchy into all aspects of the highway authority's work is crucial, and it's encouraging to see it prominently featured in the toolkit. However, while this progress is welcome, it's essential to ensure that the hierarchy goes beyond mere lip service and is truly integrated into every decision-making process. For example, it is excellent to see the progress being made on bringing this into the county's maintenance strategy, with defects on active travel being accorded a higher level of consideration in the Highway Operational Standards than previously because of the increased danger to people walking and cycling. This will make a significant difference to the journeys and safety of people across our county.</p> <p>Going further, Suffolk County Council's Street Guide is a good example of a methodology for integrating the user hierarchy into movement networks on new development sites, requiring developers to support all submissions with evidence. This should be a future consideration for the active travel toolkit.</p>

			<p>Camcycle has concerns that the progress the county council is making in terms of policy is not being matched by progress on its delivery.</p> <p>For example, the developer for the Land North of Cherry Hinton and the developer for the Wing development each submitted three junction proposals. Neither of the developers provided any evidence or supporting documentation from an active travel perspective and both failed to align to national and local policy. This failure exemplifies a disconnect between county policies and how they progress S278 designs with developers.</p> <p>Will the county council request that these developers submit the necessary junction assessments and meet with us and other stakeholders to address concerns with the proposals as they should have done, as set out in the active travel strategy?</p>
			<p>Response</p> <p>The county council guarantees adherence to the road user hierarchy for new applications submitted by developers. For small-scale developments, decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis, with a priority given to active travel.</p> <p>After the adoption of the Active Toolkit, any new planning applications we receive from developers will be required to incorporate the road user hierarchy. For large-scale developments, developers will be asked to provide detailed evidence of proposed solutions, with a focus on prioritising active travel.</p> <p>The planning applications for the aforementioned developments, Land North of Cherry Hinton approved in June 2019 and Wing development approved in June 2018, were both granted prior to the introduction of LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design Guide and the Active Travel Strategy. In the future, the county council will mandate developers to provide essential junction assessments, as set out in the new Active Travel England guidance. County council officers will engage with Camcycle and other stakeholders to address concerns raised by developers' proposals.</p>

5.	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcycle	Item 7. Highways Maintenance Capital Programme	<p>We note on page 158 the inclusion of resurfacing near the Newmarket and Barnwell Road roundabout which is linked to the GCP's Eastern Access scheme.</p> <p>The two cycle tracks on Wadloes Road and Barnwell Road will also be vital connections for the GCP scheme, but no maintenance works are included within the scope of the GCP programme. The existing condition of those cycle tracks makes what is on paper a high-quality cycle track, close to unusable.</p> <p>Will the county council confirm the scope of these works and if not already included, consider including these cycle tracks within any nearby maintenance works?</p>
			<p>Response :</p> <p>The carriageway resurfacing works on Newmarket Road will be undertaken, in co-ordination with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). The cycle tracks to which you refer are not included in the scope of these works.</p> <p>Officers will visit the site and will assess whether resurfacing works or more localised repairs are required.</p> <p>If resurfacing works are required, these will be added to the forward maintenance works programme. Such resurfacing works would constitute a discrete scheme and the timing of any such works would be dependent upon the availability of road space.</p>
6.	Cllr Immay Blackburn-Horgan	Item 7. Highways Maintenance Capital Programme	<p>Firstly, I would like to thank the County Council for the extra investment being put into highways, a critical area raised time and time again on the doorstep in my Ward Queen Edith's and the surrounding villages.</p> <p>However, when I read the appendices I was extremely disappointed by the list of schemes included.</p>

