

**COVID 19 – TEMPORARY CYCLING PROPOSALS**

*To:* Highways and Transport

*Meeting Date:* 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020

*From:* Steve Cox, Executive Director - Place and Economy

*Electoral division(s):* All

*Forward Plan ref:* Not applicable      *Key decision:* No

*Outcome:* To agree a set of measures for implementation across the County to encourage cycling during the Covid-19 crisis and through recovery.

*Recommendation:* Committee is recommended to:

- a) Note and comment on the list of cycle scheme proposals for development and implementation from Tranche 2 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund as set out in Appendix A;
- b) Delegate to Executive Director - Place and Economy in discussion with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Highways and Transport Committee the agreement of any changes to the programme.

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contacts:</i></b>	
Name:	Jeremy Smith	Names:	Cllr Ian Bates
Post:	Group Manager, Transport Strategy and Funding	Post:	Chair, Highways and Transport Committee
Email:	<a href="mailto:jeremy.smith@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">jeremy.smith@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 715483	Tel:	01223 706398

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On the 9<sup>th</sup> of May, the Government announced that £225M from the Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) was being made available for authorities in England to be used to deliver pop-up cycle lanes, wider pavements that allow for social distancing, safer junctions, and cycle and bus-only corridors. The funding was to be delivered in two tranches; a first tranche of £45M and a second tranche of £180M. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was indicatively allocated £575,000 from Tranche 1 and £2,299,000 from Tranche 2.
- 1.2 The CPCA submitted a bid for funding from the first Tranche, which was made up of scheme proposals developed by Peterborough City Council (PCC), and by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) in consultation with the five Cambridgeshire Districts and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). The CPCA was allocated £642,397, and has passed this funding to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. CCC has received almost £470,000 from Tranche 1.
- 1.3 This Committee approved CCC's Tranche 1 EATF programme at its meeting of 16 June 2020. Confirmation of the grant award was received by the CPCA on 3 July 2020, formally starting the eight week Tranche 1 delivery period (to 28 August). Delivery of the Cambridgeshire programme commenced before this point, taking advantage of the CPCA's offer to forward fund works by the Councils in advance of the funding from government.
- 1.4 On 10 July, the Department for Transport invited bids for funding from Tranche 2 of the EATF to be delivered or committed by the end of the 2020/21 financial year. The CPCA again requested that CCC and PCC develop proposals for Tranche 2.
- 1.5 The guidance for the second tranche of funding remains unchanged from the first, with a focus on 'measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling, both to encourage active travel and to enable social distancing during restart'. The timescales for Tranche 2 require that funding is spent or fully committed in this financial year.
- 1.6 This report sets out:
  - Indicative timescales for consultation and engagement on the Tranche 1 schemes that have been delivered, and for consideration of Tranche 1 proposals by this Committee, including the formal processes for Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).
  - The Tranche 2 proposals that were developed with the City and District Councils and the GCP, and submitted to government on the 7 August 2020.
  - Delivery of Tranche 2 proposals, and resource implications.
  - Future funding from government.

## 2 MAIN ISSUES

### **Proposed timescales for Committee consideration of Tranche 1 proposals**

- 2.1 The table below provides indicative timescales for engagement, consideration and decision making on measures delivered with Tranche 1 funding from the EATF. The closing date for formal objections to an ETRO is contingent on no changes being made to a scheme covered by it in the six months from when the ETRO came into force. Any alterations to a scheme would reset the start date of the six month objection period for that scheme.

