

## Appendix 4

No	Comments	Officer's Comments
1	<p>Support</p> <p>Resident proposed the idea of adding double yellow lines (DYLs) to the road as parked cars impede visibility for residents exiting their properties.</p>	<p>DYLs are outside the scope of this project but can be added through a future local highways improvement (LHI) / privately funded highways improvement (PFHI) application – should they be deemed necessary.</p>
2	<p>Objection</p> <p>If you are travelling from Park Lane and wish to head towards Cottenham Road, you now have to negotiate the School Hill junctions, which both have their issues. With the northern junction there is the issue of parked cars, where you often meet cars, that have turned in from Windmill Lane, head on.</p> <p>Then, with the southern junction it's a sharp left turn, where you have to look over your shoulder to see anything coming from Windmill Lane, and larger vehicles find it hard to negotiate without crossing the centreline as they turn.</p> <p>I would suggest that without improvements of the School Hill junctions, the restrictions on Bell Hill should be withdrawn. I say this as I believe it is more dangerous than cars/cycles/pedestrians meeting at Bell Hill.</p> <p>Note, there are also Bus Stops in the vicinity that add to congestion and danger for everyone when busses stop, especially at rush hour.</p>	<p>It is accepted that these junctions have their issues, however, to date there have not been any recorded accidents. Whilst not ideal, any accidents that would occur should be low impact (due to vehicle speeds) vehicle on vehicle collisions whereas, considering Bell Hill has no footway and is popular with pedestrians and cyclists alike, any collision on Bell Hill would likely have more severe consequences.</p> <p>When in use, the bus stops may well add to congestion, however, but this is not necessarily detrimental to safety. It is the driver's responsibility to pass a stopped bus a safe manner. This is common to most on carriageway all bus stops. Forward visibility for drivers in this location is acceptable.</p>
3	<p>Support</p> <p>Whilst (in normal times) traffic is unduly heavy and sometimes dangerously fast in this road and in principle I support any measures to ease that situation, there are two issues that need to be addressed if a one-way system is instigated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some residents, in exiting their drives in vehicles, are only able to turn in one direction only due to vehicles parking close to their drives in Bell Hill and the restricted width of Bell Hill. This direction varies.</li> </ol>	<p>To mitigate any issues with exiting their drives, residents should (where possible) reverse onto their driveways. Should they still experience problems, the installation of DYLs can be looked into, however, this would have to be raised with the Parish Council.</p>

	<p>2. One-way systems can encourage drivers to speed if they know that there will be no traffic coming in the opposite direction. It is possible that this may exacerbate the current speeding problem unless appropriate speed reduction measures are also included.</p>	<p>Approved funding is sufficient for the one-way restriction only. The situation will however be monitored, and traffic calming measures can be looked into via a future LHI or PFHI application (if deemed necessary).</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>I am glad to hear that the trial one-way system is going ahead in Bell Hill. That said, I see first-hand how some vehicles swing down very quickly, and will take advantage of the clear run if there are no speed calmers in place, I feel a narrowing at some point would be absolutely essential for the road to be safe, especially for cyclists.</p>	<p>Upon making the restriction permanent, the signing and lining will be altered to benefit such a restriction. Features, such as the water filled barriers will also be removed and a more permanent arrangement will be implemented. That said, the area will continue to be monitored and further improvements can be looked at via a future LHI or PFHI scheme.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>I think the one-way system is not a good idea, it will push more traffic round into the village, around the tight bends and is a crazy idea. Simplest idea is to allow no parking down there, quite simple, yellow lines both sides, all houses have/can make off road parking easily</p>	<p>Bell Hill is an historic village street, more suited to non-motorised use. Additionally, whilst DYLS would aid two-way vehicular traffic, it would likely also have the undesired effect of increasing the speed of vehicles, without affording pedestrians any additional space. With the street operating one-way, pedestrians are need only to expect vehicular traffic to come from one direction and there is increased space for all road users to pass one another.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>This will cause even more chaos at the School Hill Rd junction, which requires all traffic to give way to motorists &amp; cyclists continuing along High St &amp; up Windmill Ln. This junction is very busy &amp; as a local resident I confirm its the scene if many accidents, or near misses. It's also the site of Bus Stops in both directions, a busy Cafe in St Andrew's Centre, &amp; pavements have been lowered for the general public to cross the busy roads at this junction. Several hundred of additional vehicles daily of all sizes will further endanger the public in my opinion.</p>	<p>Whilst the restrictions may have resulted in an increase in volume of traffic at the School Hill junctions, the benefit to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists using Bell Hill cannot be ignored. There are no recorded accidents at the School Hill junctions .</p>