			<p>The City and South Cambs appear disproportionately few times despite roads being in urgent need of treatment, these roads being main arterial routes into and out of the City and biggest employment site too, some have the highest usage levels in the entire county.</p> <p>Just some examples such as Cherry Hinton Road in Queen Edith's near the junction is in a dreadful state yet does not appear on this list, Hills Road similarly. Wulstten Way requires more than patching being a main route through the Ward with high levels of local usage too for schools and medical needs, likewise the inner ring road Fendon and Mowbrey (never forgetting our busy side streets used continually by workers at CBC).</p> <p>What reassurances can the committee give me and our Queen Edith's Ward residents that these roads will be addressed?</p> <p>How is usage levels and risk combined alongside condition data to ensure we have the most appropriate roads included and prioritised for repair?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Cherry Hinton Road in the vicinity of Hills Road is being very closely monitored by officers, including the Local Highways Officer (LHO). The booking of road space in the City is severely restricted due to other works on the highway, including those being undertaken by GCP.</p> <p>Appendix 2 to the report contains works in Hills Road, between Rathmore Road and Cavendish Road. Some roads adjacent to Wulftstan Road are scheduled to receive surface treatments in year 25/26 and officers will assess whether Wulftstan Road can be treated at this time.</p> <p>Fendon Road is being assessed for grip fibre treatment and forms part of a longer term plan of surface treatments that is currently being developed.</p> <p>Mowbrey Road is currently being maintained via localised patching and will continue to be monitored by the Local Highway Officer.</p>

			<p>Condition data is a prime arbiter for the identification of capital maintenance schemes. This data is assessed alongside a number of other factors. The assignment of a road within the maintenance hierarchy is a key factor in scheme prioritisation. This hierarchy is based upon usage and nature of roads and footways. Therefore, roads in similar conditions will be prioritised in accordance with the hierarchy, meaning that busier roads will be treated preferentially.</p>
7.	Mrs Sarah Hughes	8. Transport Strategy Action Plans and Integrated Transport Block Funding	<p>Question for the Chair in relation to Agenda item 8 (Transport Strategy Action Plans and Integrated Transport Block Funding)</p> <p>The papers for December's Highways & Transport Committee meeting set out that the County Council will work on a new Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, to supersede the adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Within its City Access Programme (the workstream to reduce congestion and improve sustainable transport journeys), the Greater Cambridge Partnership has been working on a new road network hierarchy for Cambridge. Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance supports this work – it is a major opportunity to create priority routes for buses so they don't get stuck in traffic and put in place a network of local streets where it is safe and easy to walk, wheel and cycle. We are therefore extremely disappointed to see that - despite a consultation showing majority support - the papers for the forthcoming GCP committee meeting recommend no further development of this project by the GCP.</p> <p>GCP officers instead recommend that any revised proposals for a revised road network hierarchy (and there is no guarantee that there will be any) will be developed through the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy and led by the County Council. This is despite Joint Assembly members wanting "to remain actively involved in this work and be given the opportunity to input to the same extent it would have if the work was being progressed by the GCP" (Agenda Pack for the 7 March GCP Meeting) and the GCP having a vastly larger budget for such projects than the county council.</p> <p>Will any of the £345k allocated to Strategy Development and Integrated Transport</p>

			(schemes to support the development of local transport policies, strategies, and action plans; and to prioritise local integrated transport schemes) be spent on drawing up the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, including further consideration of a new road network hierarchy for Cambridge, and when will the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy be completed?
			<p>Response</p> <p>Preparatory works have been ongoing on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, and technical work has been ongoing for some time aligned with work by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on the initial development stages of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. That alignment will be maintained through the development of the new strategy, as was the case with the current Local Plans and the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, which were developed and consulted on together. The timescales for the new Local Plans have not yet been finalised.</p> <p>Funding for the transport strategy development work will be from a range of sources. It is anticipated that the GCP will remain involved in the detail of this work. There is a significant evidence base that has been developed as part of the work on City Access and Making Connections, and on other elements of the City Deal programme being delivered by the GCP, this will inform and steer work on the new strategy.</p>
8.	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcycle	Item 8. Transport Strategy Action Plans and Integrated Transport	<p>It is clear from the previous agenda item how stretched the funding for Highways has become and the difficult choices having to be made by the county council. In this agenda item the allocation for strategy development and integrated transport schemes is £345k which in terms of the remit of the authority, and the number of schemes is frankly a very small amount.</p> <p>This lack of funding is spelled out again in the Pavement Parking agenda item which states that there are currently no county council funds available to trial a simple scheme covering a tiny area of Cambridge City.</p>

