

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (7th March 2023)

PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No .	Question / comment from:	Item	Question
1.	Shapour Meftah	Mill Road	Drew attention to the results of a consultation where the majority of respondents were against the TRO. Concern was expressed regarding the dispersal of traffic on to neighbouring streets commenting that there was no data to support the view there would be no impact. The bridge was designed to link either side of the railway and now it was proposed to be closed. It was essential that the decision was based on accurate data.
			Response: Statement – no response required
No .	Question / comment from:	Item	Question:
2.	Abdul Arain	Mill Road	Expressed concern regarding the level of consultation with residents. There was an understanding there would be some face to face consultation to understand why people travel up and down Mill road. Traffic levels on Mill Road were significantly reduced. East Road was much busier. The workshops that were held as part of the consultation were impractical as they were held during working hours. Attention was drawn to petitions that when combined had over 4,000 signatures opposed to the suggested closure. It was highlighted that many Mill Road residents did not possess English as a first language and there no suitable adjustments were made.
			Response: Statement – no response required.
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
3.	Mill Road 4 People		Background July 2022's Highways meeting agreed to consult on both a TRO to reinstate the modal filter

			<p>on Mill Road and on exemptions to that filter. The TRO (PR0872) has been raised and the consultation phase completed. We believe that the TRO consultation results will be reviewed by the Highways and Transport committee at its next meeting.</p> <p>The TRO was drawn up and issued following the GCP's "effective and robust" Spring 2022 Mill Road consultation which received around 2,000 responses. Theme 3 of the consultation, "Changes to traffic and access in the medium and longer term" was supported by 77% of respondents. 72% of respondents expressed support for restricting motor vehicles from crossing Mill Road bridge. We extend our heartfelt thanks to the Committee, officers and the GCP for their hard work and commitment in getting this close to resolving an issue which has been outstanding for at least 50 years; and would ask the Committee now to approve the TRO and put it into operation without delay.</p> <p>An even higher proportion (83%) of respondents to the same GCP consultation approved of Theme 2, "Improve the quality of place". The July 2022 Committee meeting decided to work with the Combined Authority and GCP to develop a public realm improvement scheme along Mill Road.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Can the committee please confirm, for the consultation, design and implementation phases of the public realm improvements on Mill Road, Cambridge:</p> <p>a) What are the planned timescales, and (indicative if necessary) budgetary provisions for the work, along with the planned sources of funding?</p> <p>b) How can interested parties' (e.g. users of the road, traders, disability groups) views best be sought and incorporated into the design in a cost effective way and at the earliest possible stage in the process?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>The current timescales for the installation of the modal filter are set out in the paper at 2.6.</p> <p>a) precise timescales have not yet been confirmed as CCC is working with partners to consider funding for the public realm scheme</p> <p>b) contact with key stakeholders has already been established; early engagement with these stakeholders will be sought at the start of the public realm project followed by a full public consultation.</p>

No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
4.	Mr John Coyle	Mill Road	Expressed concern regarding the consultation and the data used to support the recommendation. The Council was accused of the wilful sabotage of the highway in terms of roadworks that produced congestion to justify measures. The impact on surrounding areas was highlighted as an area of great concern. The proposal had been rejected twice through lack of information and it should be rejected again. .
			Response: <i>Statement, no response required</i>
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
5.	Martin Lucas Smith	Mill Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To welcome the change and urge the committee to agree the officer recommendation - To relay my personal experience as a regular shopper on the street - To make clear the strong level of local support - To welcome that a sensible compromise has been reached - To point out the benefits - To remind the committee that the TRO stage is not a numbers game and is purely a legal objection process - To give suggestions for the streetscape changes
			Response: <i>Statement, no response required</i>
No .	Question / Comments from:	Item	Question:
6.	Will Nichols	Mill Road	<p>I'm a driver who lives in Fowlmere but I work in Cambridge. I drive in each day or take the train.</p> <p>I was actually born on Mill Road itself! At the old maternity hospital that is Ditchfield Place and have always taken an interest in Mill Road, having worked nearby for the past few years.</p> <p>I want to provide a personal anecdote to demonstrate how policy decisions from local authority can change behaviour as they did in my case. When the bridge was closed to through-traffic last year I used to (admittedly rather lazily) drive my car along Mill Road most days to reach my gym, Nuffield Health & fitness</p>

