

**11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p align="center">David Stoughton Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Living Streets welcomes the revised proposals for Hills Road, which include important improvements for pedestrians, both walking and wheeling. The reframing of the proposals to spell out the aim of creating a ‘healthier, more pedestrian friendly environment’, rather than just ‘Cycling+’ with pedestrians as more of an afterthought, is a significant step forward.</p> <p>We note that current pedestrian, cycling and bus use of Hills Road exceeds motor vehicle movements, despite conditions in some parts of the road being unpleasant, unsafe and a deterrent to walking and cycling. We expect active travel numbers to grow appreciably once improvements are in place.</p> <p>We do have remaining concerns about the safety of floating bus stops for access for those in wheelchairs or pushing buggies. We also regret the rather cumbersome pedestrian crossing arrangements eg. at Hills Rd/Lensfield Rd/Gonville Place, where pedestrians could still have to walk or wheel quite long distances to cross. We urge GCP to support diagonal road markings to signal the all red phase pedestrian movement here and at the Downing Street crossing. Cambridge residents might learn that all-red enables diagonal crossing, but visitors and overseas tourists need more clarity.</p> <p>Our question focuses on the negative impact of the Brooklands Avenue-Hills Rd changes for pedestrians on Brooklands Avenue. Traffic levels and pollution are likely to grow on Brooklands Avenue as the Hills Rd scheme squeezes motor traffic. The wholly inadequate shared footways will become even more attractive for cyclists – but more risky for pedestrians. Will GCP Assembly agree that investment is urgently needed in Brooklands Avenue to increase pedestrian safety and reduce health risks especially for children who need to get to local schools and for older people to be able to stay active?</p>
<p align="center">Frank Gawthrop</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 Cycling Plus – Hills Road and Addenbrookes Roundabout</p> <p>Are Councillors aware that some 6 years ago the Catholic church junction was extensively changed to introduce a cycle lane on Hills Road leading to the junction with Lensfield Road and a forward box with a cycles only green light that allows cyclists to cross this junction before general traffic is allowed and that this works well.</p> <p>Would Councillors agree that not everyone is capable of using a cycle and also for many people who have to travel longer distances using a car is the only viable option. As such any changes here must take account of all road users.</p>

**11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Are Councillor concerned that the report has introduced this major unilateral change to the scheme without prior warning.? Advertised as a consultation on Hills Road there was no mention of a major change to the A603 which is a critical part of the city inner ring road. Are they satisfied this gives the public a fair consultation process?</p> <p>All traffic heading down Hills Road intending to enter the city centre car parks or use the Fen Causeway to access west Cambridge will be offered two alternative routes:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use Brooklands Ave (already heavily congested) and then Trumpington Road to the Fen Causeway roundabout 2. cut though Station Road, Tenison Road (a largely residential street), Mill Road and Gonville Place to approach the Catholic junction from the other direction <p>Both these alternatives are highly unsatisfactory, causing extra journey time and congestion. The routing of traffic down Tenison Road is particularly onerous on residents.</p> <p>I would also point out that the removal of the right turn from Lensfield Road will have the reverse effect on the above roads. Do Councillors consider it acceptable to propose such a change without a proper analysis of the effect on the road network as a whole?</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7: Cycling Plus – Hills Road And Addenbrooke’s Roundabout</p> <p>Hills Road is a bustling street of shops, restaurants and local services connecting the city centre to many of Cambridge’s largest educational and employment sites. It sees a large number of transport journeys and includes some of Cambridge’s most dangerous junctions including both the Addenbrooke’s roundabout and Catholic Church junction.</p> <p>Neither of these junctions can be considered alone: any new designs must be part of a wider vision for both the sustainable transport network and city priorities as a whole. Due to the limited scope of the Addenbrooke’s scheme and funding, here this opportunity has been missed.</p> <p>However, Camcycle does welcome the new option provided for the Hills Road/Lensfield Road junction, a place where far too many cyclists have been seriously hurt in collisions. The proposed changes to this junction will rebalance road space, allocating half the area to walking and cycling and half to motor vehicle movements. Currently people walking make 40% of the daily journeys on Hills Road, but are only given 26% of the roadspace at this junction, leading to squeezed pavements and congested crossings.</p>