		Block Funding	<p>Therefore, based on the above it is unclear why the County in its present position would suggest that they should lead on the network hierarchy work for Cambridge City when the GCP is set up to fund schemes of this kind, and the county council is only one of three constituent authorities. This is also in the face of Joint Assembly members wanting “to remain actively involved in this work and be given the opportunity to input to the same extent it would have if the work was being progressed by the GCP”.</p> <p>Why does the county council believe it’s really in the best political and financial position to take on this work?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Funding for the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy development work will be from a range of sources. It is anticipated that the GCP will remain involved in the detail of this work. There is a significant evidence base that has been developed as part of the work on City Access and Making Connections, and on other elements of the City Deal programme being delivered by the GCP. This will inform and steer work on the new strategy by the County Council with the City, District, GCP, and the Combined Authority.</p>
9.	Mr David Staughton. Cambridge Living Streets	10. Electric Vehicle Charging Cable Cross-Over Pilot	<p>Living Streets welcomes the transition to electric vehicles and is pleased to see these proposals to pilot trials of the charging of cars parked on the public highway. Few householders have the luxury of off-road parking and charge points have a large footprint, often on the footway, and are necessarily limited in number.</p> <p>However, despite the thorough appraisal of the risks of the proposed solution, we remain concerned on several grounds. First is the lack of clarity about safe ways to reduce trip hazards. Without providing pavement gullies the most likely solution, use of cable safety covers as protection for the cables and of footway users, while often satisfactory for short term installations, is potentially</p>

		<p>hazardous in the longer term. Its robustness outdoors, in constant use, with long-term exposure to weather, and unpredictable levels of loading is doubtful. We note that some households have already unofficially tested this and observed that short runs of cable cover soon get displaced with heavy footfall.</p> <p>Secondly, any variation in level tends make less confident walkers focus on the pavement and therefore reduces attention to what lies further ahead. In an environment where other walkers are often glued to a phone screen or walking abreast and where scooters, cyclists and others make unauthorised use of the footway, existing hazards are amplified.</p> <p>Finally, are there not better alternatives? Overhead cable runs, lamppost fed chargers and a range of other provisions may be more expensive in the short term but provide a more durable solution.</p> <p>Could you please provide greater clarity as to what safety measures are proposed and how much variation is permitted and will this committee agree to explore and test a wider range of alternatives, perhaps in conjunction with other councils, to ensure long-term and safe solutions are found.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Response</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) that accompanies this agenda item identifies the potential negative impact of trialling any cross-over solution that does not provide a fully flush solution within which a charging cable can be housed. The EqIA further identifies that these impacts will most likely be felt by pedestrians or those who use wheeled modes such as wheelchairs, mobility scooters or who travel with pushchairs. In order to mitigate against this impact, the EqIA specifically states that any cross-over solutions that do not provide a fully flush solution in which a charging cable can be housed should be excluded from the trial. This is reflected in section 4.1 of the paper.</p> <p>Officers have been in contact with other authorities already trialling some of these products, to help inform the design of the trial and will continue to engage with them to find solutions to issues as they arise during the trial.</p>
10	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith	11. Pavement Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly welcome the report - Welcome use of an ETRO so this can be experimented with - That Mill Road and East Road need to be included <p>I am speaking as a resident of Petersfield, and am not a representative of any organisation.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Mill Road and East Road already have restrictions in place and therefore Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) can and do enforce the existing parking restrictions. But they can only enforce when they are present and observe the offence. A Red Route may be a more appropriate restriction for roads such as East Road and Mill Road. Enforcement for Red Routes is carried out using a camera and does not require the patrolling CEO to observe the offence. This is something that can be explored with GCP if the committee approve the recommendation.</p>

11.	Ms Elizabeth Walter	Item 11. Pavement Parking	<p>This question is from Mill Road 4 People, a campaigning organisation with over 1,000 signed-up supporters, which has recently been running a campaign specifically highlighting the extent of pavement parking in Mill Rd. Our question has three parts.</p> <p>1) Why haven't councillors for Romsey and Petersfield ensured that Mill Road was included in 3.2 of item 11 of the agenda as an area of concern regarding pavement parking? Those councillors and Cllr Beckett have received several email communications from MR4P detailing our concerns and asking for specific measures to mitigate the problem. As yet, no responses have been received by us.</p> <p>2) Will you commit to implementing MR4P's request to install bike stands at the pavement edge, parallel to the road, in all places where the pavement width is sufficient? This would be a cheap and simple means to both create a barrier to pavement parking and provide much-needed extra bike parking.</p> <p>3) Why are you not employing more parking enforcement officers in Cambridgeshire? In 2023, the income from parking fines was £2,424,473.00 and the expenditure on enforcement was £545,649.89 plus some in-house admin. These figures suggest that there is no financial barrier to employing more officers – in fact quite the contrary.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>3) The costs of enforcement do not cover all systems, management etc. as well as the processing costs of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN)</p> <p>Recruitment is challenging to say the least. In the current environment our contractors OCS Legion have a constant battle to achieve staffing requirements. A role where you are verbally abused on the street daily does have limited attraction.</p> <p>Having more Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) does not guarantee more income. We find in Mill Road and around schools patrolling CEOs bring limited PCN income and it uses substantial time. Parking on Mill Road is often related to the business</p>