			<p>– it meant I could get a gym session or swim in during my lunch break before getting back to work for the afternoon; Mill Road bridge being open to through traffic gave me the most direct route, and gave me no incentive to switch to walking or cycling. I can remember several times when driving to Cambridge wanting to go to one of those local shops, which generally have a far more interest range than the more generic supermarkets, however, parking was virtually impossible with Gwyder Street car park usually full and it was usually easier and more practical to go to one of the nearby supermarkets.</p> <p>Often arguments are made by those who oppose road closures that they displace traffic but ultimately, they create the conditions to encourage modal shift and reassess our behaviours as I did in this instance by changing from driving to walking. It enabled me for the first time became able to stop and spend money in the businesses on Mill Road, frequently buying lunch and visiting shops that would have been difficult to do in my car. The reduction in through traffic, virtually none of which is stopping to use the many businesses, restaurants and shops on Mill Road, made Mill Road a much more pleasant environment to spend time – safer, less congestion, less pollution, and an opportunity to completely rethink the street focusing on people rather than cars. I have continued to walk rather than drive because I’ve continued the habit albeit it is a much less attractive environment now the heavy through traffic is back.</p> <p>Several shopping streets in Cambridge have reduced through traffic over the past few decades in Cambridge: Fitzroy Street, Burleigh Street, Trinity Street, Sydney Street, and Bridge Street – I’m not aware of any where business and residents are calling for the return of through traffic – the evidence shows that far from negatively impacting on businesses such measures create a much more attractive environment for people and businesses flourish as a result. The restriction of Mill Road bridge would still enable vehicles to access Mill Road but would remove through traffic from what is a relatively narrow road and certainly not suited to function as a major arterial road in the way that say Newmarket Road or Hills Road are.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I believe this is a once in a generational opportunity to reimagine how fantastic Mill Road could be putting businesses, residents, and people first, and I hope you will pass the motion today.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
No	Question / Comment s from:	Item	Question:
7.	Mel Telford	Mill Road	1. What if any expert feasibility studies with data and projections and alternative proposals with pros and cons have been carried out to determine the effect of the restrictions upon residents, and traders and the additional congestion and pollution transferred to other routes and those who live

			<p>along them ?</p> <p>2. If so how have they been made available to the public as none of those facts appear to have been included in the consultation?</p> <p>3. If there are none available for the public to view why not</p> <p>4. To what extent do the public consultations relating to this, affect the outcome – the decisions of the council ?</p> <p>5. How much weight is placed on answers which come from residents living in the Mill Rd area and what consideration given to other Cambridge residents ?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>1. The work has been informed by the ETO(observed impacts), road accident data and subsequent GCP consultation, matters that have been considered by H&T. Impacts of any modal filter would be monitored on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>2. The statutory TRO consultation accords with the legal requirement; the GCP consultation was wide-ranging and detailed the many issues affecting Mill Road. The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) procedure is a statutory consultation process that requires the Highway Authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The public notice invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a 21 day notice period.</p> <p>3. See 1 and 2.</p> <p>4. H&T considered the GCP consultation in July 2022 and determined to proceed with publication of the TRO and statutory objection period. Members are considering objections received.</p> <p>5. Proximity of responder is not weighted. All issues are considered. Any person may object to the making of an order and the order making authority shall consider all objections duly made under regulations and not withdrawn</p>
No	Question / Comment from:	Item	Question:
8.	Corinna Deighton	Mill Road	<p>Disabled does not equal Blue Badge Holder. I am the mother of a 13 year old boy who receives Disability Living Allowance from the Government, we receive high rate care but low rate mobility so do not qualify under the Blue Badge Rules for CCC. My child has several disabilities including Dyspraxia, Motor Co-Ordination Difficulties, Muscle imbalances (Tight & Hypermobility), ADHD, Severe Anxiety & Other Mental Health conditions, Bowel & Bladder issues and we are awaiting the final assessment for Autism (all documented by health care professionals). My child cannot ride a</p>