Early Nov 2020	GCP / CCC launch formal consultation for six week period on the following schemes implemented with Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders.
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus Gate ETRO covering Mill Road, Cambridge (CCC delivered).</li> <li>• Prohibition of Driving ETRO covering the following roads in Cambridge (GCP delivered): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Newtown Phase 1 – Prohibition of driving on short stretches of Bateman Street, Coronation Street, Pemberton Terrace (and suspension of the one-way flow in Coronation Street between St. Eligius Street and Panton Street).</li> <li>– Prohibition of driving covering a short stretch of Carlyle Road.</li> <li>– Prohibition of driving covering a short stretch of Luard Road.</li> <li>– Prohibition of driving covering a short stretch of Nightingale Avenue.</li> <li>– Prohibition of driving covering a short stretch of Storey’s Way and suspension of the existing 2 metre width restriction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Silver Street – Bus Gate ETRO extending hours of operation to all hours of the day on all days (GCP delivered).</li> </ul>
	Signposting to website where comments can be made on other schemes implemented in Tranche 1.
Nov to Feb 2021	Final opportunity for consideration of any changes to be made to Tranche 1 measures implemented with ETROs, on the basis of feedback and objections received. See row below for deadlines for each scheme. Decision delegated to Executive Director – Place and Economy or Assistant Director Highways in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman of this Committee – see relevant paragraphs from 16 June report to this Committee in Appendix B. Opposition Lead Members and Local Members will be asked for their views.
Dec 2020 to Feb 2021	Closing dates for comments (end of six month statutory period under which objections to ETROs can be registered, subject to no changes being made to the scheme in that period) for the schemes noted below: 24 December 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mill Road, Cambridge (CCC delivered).</li> </ul> 10 February 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bell Hill and Winders Lane, Histon (CCC delivered).</li> </ul> 12 February 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newtown Phase 1, Carlyle Road, Luard Road, Nightingale Avenue, Storey’s Way (all GCP delivered).</li> </ul> 24 February 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silver Street (GCP delivered).</li> </ul>
Early July 2021	Final communication with stakeholders seeking comment on Tranche 1 measures.
Sep 2021	GCP take reports to their Joint Assembly and Executive Board seeking recommendations on whether their six Tranche 1 schemes implemented under ETROs should be made permanent.
Oct 2021	CCC Highways and Transport Committee to consider whether the ETROs relating to the Tranche 1 CCC schemes and the GCP schemes noted above should be confirmed, making them permanent.
Jan 2022 onwards	CCC / GCP implement permanent measures for any Tranche 1 schemes that are confirmed.

2.2 Depending on how matters progress as conditions on the transport network revert to normal or move towards a new normal, it may be necessary to consider changes to measures outside of the timescales noted above.

2.3 The process for Tranche 2 schemes implemented using ETROs will be similar; timescales will be determined when ETRO dates for Tranche 2 schemes are known.

## **Tranche 2 programme**

- 2.4 Appendix A to this report contains lists of Tranche 2 scheme proposals across all five Cambridgeshire districts to support walking and cycling, and the bid form that was submitted to the Department for Transport. They have been developed by the County Council in discussion with the City and district Councils and the GCP. They build on the Tranche 1 programme, and include some schemes that were in the Tranche 1 list but which have not yet been delivered due to practical or funding constraints. For example, the modal filter proposed for the Old Bridge between Huntingdon and Godmanchester and associated measures have been held up by the delay from July to September of the opening of the Pathfinder Link as part of Highways England's A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon scheme.
- 2.5 As with the Tranche 1 programme, proposals for Tranche 2 have been assessed against their fit with government guidance, direct transport benefits, impacts on the wider network, and deliverability within the required timescales. Notwithstanding that assessment, there are a number of proposals that require further work to develop the detail and to confirm that there is available road space to enable their safe implementation, and that the implications locally in terms of impacts on access and parking are acceptable to the City and district councils. Areas where further work is being undertaken to assess these issues include:
- Improvements to Ely City Centre and in Soham town centre for pedestrians and cyclists.
  - Measures in Huntingdon that reallocate road space on Huntingdon the ring road.
  - Measures on Cambridge Road, Godmanchester.
  - Some of the proposed measures that involve significant changes to existing layouts such as modal filters, Arbury Road and Coldhams Lane in Cambridge being examples, will need significant further work before delivery can be assured.
- 2.6 As was the case with the Tranche 1 programme, due to the tight timescales involved in pulling the bid together, it has not been possible to undertake a level of work that would be needed to guarantee that all measures proposed are deliverable, in the space available or in the timescales set out by government, or to undertake a level of local and stakeholder consultation that would allow any potential show stopping issues to be identified. Some of the measures will require Traffic Regulation Orders, and there are potential delays in that process that could delay scheme delivery.
- 2.7 The same flexibility as was agreed in relation to Tranche 1 would allow changes to the programme, should they be needed, to remove schemes from the programme if they are undeliverable, and to bring new schemes into the programme in discussion with partners and key stakeholders if necessary and as funding allows. An appropriate delegation to the Executive Director in discussion with the Chair, Vice Chair and opposition lead members to allow this to take place is included in the recommendations.

### **Traffic Order process for Tranche 2**

- 2.8 The Traffic Order process required for a number of the proposals will be largely the same as that set out into the 16 June report to this Committee in relation to Tranche 1, and reproduced in Appendix B to this report. While timescales for Tranche 2 remain tight, there will be more time to allow some local / stakeholder engagement on schemes that require Temporary or Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders prior to the publication of those orders.

