

## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (3rd October 2023)

### PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question
1.	Roxanne de Beaux  CamCycle	7 Soham to Wicken Non-Motorised User Route	<p>Camcycle is very pleased to hear about the proposed construction of an active travel link between Soham and Wicken. This route, if built to national and local active travel design standards, could offer a fantastic option for people who want to use a more sustainable mode of transport. Unfortunately, the type of surface specified will fail to serve a significant proportion of the intended users. A self-binding gravel surface will not offer a smooth surface as described. The reality of this matter can be seen in other areas of the county where this surface has been used, such as Reynolds Drove and The Fen at Fenstanton.</p> <p>The county council's own Active Travel Design Guide describes this type of surface as a semi-sealed surface, which due to its higher rolling resistance and risk of accidents caused by loose material, may exclude some active travel users, such as small-wheeled cycles, children's bikes, folding bikes, scooters and other similar cycles. At Reynolds Drove, which is just over a year old and has very little traffic, this type of surface has already been damaged in sections, and is bumpy and uncomfortable for cyclists even on larger tyres. Based on the evidence available, this surface will also be unsuitable for ground-level solar lighting and therefore will exclude a large number of potential active travel users during the night and winter months.</p> <p>Camcycle believes that to fully deliver on the potential benefits stated in sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7 of the report the surface needs to be changed to a smooth sealed surface as defined in the Cambridgeshire County Council Active Travel Design Guide and LTN 1/20 Table 4-1, such as an aggregate mix, rubber crumb or asphalt.</p> <p><b>Why is the county council failing to follow its own design guidelines?</b></p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The County Council is not failing to follow its own design guidelines.</p> <p><b>A full respp</b></p>

			<p>The design guide states: <b><i>The choice of surface material may also be influenced by external factors such as space availability, scheme budget, land availability and planning requirements/agreements.</i></b></p> <p>The surfacing options outlined in the design guide are not prescriptive, the <b><i>choice of materials and construction technique will need to be adapted for each individual location and its site-specific character.</i></b></p> <p>CamCycle is questioning the material selected for the surface of the section of the route that runs along the exiting bridleway. The width of the bridleway is limited and so the only practical solution for the bridleway section is for all Non-Motorised Users to share the same surface. The surface therefore needs to be appropriate for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians. It is agreed by officers that cyclists prefer a smooth surface which can be formed from material such as an aggregate mix, rubber crumb or asphalt. However, these smooth surfaces can be too slippery for equestrian users. Equestrian users would prefer a natural grass surface, but a separate grassed strip cannot be accommodated in the space available. The design guidance has been followed to select a surface which can be used safely for all three types of Non-Motorised User. The scheme does include “trial” sections of rubber crumb surfacing subject to confirmation from an environmentalist that there will be no harmful impact to the soil, vegetation, or watercourses.</p> <p>The existing bridleway section (approx. 600m) is restricted due to a large drainage ditch managed by Internal Drainage Board (IDB). Therefore, the proposal is a 3.5m shared path for all users with a self-binding gravel surface. As stated within the design guide, asphalt and similar hard surfacing provide <b><i>very little cushioning and may lead to injuries for horses and other users</i></b>, alongside this they <b><i>can become slippery for equestrians and other users when wet or covered in ice or leaves</i></b>. For these reasons the project has explored an alternative surface to satisfy the requirements of all users. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD143 (Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding) includes surface option tables (Table 5.29 and E/6.3) with an adequacy scale rating each surface material for equestrian, walking, and cycling routes. Asphalt scores 1 (excellent) for walking and cycling, but 3 (reasonable) for equestrians, however naturally binding stones and gravels score 2 (good) for all users. Provided that the material is compacted correctly there should not be any loose material on the surface which might otherwise cause problems.</p>
--	--	--	---

			CamCycle has referred to Reynolds Drove in the question. Approximately a year ago at Reynolds Drove the existing Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) surface was planned out. The existing recycled plannings sub-base was then covered with a double dressing of 6mm size granite chippings. Officers note that this is a completely different material when compared with the self-binding gravel which is proposed for the shared section along the bridleway in the Soham to Wicken scheme. The self-binding gravel will have a smoother surface than the surface at Reynolds Drove.
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comments from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question / Statement</b>
2.	Roxanne de Beaux  CamCycle	8 Developin g a Performan ce Managem ent Framewor k	Camcycle welcomes the recent changes made to the performance management system, particularly the inclusion of more KPIs relating to active travel. However, it is seriously disturbing to see that the council is continually failing to meet its targets to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on our roads. Even without the forthcoming indicator 43c, we know that far too many people are hurt walking and cycling in our region. What actions is the council taking to address this issue and prevent the ongoing suffering of hundreds of families in Cambridgeshire each year?
			<b>Response:</b>
<b>No .</b>	<b>Question / Comments from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question / Statement</b>
3	Cambridge shire Sustainabl	8 Developin g a Performan	Congestion in Cambridge causes daily misery and damages the economy. It also makes bus services highly unreliable. Earlier this month, the Stagecoach East MD wrote in the Cambridge Independent: <i>“Once a bus leaves the depot, the service punctuality is overwhelmingly reliant on the control of road management, which falls with highways and the local authority. Our region’s roads</i>

	e Travel Alliance	ce Management Framework	<p><i>are congested, leading to service cancellations, delays and increased pollution.”</i> There are reports it can take young people three hours to get from Burwell to college in Cambridge by bus. High traffic volumes also reduce road safety, increase air pollution and carbon emissions and deter people from walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <p>We note that the Performance Management Framework contains one indicator associated with congestion: ‘238 ‘Changes in traffic flows across Cambridgeshire from a 2013 baseline’. This indicator does not have a performance target, however, and isn’t subject to a RAG rating. The report says data is gathered “to present a rounded view of information relevant to the service area.” In contrast, Indicator 43a ‘KSI casualties’ is subject to a performance target. It is easy to see from the red rating that this target is not being met.</p> <p>This month our politicians failed once again to vote through a system to reduce congestion in Cambridge and there is currently no plan in place to manage traffic volumes. We wonder whether things might have been different if the County Council had a performance target in this area they had to meet.</p> <p>Given uncongested roads underpin both a functioning bus service and the County Council’s efforts to make active travel the ‘go-to’ travel option for local journeys, what does the Highways and Infrastructure Committee think about the need for a performance target and RAG rating on congestion in Cambridge?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The County Council recognises that congestion is a challenge, particularly at peak hours, and that congestion can negatively affect growth, productivity, air quality, and public transport reliability. We will continue to work with partners (including the Combined Authority, the GCP, bus operators, businesses, and others) to tackle congestion. Part of this work is to enhance, and provide more reliable and credible alternatives to the private car - the GCP programme of infrastructure investment is just one example of how we are doing this with partners.</i></p> <p><i>The indicators associated with modal choice relate to total numbers of users, rather than flow speeds per se. This is informed by the information we can capture at a County level. Due to the limited amount of data available at a County level, this indicator is classified as contextual and developed to build a picture of performance to inform the Highways &amp; Transport Committee.</i></p>

			<p><i>Congestion levels are of course considered through the planning process, on a site by site basis, based on specific surveys, and through our strategic studies (for example the live Royston to Granta Park study). At this stage it is not proposed, nor practicable to introduce a Countywide congestion monitoring metric/target.</i></p> <p><i>The GCP have a target to reduce Cambridge traffic levels by 15% from 2011 levels, which is more appropriate as a detailed target to monitor their programme against. The Combined Authority is likely to be considering monitoring and evaluation of transport as part of their Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, and we will work with them on this as appropriate.</i></p>
--	--	--	--