			<p>bike, cannot walk far without being in pain and cannot uses buses. We live in Coleridge and use Mill Road bridge to access the city for various reasons including therapy sessions, medical & dental appointments and disability swimming clubs (held at Parkside). If you close the bridge then our access will be severely restricted to said therapies and activities and appointments, the traffic and time taken on Hills Road will prohibit us using this route – we tried before and it was over an hour long. By denying access to a road for all those who are recognised as disabled by Central Government you are guilty of disability discrimination. Any other teen can access Parkside Pool from Mill Road by any of the ‘active travel’ methods you are promoting as an alternative but yet you denying the same access to any person who via the very nature of their disability cannot use said methods. Parkside Pool is the one pool in Cambridge that offers Disability swimming lessons for teenagers and adults alike.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that at no point was I aware of this consultation and that local charities for the disabled were not consulted to make their members aware. For example Pinpoint Cambridgeshire is the local parent career forum and hub for information partnered with all the local Cambridgeshire Councils (City, East & South, Hunts etc). Yet again another example of how those with disabilities were and continue to be ignored.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
No .	Question / Comment from	Item	Question:
9.	Camcycle	Mill Road	
			Response:
No .	Question / Comment from	Item	Question:
10.	Sarah Lightowlers	Mill Road	With the traffic restriction being introduced on Mill Road bridge, will Cambridgeshire now be eligible for the tranche 3 funding from central government to improve walking and cycling infrastructure that was denied previously?
			Response:

			No, Active Travel Tranche 3 funding has already been allocated by government. However, this sustainable transport measure will improve the likelihood of success on future rounds of funding.
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
11.	William Bannell	Mill Road	The accompanying document - Mill Road Spring 2022 Consultation Report - seems to refer to a majority percentage of respondents (1986 responses out of approx 3500 leaflets distributed), as a majority opinion, inferring consent or support from the public. 70% of 1986 is 1390 responses, not very many in the whole picture. Also, the cycling campaign group Camcycle organise and coach their members in how to fill in the consultation, which is a help that the rest of the public do not receive. 3500 leaflets distributed in total is a very small number, compared to how many people around Cambridge will be afflicted, and who use Mill Road, the vast majority were none the wiser when it came to this consultation in Spring 2022. Therefore one should not take the results of the consultation as any sort of valid survey, and should not infer a popular mandate from those figures. Will the Committee recognise and acknowledge that this is the case, and adjust their decision-making accordingly, and account for the widespread opposition which has been expressed prior to the consultation deadline itself, and recognise that the figures in the Consultation Report are distorted and skewed by other factors which are not included in the report?
			Response: Not for officer response but member consideration during the debate
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
12.	Bev Nicolson	Mill Road	We know how little space there is for road users at busy times, we know how easy it is for the road to become grid locked when one vehicle is badly positioned. And these are just vehicles passing through. They aren't stopping to buy anything. Making this a no-through road (not closing it, note) will have a significant positive impact for everyone. Can I seek an assurance from the committee that they will commit to progressing delivery of the modal filter and ensuring that work is done alongside the community to improve the streetscape?

			<p>Response:</p> <p>That is the nature of today's decision – streetscape design work is referred to in 1.6. CCC is working with partners to consider funding for the public realm scheme. Community involvement on the public realm scheme will be sought from the start of the project.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
13.	Chris Howell	Mill Road	Speaking in support of TRO
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
14.	David McHardy	Mill Road	I'm looking forward to the long-delayed bus gate being re-introduced. Can the committee confirm that the TRO raised no legal objections, and also when the filter will be brought back?
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Objections are detailed in 2.4 Timescales are set out in 2.6. Going forward CCC will provide regular progress updates.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
15.	Richard Wood	Mill Road	<p>Cambridge Area Bus Users have been concerned that citi 2 bus services along Mill Road have never been restored to the pre-Covid frequency of 10 minutes (Monday-Saturday daytimes). Discussions with Stagecoach East management have revealed that traffic congestion – particularly along Mill Road – has caused significant delays, thereby increasing costs of operation, hence the reduction to a 20-minute frequency. It was, previously, common to see three buses stuck in traffic congestion between the railway bridge and Parkside Pool.</p> <p>So frustrating was this for bus drivers that, following the re-opening of Mill Road Bridge after the closure for railway works, they pleaded with Stagecoach East management to make the diversion</p>

			<p>via Coldham's Lane permanent.</p> <p>The current reduced frequency has meant poorer services to the Mill Road community, to residents of Birdwood Road, Walpole Road and Wulfstan Way and school students at St Bede's School.</p> <p>I would plead with the committee to consider carefully the need to work in collaboration with the Greater Cambridge Partnership, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Stagecoach, to transform Mill Road into a high-quality bus corridor, serving the surrounding communities with sustainable transport.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
16.	Catherine Aman	Mill Road	<p>The gate on Mill Road Bridge during the pandemic made cycling and walking on this vital artery safer, quieter and far more appealing.</p> <p>Please can the committee reassure me that they will continue to prioritise safety and health on Mill Road?</p> <p>As I understand it, the TRO has raised no legal objections and a filter will be put in place in the coming months. Will the committee confirm?</p> <p>Mill Road "belongs" to many: long-term local vendors who have served the community so well throughout pandemic and through changing economic climates; new vendors bringing their energy and vision; local residents and children and teens who use Mill Road as their route to school and work.</p> <p>We must protect and support our shopkeepers, absolutely. But we must do this without sacrificing safety and health, cycling and walking as true alternatives to cars.</p> <p>Mill Road belongs much less compellingly (imo) to those who see it as a nuisance corridor through which they must speed to get across the city. It is a community, not an impediment!</p>