**11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>The proposed design would increase walking areas to 34% of the space, and cycling areas from 6% to 17%. This will vastly improve safety and comfort for active travel users and encourage more people to choose these modes of transport. Restricting some of the vehicular movements will also improve traffic flow across the junction for cars and buses.</p> <p>The design of this scheme would need to be carefully planned and adjusted to ensure a solution that works well for all road users in surrounding areas. It should also be considered in line with the city council's vision for the core of the city and its future vision for Cambridge.</p> <p>Is the GCP working closely with Cambridge City Council on its plans?</p>
<p align="center">Sarah Hughes Campaign Officer Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7: Cycling Plus – Hills Road And Addenbrooke's Roundabout</p> <p>The CSTA is delighted to see the new design option under consideration for the Lensfield Road/Gonville Place junction on Hills Road. The movement report shows that the majority using the road are travelling by sustainable means: 22,000 pedestrians, 6,250 cycles, and 27,250 vehicles including 760 buses (note that 760 double decker buses can transport up to 57,000 people). The improved design option should greatly improve safety for active users by providing additional footway space, and by preventing left-turning motor traffic coming into conflict with cycles passing through the junction from Hills Rd and Regent Street. It also enhances bus priority.</p> <p>We believe that this design will also bring benefits to those driving. Removing right-turning motor traffic from Lensfield Rd to Hills Rd will improve flow through the junction. Currently right-turning traffic often blocks traffic going straight on and takes up significant time in the phasing, reducing overall capacity. Removing left-turning traffic from Hills Rd to Lensfield Rd will also improve flow on Lensfield Road and through the Trumpington Road mini-roundabout.</p> <p>We also support the new design option as it prioritises sustainable transport through a major gateway junction into the heart of the city. One of the aims of the 2014 Greater Cambridge City Deal, as stated in the founding document, was to “allow significant increases in bus and cycle use, particularly within Cambridge, that will maximise the capacity for movement, particularly within the historic core”. The centre of Cambridge currently experiences high motor traffic levels, especially at weekends. By prioritising journeys into the centre by active and public transport and lowering motor traffic levels, the city centre will become a more pleasant and safe area to work, shop, eat out and spend time.</p> <p>What will the GCP do to progress this design option?</p>

**11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Councillor Lesley Sherratt on behalf of Grantchester Parish Council</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>Grantchester Parish Council (GPC) wishes to ask members of the Joint Assembly if, in the light of the strong local majority against the routing of the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway, it wishes to progress with this section.</p> <p>In a poll conducted by the Parish Council during the previous consultation on this Greenway, its route was opposed by 80% of local Grantchester residents. As a result of this, the Parish Council met with Cllr Smith and Peter Blake, and Cllr Smith proposed that if the Parish Council would work with the Greenways team to try to improve the proposals so as to answer as many local objections as possible, a second consultation would then be held that asked both the wider consultation group and Grantchester residents specifically, if they now approved the amended proposals. If a local majority was still opposed to the route through the centre of the village, Cllr Smith stated that it would not then be imposed upon Grantchester against its residents’ will.</p> <p>The Parish Council has participated in the second consultation in good faith, but the results are that 75% of Grantchester residents still oppose the route through the centre of the village and indeed most oppose most of the smaller changes as well (Appendix B makes clear that the local, Grantchester, response to these changes is in inverse proportion to that of the wider group, and is strongly majority opposed to them).</p> <p>GPC is not opposed to the Haslingfield Greenway, which if the Grantchester section is not approved, can proceed over the ‘Baulk’ route. GPC therefore asks the Joint Assembly if it will decline to progress the Haslingfield Greenway (Grantchester section), respecting the village’s repeated opposition to this section, Cllr Smith’s commitment to the Parish Council, and the principle of local democracy.</p>
<p align="center">Peter Scrase</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>The Joint Assembly has to make a recommendation to the Executive Board as to whether the route for the Haslingfield Greenway should pass through the village of Grantchester or whether it should bypass the village and proceed via the Baulk. The Director of Transport has recommended the village route, but in doing so has not advised the Assembly on the relative cost of the two routes.</p> <p>The village route involves substantial expense in street furniture and in modifying the footbridge over the M11. The Nigel Brigham & Associates report of October 2016 filed on the GCP website says “ One of the significant problems with this route is the cost and difficulty of modifying the existing bridge, which has steps.</p>