	<p>Bell Hill, I know is narrow, &amp; lacks a pavement, but it's a valued access for traffic traveling in both directions. There is a relatively safe access onto Church Street for cars as traffic can be seen from both directions. It's of huge benefit to reduce the traffic at the School Hill junction.</p>	
7	<p>Objection</p> <p>I should like to raise my objections in the strongest terms for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have walked, cycled (everyday) and driven up and down this road for 7 years without any problem whatsoever.</li> <li>• Cars will travel faster along the road.</li> <li>• Cycles will feel intimidated going the wrong way (despite being allowed to do so)</li> <li>• More vehicles sent past 16, 18 School Hill (currently very quiet)</li> <li>• Inconvenient for residents of Bell Hill</li> <li>• More street furniture</li> <li>• Unnecessary use of public funds;</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst the objector may have had no issues with negotiating Bell Hill, as a pedestrian/cyclist/driver, this view is not shared with all users.</p> <p>The one-way restriction seeks to address this by affording more space to pedestrians/cyclists, as well as the knowledge that vehicles can only come from the one direction.</p> <p>Signs indicate cyclists riding in the opposite direction and should help to alleviate any speeding concerns. The volume of traffic should remain relatively low, however, the situation will continue to be monitored and additional measures will be sought, should they be deemed necessary.</p>
8	<p>Objection</p> <p>"Another example of wasting taxpayers money! The reasons stated in your Statement of Reasons, are in my opinion spurious and stretch credibility.</p> <p>The nature of Bell Hill is that it has 'natural restrictions' i.e. it is narrow and cars routinely park on one side etc.</p> <p>The 'natural restrictions' actually assist social distancing, where my family and I have routinely walked in single file, without issue, for many years.</p> <p>If this scheme is implemented, motorists will be faced with a much more dangerous route to access the north of the village i.e. when coming into Histon from Park Lane, motorists will have to negotiate the sharp left turn into windmill Lane, adjacent to the School Hill Triangle."</p>	<p>Whilst the original statement of reasons were written with social distancing in mind, the situation has since progressed. Central Government is keen to promote the uptake of active travel i.e. increase of pedestrians and cyclists. This is one facet of measures which aim to promote Active Travel more widely.</p> <p>The perception of the 'School Hill Triangle' being dangerous is not supported by the accident data. Should there be a noticeable rise in accidents though, additional measures will be sought to rectify the problem.</p>
9	<p>Objection</p>	