			Will the committee commit to delivering this scheme and improving the streetscape on Mill Road?
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Objections are detailed in 2.4 Timescales are set out in 2.6. Going forward CCC will provide regular progress updates.</p> <p>The commitment you refer to is part of the decision before H&T Members.</p>
No .	Question / Comment	Item	Question
17.	Simon Nuttall	Mill Road	<p>In my thirty years living in Cambridge the motor traffic on Mill Road has grown in volume, size of vehicles, and the level of impatience shown to other road users.</p> <p>In recent years I've had three incidents on or near Mill Road in which vans and cars have driven into the back of my bike, one on the bridge itself.</p> <p>My wife often reports to me incidents of close overtaking as she rides her bike over the bridge. I know experienced long-distance cyclists who actively avoid riding along Mill Road.</p> <p>The lobby group in favour of keeping the road open to motor traffic have themselves used an image which portrays an SUV as the only safe way across the bridge.</p> <p>What clearer evidence is needed of the urgency to re-introduce the modal filter to remove these dangerous road conditions?</p> <p>Can the committee assure me that they will continue to prioritise safer streets and give final approval for the updated bus gate scheme?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Statement, no response required</i></p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
18.	Jennifer Williams	Mill Road	<p>I am a local Petersfield resident with a small toddler - we cross the bridge on foot every day to access childcare and for shopping. While the bus gate was in effect, this was a safe and pleasant trip, with traffic easy to navigate. Can the committee reassure me that the needs of our smallest residents will be prioritised by bringing back the bus gate and ensuring young people's road safety, lung health and ability to enjoy the place they live in?</p>
			<p>Response:</p>

			No officer response required
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
19.	Francesca Raphaely	Mill Road	<p>As a local resident (Brampton Road) I am writing to express my enthusiasm for a renewed closure of the Mill Road Bridge to the majority of traffic.</p> <p>I have young children and chronic illness which I have no doubt has been fuelled by living with poor quality air most of my life. When the bridge was closed, it had huge benefits enabling active travel to school and a closer sense of community, including more activity around local shops - it is no joke negotiating the mill road with a pram and a child on a scooter, when it is clogged with cars parked up and defensive bicycles on the pavements!</p> <p>I also live very close to the Coldhams Lane and contrary to the views expressed by some of my fellow residents, feel any reduction in car traffic around the city centre is progress towards the clean, liveable cities our children deserve.</p> <p>My only question is - how soon can you bring in a closure?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Timescales are set out in 2.6. Officers will be working hard to ensure the modal filter is in place as soon as possible.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
20.	Hannah Stanley Jones	Mill Road	The trial period for the Mill Road bridge traffic restrictions saw the neighbourhood transformed. It was safer for pedestrians, cyclists and especially for young families. Can the committee provide reassurance from the committee that the proposals will be reinstated in the coming months?
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Not for officer response</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:

21.	Cllr Katie Thornburrow	Mill Road	<i>Local Cambridge City Councillor</i>
			Response: None required
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question
22.	Cllr Mairead Kelly	Mill Road	Local Cambridge City Councillor
			Response: None required
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
s2 3.	Cllr Richard Howitt	Mill Road	Local Cambridgeshire County Councillor
			Response: No response required.
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
24.	Cllr Edna Murphy	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	I am the County Councillor for Bar Hill Division which includes Bar Hill village. I will make the case for including a path around the ring road in the County's active travel plans and ask that it is included on the TIP list as soon as possible.
			Response: No response required