			<p>(popping to a shop for example) and drivers will quickly move their vehicle when they see a CEO approaching, meaning that no ticket can be issued.</p> <p>All surpluses from parking enforcement are allocated to supporting public services provided by the County Council.</p> <p>A more effective restriction for a busy route in Cambridge might be a Red Route which can be explored further if the Committee agree to the recommendation.</p>
12.	Professor Linda Jones	11. Pavement Parking	<p>I am speaking on behalf of Cambridge Living Streets. We welcome the ETRO pilots for banning pavement parking but are concerned that the pilots are so limited in time and scope. We worry that insufficient evaluation data will be gathered to inform the committee about implementing and managing more difficult and challenging parts of the city where pavement parking is a major problem throughout the day, every day, for example along Mill Rd.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Mill Road already has restrictions in place and therefore Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) can and do enforce the existing parking restrictions. But they can only enforce when they are present and observe the offence.</p> <p>A Red Route may be a more appropriate restriction for roads such as Mill Road. Enforcement for Red Routes is carried out using a camera and does not require the patrolling CEO to observe the offence.</p> <p>This is something that can be explored with GCP if the committee approve the recommendation. There will, however, be significant set up costs for a Red Route scheme as it requires installation of enforcement cameras which will need to be found.</p>

13.	Mr Richard Wood	11. Pavement Parking	<p>I note, with pleasure (Agenda Item 11) that pilot schemes for bans on pavement/verge parking through ETROs are proposed to go ahead.</p> <p>I am however dismayed that neither Mill Road, Cambridge (from Coleridge Road junction to the Parkside junction) nor East Road (from the Parkside junction to the Burleigh Street junction) are included.</p> <p>Both of these stretches of highway are plagued with obstructions to the footway by parked vehicles, including delivery vehicles and Private Hire vehicles.</p> <p>The problem is particularly intense on the section of Mill Road from the railway bridge to the junction with Mortimer Road. Between 7 am and 7 pm it is rare to encounter fewer than three vehicles simultaneously obstructing the footway. From 7 pm to midnight it is rare to find fewer than six such instances, and can suffer from as many at 15 concurrently.</p> <p>I wish to query why Mill Road and East Road have not been proposed for pilot schemes, and to ask that they are included as swiftly as practicable.</p>

			<p>Response:</p> <p>Mill Road and East Road already have restrictions in place and therefore Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) can and do enforce the existing parking restrictions. But they can only enforce when they are present and observe the offence.</p> <p>A Red Route may be a more appropriate restriction for roads such as East Road and Mill Road. Enforcement for Red Routes is carried out using a camera and does not require the patrolling CEO to observe the offence.</p> <p>This is something that can be explored with GCP if the committee approve the recommendation.</p>
14	Ms Anna Williams/ Camcycle	Item 11. Pavement Parking	<p>Earlier we spoke about the disconnect between the lip service that is often paid to the user hierarchy and the reality of the experience for people who are towards the top of the hierarchy.</p> <p>Nowhere is that clearer than pavement parking. Our pavements are only a small part of highway land which should be dedicated to the most vulnerable road users and the protection of this space should be an imperative.</p> <p>Therefore, we 'd like to ask the county council to be bolder here – why not work with the GCP on a more ambitious scheme? Parking bans on pavements can be rolled out across larger zones; for example (apart from a few minor exemptions), there is no legal barrier to zoning the entirety of Cambridge as a no pavement parking zone.</p>
			<p>Response</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed trial is to see how effectively the scheme works. If successful and resources are available, then Members may wish to pursue a wider roll out.</p>

--	--	--	--