	<p>I would like to register my objections to the one-way system on Bell Hill in Histon. This doesn't make sense and pushes additional traffic into the village and outside the St Andrews centre instead of being able to cut the corner. Having it open to bikes in the wrong direction without a designated cycle lane is also an accident waiting to happen. This road has now become much more dangerous than it was originally. This also seems a complete waste of money as it is a relatively low traffic area and was fine as it was. Please return it to how it has always been.</p>	<p>The intention is to install cycle symbols, at regular intervals, on the western side of the Road, however, these would only be installed if the scheme is made permanent. Note, the understanding that cyclists could be coming the other way should help keep vehicle speeds down.</p> <p>If the area is considered a 'relatively low traffic area' then the effect on motorised vehicles should be negligible.</p>
10	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I wish to object to the scheme to introduce a one-way restriction on Bell Hill in Histon. I have the following comments, observations and queries.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please explain why this has been introduced?</li> <li>2) Please confirm who decided to introduce this?</li> <li>3) How much council resource has been used to implement this and how much has the scheme cost?</li> <li>4) Why have these roads been chosen when there are others in the village near schools where money would be far better spent to improve safety, (e.g. Station Road between the infant and junior schools).</li> <li>5) Please provide clear evidence proving that this scheme is needed, including affect on: accident rates, pollution reduction, congestion reduction, noise reduction etc.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To provide more road-space for pedestrians / cyclists and making existing routes feel safer for use.</li> <li>2) The scheme was put forward as part of a wider list by the parish council, this was then reviewed by the county.</li> <li>3) Resources wise, this has been one of a number of schemes countywide, these have been prioritised at the expense of other work. At this stage the scheme costs are approx. £4k, but these would increase if it was made permanent, to be determined following agreement on design with stakeholders.</li> <li>4) A scheme for Station Rd has been proposed for Tranche 2 funding, this was one which was considered easier to deliver within provided budgets, and the amount of funding provided by central government for the first tranche of schemes is considerably less than available in tranche 2.</li> <li>5) The scheme was delivered in very short timescales during the pandemic to meet Government requirements. There was no opportunity to collect base line data. This is a small-scale scheme within a village, Consideration of impact would be proportionate with these factors. Removing Bell Hill as a convenient cut through from Park Lane will reduce the amount of traffic using Bell Hill – therefore less noise /</li> </ol>

		<p>pollution along here but this maybe displaced onto the alternative routes, although encouraging walking and cycling may reduce displacement. The accident data for the area shows a limited amount of accidents having occurred.</p>
11	<p>Support</p> <p>Just to say that I am very happy with the one-way system put in place on Bell Hill. It feels so much safer for me cycling up and down it. It was too chaotic and busy when it was two-way plus it helps with the local community accessing the church yard. I think it also helps with social distancing as we're no longer having to navigate cars and bunch up with other people. I do hope it is kept in place!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
12	<p>Support</p> <p>I would like to express my support for the ETRO on Bell Hill, Histon, however, overall, I feel it is an unambitious change.</p> <p>I believe it would've been better to solve the issue with a complete modal filter, as is the case with many of the ETROs in Cambridge. This would have allowed walking and cycling without any conflict from through drivers. As it is now this is particularly problematic where drivers face contraflow cyclists. A filter could also have been implemented in more attractively way that would be more in keeping with the character of this part of the village.</p> <p>Beyond that if a LTN in the vicinity of Bell Hill was desirable, then the truly effective change would have been to filter the Cottenham Road. This takes a number of through trips between Cottenham and Oakington to avoid the lights at Histon Green. The narrow winding lanes aren't suitable for this traffic; last week a cyclist was hit by a driver on this road. A bus gate, to allow for the City 8 bus route, combined with strategic filters in the Greenleas estate to prevent Waze/Google routing through the residential estate, would genuinely transform this area.</p>	<p>Given the fact that Bell Hill is relatively narrow, a modal filter would not serve as a cure-all, rather it would present alternative issues e.g. delivery vehicles, and other large vehicles (refuse etc) would be forced to reverse back out the road onto the busier Church Street, which would be an unsafe manoeuvre for pedestrians, cyclists and other motorists alike.</p> <p>Whilst the comments made in regards to an LTN (low traffic neighbourhood) are noted, such proposals are outside the scope of the programme approved and are not feasible, given the allocated funds.</p>