No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
25.	CamCycle	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	<p>Camcycle would like to thank the county officers for their work on the Active Travel Strategy and Design Guide. We support the aspirations of this strategy and the alignment with government policy, particularly Gear Change. The tool kit for new developments is very welcome and we support the focus on rural connections. We would like to highlight the principles for inclusive design. We would also like to thank officers for taking on board our feedback from the consultation and we are pleased to see that a number of our recommendations have been included. We've not had enough time between the publication of the papers and the question deadline to review the full details of the design guide, however, as this is a live document we hope to continue collaborating over the coming years to ensure our region has the highest standard of active travel design guidance in the UK and that it leads to significant improvements for people walking, cycling and wheeling on our streets.</p> <p>A quick review of the guide indicates that there are still some areas that need development. Can officers confirm that stakeholder engagement will continue for this design guide and provide an outline about what we can expect regarding collaboration?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>I can confirm that stakeholder engagement will continue. We will continue to engage through the Local Access Forum and other local stakeholder meetings will be arranged to regularly review the design guide.</p>
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
26.	Simon Martin	Cambs Active Travel Strategy	<p>At the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways and Transport Committee on 7th of March 2023, Members are requested to “Adopt Cambridgeshire’s Active Travel Strategy”.</p> <p>The papers for this agenda item state in “2.2” that “Cambridgeshire’s Active Travel Strategy sets out our vision, objectives, detailed policies and a vision for a connected active travel network for Cambridgeshire. The active travel network identifies schemes for development and investment across Cambridgeshire with a focus on achieving mode shift from private car journeys that will</p>

		<p>contribute to the County Council’s target to achieve Net Zero Carbon by 2045, as well as wider environmental and health benefits for the people of Cambridgeshire.”</p> <p>I note that the “Huntingdonshire active travel network” map on Page 58 of September 2022 version of Active Travel Strategy Consultation document, differs from the “Huntingdonshire active travel network” map on Page 72 (Figure 16) of March 2023 version of Active Travel Strategy document, with large sections of “Existing routes” (grey), and “Tier 2 schemes” (orange) removed from the map.</p> <p>— Removed “Existing routes” includes the sections between the Alconbury area west of the A1M via Hammerton, Great Gidding, Stilton, Norman Cross, Yaxley.</p> <p>— Removed “Tier 2 schemes” include “Transport Investment Plan ID: 0301, Alconbury Weald development to key destinations; Alconbury Village, North Huntingdon, Great Fen” that is noted to be “Developer to deliver” on maps.cambridgeshire.gov.uk, and “Transport Investment Plan ID: 0340, North of Ramsey, to the Great Fen” that has Ramsey MTTs notes as the strategy basis on the same map in the Transport Investment Plan layer.</p> <p>Before Members adopt the Active Travel Strategy, I wish to draw their attention to the following questions specific to the Huntingdonshire Active Travel Routes map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why have sections of “existing routes” (grey), and “tier 2 routes” (orange) been removed in the March 2023 Active Travel Strategy? 2. What has happened to the routes that were previously “Tier 2” and are no longer included in the map or strategy? 3. As the papers for this agenda item state, the strategy “identifies schemes for development and investment” does this mean those removed routes will miss out on development and investment due to no longer being in the strategy? 4. As there is a stated aim of “focus on achieving mode shift from private car journeys that will contribute to the County Council’s target to achieve Net Zero Carbon by 2045, as well as wider environmental and health benefits”, and that Huntingdonshire has recently introduced their own Climate Strategy with similar aims by 2040, shouldn’t there be an increase in Active Travel cycling and walking routes (including those that may be candidates for bidding for funding even if such funding is not currently known), rather than a reduction in those routes?
--	--	--