**11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>The existing ramp could be filled and regraded and extended but that might cause structural concerns. The bridge is also narrow and the bridge parapets would need raising, so this is not an easy option”.</p> <p>The Baulk route would involve very little additional expense, as it would be over a route already planned as a spur to the Haslingfield Greenway alongside the M11 and the Baulk itself, which is part of the Barton Greenway which has already been approved.</p> <p>My question is whether the Assembly is aware of the disparity in cost between the two alternatives and if so whether it agrees that this is a factor to be taken into account when considering which of the two routes is to be preferred.</p>
<p align="center">Hugh Clough</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn and Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>It is disturbing that the officers are proposing to ignore the rejection of the current behind-the-hedge-scheme by Grantchester residents (87 of 119 against). The officers also have not provided any postcode analysis of the 297 (416-119) non Grantchester respondees to know if they would ever use the Greenway.</p> <p>Similarly the proposal to rush ahead with Grantchester Road-Barton Road junction modification and bus stop relocation which has widespread opposition in South Newnham shows another community being overridden by GCP planners.</p> <p>Surely the proposal to make Grantchester Road a 20 or 15mph “Quiet Lane” should have been considered? The proposal to use and ruin the Baulk Path remains on the table in spite of a resident’s survey analysis from 2018 that proved it would never be used.</p> <p>The movement counts data for the Haslingfield Greenway (paragraphs 2.2.13 and 2.2.14 pages 42 and 43 of the Haslingfield Outline Business Case Nov22) shows that only 2 (4/2 out & return journey commuters) might come from Haslingfield itself. So if Grantchester will not use the behind-the-hedge-route and many Newnham residents prefer the safer route along Selwyn Road to using the Barton Road junction, who will actually use this Greenway? There is no business case for this huge financial expenditure.</p> <p>Question: What justification does the GCP now put forward for continuing to ignore the communities it is supposed to be serving and will it now commit to rethinking this scheme with the local residents who actually know and cycle these routes?</p>

11th December 2023 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8: Greater Cambridge Greenways – Fulbourn And Haslingfield Greenways</p> <p>In July, Camcycle said that the proposals put forward for the Fulbourn phase 1 consultation were lacking in ambition. We believed they would bring little to no improvement on the existing situation and were over-reliant on speed cushions. We called for a more comprehensive approach including public realm improvements, reduction of on-street parking, new planting and stronger land negotiations.</p> <p>It was clear to us at the time that significant changes would be required if a high-quality scheme was to be delivered. Therefore, it is deeply concerning to see such a lack of detail provided in these papers on the proposed actions following the consultation. The small number of actions listed are often no more than a minor acknowledgement of comment or a promise to review them.</p> <p>There is also no mention of any specific stakeholder comments in either the agenda papers or the Engagement Summary Report. Whilst there is value in analysing the themes of responses, when you only include stakeholder responses within this, they carry no more additional weighting or consideration than a single response. For example, should Historic England not be given specific consideration in conservation areas, should the British Horse Society comments not be highlighted on a well-used equestrian route, should Camcycle and CTC Cambridge comments not be highlighted when considering cycle infrastructure?</p> <p>The GCP recommends that the Board agrees to changes to the Fulbourn Greenway scheme based on results from the public consultation and resulting amendments. However, it is very unclear from the information provided what exactly is planned to change. As an experienced Civil Engineer, if I can't identify any physical changes to this scheme, how can anyone else?</p> <p>Do assembly members believe that the responses and next steps set out by the GCP provide enough information for board members to make an informed decision?</p>
--	---