	<p>This is particularly important with the opening of Histon and Impington Park Primary school in the new year. A filtered LTN around Cottenham Road would create a far safer environment to bring children to the school by walking or cycling. Keeping the motor-vehicle trips to the main B1049 which has a reasonable segregated cycle route. We must do all we can to support the school in its ambition to have most pupils arrive without car trips.</p>	
13	<p>Support</p> <p>I wanted to email to let you know that Bell Hill in Histon feels safer and much more pleasant now it's one-way. Given that using this road saves just a minute (or less) of drivers' time, I (and neighbours in the area I have spoken with), would really prefer it to stay this way. I have a baby on the way and would feel a bit anxious about having to navigate cars travelling in both directions without a footpath.</p>	Noted.
14	<p>Objection</p> <p>I am writing to ask that Bell Hill in Histon be turned back to two-way traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cars now swing into bell hill from church street as they are not expecting any traffic coming the other way. I have had more than one close call on foot and by bike. My son was almost hit by a driver who didn't look down bell hill before turning in.</li> <li>2. Cars are now racing round the corner of Church St and Windmill Ln to make up for a perceived loss of time using bell hill. This is dangerous and have seen the bus have plenty of close shaves by drivers cutting the corner. In both directions.</li> <li>3. This additional traffic makes it hard for my two primary school children to cross the road safely to get to and from school. The bend is blind for drivers and pedestrians alike. I have asked numerous times for a mirror to be placed on the lamppost near the</li> </ol>	<p>If the restriction is made permanent then the junction between Church St and Bell Hill will be looked at to address this concern – physical features may help to narrow the access meaning drivers must negotiate the turn at lower speeds and pedestrians/cyclists will in effect be shielded from on-coming vehicles.</p> <p>The situation will be monitored and additional measures will be sought if the issue remains.</p> <p>The Council is not permitted to use mirrors on the public highway other than in extreme circumstances with specific site approval from DfT. Applications are seldom granted as their effectiveness is limited on account of such issues as; distortion, glare from sunlight or headlights can affect a driver's vision; it can be difficult to judge a vehicle's speed, when using one; road users can become over-reliant on them and can in turn ignore the fact that their view/image is limited; mirrors are prone to</p>

	<p>butcher to increase safety but have never ever received a response.</p> <p>4. That plastic barrier is a disgraceful eyesore in the oldest part of the village and a conservation area. Also, the sign at the top of the hill is dangerous as it just appears in the middle of the road. Cycling at night could cause someone to hit it.</p> <p>So, in summary, it seems there has been no increase in cycling or walking and for those that do, it has been made more dangerous using bell hill, especially up the hill.</p> <p>Traffic speeds have increased and crossing Church St has become more dangerous.</p>	<p>vandalism and their alignment/cleanliness are critical to their operation.</p> <p>The barrier is a temporary feature. Should the restriction be made permanent, a more befitting arrangement would be installed with adequate lighting.</p>
15	<p>Support</p> <p>I just wanted to say that I am very happy about the one-way system in place on Bell Hill. I take my children on that road for walks and it's very reassuring to know that there's more space on the road. It seems unnecessary to permit two-way traffic on such a narrow road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Support – Cllr Ros Hathorn

My thoughts are that there was a loud and vocal group of people who objected to the Bell Hill one-way system, as it added a few hundred metres to their journey, but that it was very successful in terms of active travel.

It was notable how few of those who objected support other active travel schemes and generally have strong views that all spaces should be open to cars all the time.

I heard many positive comments about how it's lovely to be able to walk down there, or for families to be able to cycle down there without worrying about traffic coming in the opposite direction. It has given children and young people more independence and parents more confidence about children cycling and walking around the village, it has changed the culture in one small part of the village. Often the people who felt this way and supported the scheme felt that they couldn't speak out about this as their voices were attacked and shouted down - I have been told precisely this from one resident.

I'm sure there have been negative comments from people who are having to drive a few hundred metres further but the objective of these travel schemes was to support people who want to walk, cycle and use active travel and it has been very successful in this. It is also invaluable in creating a culture which does not always defer to car usage to say that this is a space where you can expect people to be walking/cycling.

Since this measure was trialled it has become a more important route for local community usage as since the initial proposal was made the community have acquired a community Nature reserve along Park Lane and the Bell Hill route is a key cut through round the corner from the entrance to this site. The nature reserve does not have parking spaces so supporting community active travel to access this site is important.

I do understand that there may be issues specific to those who live on Bell Hill and I am not in a position to comment on those although I believe there have been some positive comments from residents about the reduction in traffic which I also think is an important consideration. It will have improved their quality of life and made the space they live in feel more relaxing.

I fully support this measure being made permanent,