			<p>5. The proposed response to the Active Travel Strategy Consultation from Huntingdonshire District Council approved by Cabinet (15 Nov 2022) mentioned how Ramsey's routes had been requested to be "reviewed and considered further under the LCWIP methods. In doing so this would include projects for the market town of Ramsey being included within Tier 1" as response to Q10, however the map suggests this has not happened as there are no Tier 1 routes showing on the map for the Market Town of Ramsey, and as a member of the Public I do not know if this made part of HDCs final response, however has HDCs recommendation been considered and included in the finalisation of the March 2023 version of the Active Travel Strategy or has this been overlooked/rejected, and if so why?</p> <p>6. As the "Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Consultation: Report of Consultation" references feedback on Q10 of "Concern about the lack of active travel improvements across Huntingdonshire compared to other areas", I feel there should have been further routes added to the Strategy map for the reasons previously stated rather than reducing the already noted "lack of active travel improvements across Huntingdonshire" (bulletpoint 4 of Q10 'Qualitative' responses in Report of Consultation Findings), and question if reducing them is responding correctly to the consultation feedback that has been received?</p>
N0.	Question / comment from	Item	<p>Response:</p> <p>The draft Active Travel Strategy was published in September for consultation and changes have been made to the draft version of the active travel network maps considering suggestions from the public and to address any updates or make corrections.</p> <p>1. The existing route to Yaxley marked as grey on the map was removed as Sustrans have declassified it as an NCN route as it was not deemed safe enough to be an NCN route, so has been removed as an existing route shown on the map. The route between Alconbury and Ramsey identified as ID 301 on the MyCambridgeshire Map was removed as it is a route already being funded and delivered by the developer. The original inclusion of the route from Ramsey to the Great Fen Project was an error as it is primarily a leisure route and does not meet the objectives of the Active Travel Strategy connecting people to places of education, employment, medical centres, transport hubs or local services to achieve modal shift. It was therefore removed as a Tier 2 route. The Ramsey Market Town Transport Strategy is being replaced by the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy.</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Route ID 301 will be constructed and once complete it would show on the map as an existing route. Officers will review route ID 340 as part of the annual review of the action plan to reconsider its inclusion. 3. Route ID 301 already has funding and is being delivered. Dependent on the outcome of officer review of ID 340, if it is included into the future review of the action plan it would become eligible for funding but would likely score low against funding criteria which is often active travel focused. 4. Despite the removal of the identified schemes above, additional schemes have been added to the active travel network maps. Specifically to Huntingdonshire, following suggestions made during the public consultation, links between Tilbrook and Kimbolton, and between Holme and Sawtry have been included to provide links to local schools and centres. As stated on page 66 of the Strategy, it is important to note that the proposed active travel network will evolve as studies are completed and scheme proposals are developed. 5. The consultation response from Huntingdonshire District Council has been considered as part of the review of the Strategy. At H&T Committee in October 2022 it was agreed that an updated LCWIP would include walking routes in Ramsey and Littleport. The Active Travel Network maps do not show the LCWIP cycling routes due to scale. 6. As mentioned above, proposed routes as part of the consultation that meets the vision and objectives of the Strategy have been added to the active travel maps. The comments made during public consultation have been noted, but further work needs to be undertaken to act on those suggestions. Such work will take place under action ATAP 01 of the High-level action plan (page 62) <i>“Develop a prioritised action plan of studies and schemes. Schemes to be included as an expanded Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.”</i> Further work will be undertaken as resource and funding allows to further develop the active travel network across the county.
27.	Daniel Carney (Chair Girton Parish Council)	Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy	<p>I have been authorised to speak on behalf of Girton Parish Council, of which I am the Chair.</p> <p>As part of the A14 works, bridleway 99/6, linking Girton village via further Rights of Way to Madingley and Dry Drayton, was stopped up in a way that we believe to be in contravention of the Planning Act 2008, under which the entire A14 scheme was authorised. According to the Act, for a Right of Way to be removed a replacement must be provided or the Secretary of State must determine that one is not required. No replacement has been provided, and Highways England have made no claim that “not required” was the case. Whilst replacements have been seen at Bar Hill, Lolworth, and Boxworth, in Girton we are left without a right to cross the A14 to reach the previously connecting ROWs without making a major diversion from the original route. This</p>

			<p>diversion is even greater for cyclists and horse riders, who may not use the A14 crossing on footpath 99/4, a stretch of path which plans for the A14 upgrade show was due to be upgraded, work that has not materialised.</p> <p>There is a great deal of concern within the village about the removal of much-used public rights of way. Therefore, on behalf of Girton village I am asking the Council to explain how has been allowed to occur, and how the Act has been complied with. But above all I want to emphasise that these links were valued by the local community and are very much missed. So can you please provide us with proposals for what can be done to provide alternatives that restore connectivity and go some way to make up for the loss of these much used and important local rights of way?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>This is one of several paths severed or rerouted due to the A14 works for which the new alternative was not built on the correct alignment according to the Development Consent Order. Therefore, although the new route is physically available, it has not legally come into effect. National Highways (previously Highways England) are paying for the legal work to address 28 such paths impacted in this way by the A14 through new legal orders, and this route is one of the initial priorities for that work.</p> <p>However, to provide connectivity to existing public footpaths, upgrades to footpaths 99/4 and 99/5 are needed. The County Council continues to recognise the importance of resolving this issue and restoring as far as possible the connectivity that has been lost and it is intended these routes be upgraded to bridleways. Officers will contact the Parish Council to discuss their concerns and to try and resolve them.</p>
No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
28.	Cambridge Living Streets	Cambridges hire Active Travel Strategy	<p>Living Streets Cambridge broadly welcomes the Active Travel Strategy and the laudable aims to rebalance and embed active travel in everyday processes. However, if walking is to be treated as a priority, and the ambition to 'Enhance' and 'Expand' approaches is to be realised two changes must be realised.</p> <p>First there needs to be a shift of resources to deliver the change - too often walking and cycling are conflated with little distinct expenditure on the pedestrian environment.</p>

			<p>Second, particularly where space is limited, there are often tough choices to be made in respect of the trade-offs between modes of travel. If walking is genuinely to become top of travel hierarchy, then it must be considered a priority in decision making.</p> <p>Will this committee ensure that the resources assigned in realising the strategy are commensurate with the objectives set out here and will they ensure that in future deliberations by officers or the county the tough choices are not ducked? Otherwise this strategy will, like so many previous initiatives be reduced to warm words.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>Commitments to improvements to walking are equal to those to improve cycling in the Active Travel Strategy. The LCWIP identifies walking improvements in large market towns across Cambridgeshire, and although not possible to map on the active travel network maps, are mapped as part of the LCWIP.</p> <p>However, to provide connectivity to existing public footpaths, upgrades to footpaths 99/4 and 99/5 are needed. Unfortunately, these paths were outside of the red line boundary of the A14 scheme, so this is having to be separately addressed. The County Council continues to recognise the importance of resolving this issue and restoring as far as possible the connectivity that has been lost and it is intended that these routes be upgraded to bridleways. Officers will contact the Parish Council to discuss their concerns and seek to resolve them.</p>
No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
29.	CamCycle	Fenland Transport Strategy	<p>Camcycle thanks officers for all the hard work that has gone into the Fenland Transport Strategy. We know that there is huge potential for an increase in walking and cycling in this district with the right infrastructure and support in place.</p> <p>We'd like to ask, given the low levels of engagement in the strategy survey, how does the county plan to work with local communities and groups on designs for upcoming prioritised routes and projects?</p>

			<p>Response:</p> <p>We welcome the support of the Fenland Transport Strategy. The next stages of work are to build on the emerging action plan of schemes, interventions, and studies to deliver the Strategy. This work will involve reviewing the emerging action plan and prioritising the schemes for funding. This will be done with the Member Steering Group and be approved by the Highways and Transport Committee at CCC.</p> <p>As schemes move through the development process stakeholders, local communities and Members will be engaged at various stages. We always welcome suggestions as to how we can improve engagement- please get in touch with any suggestions.</p>
No	Question / Comment from	Item	Question:
30.	CamCycle	Huntingdons hire Transport Strategy	<p>Camcycle thanks officers for all the hard work that has gone into the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. We welcome Policy TSH18 on reprioritising space for active travel, which is in line with national policies and funding objectives.</p> <p>Given the existing barriers to those travelling in the district and several tragic fatalities including that of Celia Ward on the Huntingdon Ring Road, we believe that safer routes are urgently needed including a revocation of the ban on cycling through Huntingdon city centre, safer active travel routes around the ring road and restrictions on traffic over the Huntingdon-Godmanchester Town Bridge.</p> <p>Will the county commit to prioritising safety for people walking and cycling in Huntingdonshire and deliver schemes that help people reach their everyday destinations safely on foot or by cycle?</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>We welcome the support of the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. The next stages of work are to build on the emerging action plan of schemes, interventions, and studies to deliver the Strategy. This work will involve reviewing the emerging action plan and prioritising the schemes for funding. This will be done with the Member Steering Group and be approved by the Highways and Transport Committee at CCC.</p>

			<p>The operation of Huntingdon Ring Road and Town Bridge have been identified for detailed study work.</p> <p>The county council is committed to the safety of all users of the highway network including people walking and cycling. The LCWIP routes have been prioritised on connecting people to everyday destinations. The Tier 2 routes identified in the Activity Travel Strategy will also be prioritised and connectivity and safety are expected to be key in this prioritisation. Godmanchester bridge and the western section of the ring road are included as Tier 1 routes in the LCWIP.</p>
No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
31.	Huntingdonshire Cycling and Walking Group	Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy	<p>Hunts Walking & Cycling Group was formed in 2019 to promote and support active and sustainable travel in Huntingdonshire. We have almost 2,000 members on our Facebook group: http://tinyurl.com/HuntsWalkCycle</p> <p>When are there going to be a joined-up, fit-for-purpose cycle routes between Huntingdon and St Ives? There have been petitions and calls for safe cycle routes for years but so far little sign of action. Some feel that the number of cyclists has actually reduced in the last 15 years due to the roads becoming busier and more dangerous for cyclists. There are two main cycling routes connecting both towns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The strategic route via Houghton & Wyton has a short key missing link on the A1123 Huntingdon Rd, opposite Dobbies Garden Centre – see photo 1 2. The route via Hemmingfords to Godmanchester is only partly suitable for cyclists and becoming increasingly busy to cycle along through Godmanchester from Cow Lane to the White Hart Pub along the busy B1044 Cambridge Road. – See photo 2 <p>Cow Lane is full of potholes, and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians particularly in the dark. Installing a good safe cycle route between two of our main towns in Huntingdonshire would help encourage modal shift from car to bicycle for a journey of less than 6 miles between two major population centres that many people could easily cycle in about 30 minutes. Active Travel in Cambridgeshire is not just about Cambridge City. Huntingdonshire deserves decent active travel routes with cats eyes on dark stretches, and wide enough to enable multiple users if space permits.</p>

			Question: When can we have a timetable for completing the missing links in these two strategic active travel routes from St Ives to Huntingdon which have been identified as a priority for investment in the draft Active Travel Strategy and the draft Local Walking & Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Response: Funding opportunities for schemes continue to be sought. Further work will be undertaken to prioritise schemes in the emerging Action Plans to develop a pipeline of schemes for delivery. Both schemes highlighted here are included as Tier 1 LCWIP schemes but progressing schemes is dependent on funding being secured.
32.	CamCycle	Civil Parking Enforcement	Welcoming the work done and a question on timescales. Relating to TMA Part 6
			Response: In November 2022, Cambridgeshire County Council sent an application letter to the Secretary of State seeking permission to proceed with the civil enforcement of moving traffic contraventions pursuant to Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. The Order is due to be laid before Parliament in June 2023.
No .	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
33.	CamCycle	Commuted Sums	In the Housing Estate Road Construction Specification for January 2023, the requirements for crossings do not seem to acknowledge the changes to the Highway Code which came into force in January 2022. It needs to be made clear that those walking and cycling should be prioritised above vehicular access in designs – for example Copenhagen crossings or continuous footways should be highlighted as a side road design in preference to the use of dropped kerbs

			Camcycle would like to ask why policies for new developments are not already being made consistent with the Active Travel Strategy, LTN 1/20 and the county and country's wider transport aims.
			Response:
No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
34.	CamCycle	Highways Operational Standards	<p>Camcycle welcomes the move to introduce an authorisation process for the change of surface to Public Rights Of Way. It is extremely important that there is a consistent approach to this across the county and that any routes which are intended for utility cycling (in line with the new Active Travel Strategy) are constructed with smooth, even, hard, all-weather materials with proper drainage, following LTN 1/20 guidance, in order to ensure fair access for people of all abilities.</p> <p>We note that the county council gained government funding via the Combined Authority in January 2023 of which part will be used for officer training on LTN 1/20 and the creation of a new Active Travel Centre of Excellence.</p> <p>We would like to ask if LTN 1/20 could be included as a reference document in the Collation of Information form and could the Centre of Excellence be included as an official consultee?</p> <p>We'd also like to note that there is a lot to read in the Highways Operational Standards document (which is due to last 10 years), but we hope changes can be made in the coming years in line with developing transport policy.</p> <p>For example: Point 22 – parklets should be more clearly encouraged as a way to support sustainable and liveable communities. Point 23 – 'Copenhagen crossings' or continuous footway designs should be included in this list. Point 25 – cycle stands should be encouraged on the highway rather than the on footways in order to maintain space for pedestrians and increase accessibility for all types of rider and cycle.</p> <p>Lambeth Council has recently published an ambitious Kerbside Strategy and we would urge Cambridgeshire to produce something similar to guide future policy.</p>
			Response:

No	Question / comment from	Item	Question:
35.	CamCycle	Finance Monitoring Report	<p>In light of the two fatalities on the southern section of the busway path, Camcycle strongly welcomes the proposal in point 2.6 to allocate funding to widen this much-used active travel route and ensure it is safe for all users.</p> <p>We'd like to ask if this project could include consultation with the path's current users and other stakeholder groups such as Camcycle and Cambridge Living Streets so a design can be developed that considers the needs of current users and adequately provides for the growth in people walking and cycling in this area.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p>None required</p>