### **Delivery of Tranche 2 proposals, and resource implications.**

- 2.9 The scale of the Tranche 2 programme is significant and will require staff resource from teams in Highways (Highway Projects and Road Safety, Traffic Management) and in

Growth and Development (Major Infrastructure, Transport Strategy and Funding), as well as Finance and Communications support. Skanska resource will also be utilised. While government would prefer authorities not to use external consultant support other than through term consultants where possible, there is likely to be a need to bring in additional design and delivery support to ensure the timescales can be met. The teams are currently working up proposals to identify the scale of the necessary resource so this can be procured as soon as possible. Plans for delivery will be reported to Members and any impact this may have on existing programmes.

### **Further development and funding of Local Cycling and Walking schemes**

- 2.10 A large number of proposals were submitted for consideration for funding from the EATF that were not included in either Tranche 1 or Tranche 2 bids because they were not compliant with the particular requirements of the EATF guidance, or because they were not deliverable in the required timescales. The particular requirement of the guidance for measures that reallocate road space has ruled out a significant number of proposals from consideration for funding from this source.
- 2.11 Many of the proposals duplicate proposals that are already included in the emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). All proposals that have been suggested will be reviewed against the LCWIP, and if not already covered, may be added to it. The £250M allocated to the EATF comes from a larger £2 billion allocation for walking and cycling measures across England, so it is likely that there will be new opportunities to bring forward some of these schemes in the next 2-5 years.

## **3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

### **3.1 A good quality of life for everyone**

The report above sets out the implications for this priority in paragraph 1.1.

### **3.2 Thriving places for people to live**

As society and the economy come out of lockdown, the proposals seek to allow the transport network to support changes in travel patterns necessitated by the need to continue social distancing, while allowing travel levels to return towards more normal levels.

### **3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children**

The measures included in the Tranche 2 Emergency Active Travel Fund programme include provision of measures that will enable safer trips to schools by walking and cycling.

### **3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050**

- The reduction in travel brought about by the lockdown has led to large reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the transport sector. However, there is a significant risk that levels of emissions will rebound significantly and in a worse case, to levels greater than before lockdown, if reduced public transport capacity is compensated for by additional car trips.
- The government funding for temporary cycle measures is focussed on addressing this problem by providing additional capacity for local trips to be made by walking and cycling.
- An increased willingness from companies / workers for home working compared to pre-COVID-19 may also have a positive impact on transport's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

## **4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

### **4.1 Resource Implications**

The report above sets out details of significant implications in paragraph 2.9.

### **4.2 Procurement / Contractual / Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

- It is anticipated that much of the work will be commissioned through the highways contract with Skanska and that no further procurement will be needed.
- Should any work need to be commissioned from other parties, it will follow the Council's Contract Procedure Rules

### **4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

- An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order is made under s9 and s10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England) Regulations 2012.
- Given the speed that schemes have been developed and will be implemented, measures will be closely monitored, and if necessary changes will be made to schemes address any problems seen. If necessary, temporary measures can be removed.
- As traffic levels build up towards more normal levels, it may negate the positive impact of measures in some places, or lead to issues elsewhere on the transport network. For example, where traffic is currently flowing well enough to allow a bus lane to be reallocated to cyclists or pedestrians, when traffic returns to a level where buses are experiencing delays due to congestion, the temporary measures are likely to need to be removed.
- The enforcement of some measures may require police intervention, as the powers available to the County Council and the temporary nature of the measures rule out other options in the short term.

### **4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications**

- An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken on the Tranche 1 programme. A further EQIA has been undertaken for the Tranche 2 programme and is being published on the Council's website.
- There is a risk of social or distributional impacts, particularly if measures disadvantaged public transport users with protected characteristics. This will need to be accounted for in areas where modal filters are introduced, with a presumption that bus access will be maintained.
- Where car parking is to be removed or re-allocated, disabled parking provision will be maintained.
- There may also be social and distributional impacts if measures are not introduced, as the lack of space for social distancing may disadvantage some groups more than others, as might increases in congestion to levels greater than seen pre-lockdown.

### **4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications**

- Additional central communications resource has been provided for Tranche 1 and this will need to continue into the Tranche 2 programme.
- Staff from Transport Strategy and Funding are also providing communications support and managing correspondence with the public and stakeholders.

- The slightly less urgent timescales associated with the Tranche 2 programme means that there should be more opportunity for engagement with key stakeholders prior to the delivery of proposals than was the case for the Tranche 1 programme.
- We will use a number of channels including through local Members to engage with the public and stakeholders as measures are introduced.
- Normal requirements in terms of statutory consultees will apply.

#### **4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement**

- Local members have had a short opportunity to engage with the proposals, and as noted above, will be an important channel for communications with their communities.
- Local Members will be consulted on any proposed changes to the current programme before they are agreed by delegation to the Chair / Vice-Chair.
- As the programme is taken forward, local intelligence on the impact of interventions from local members will be sought, along with commentary on whether proposals are working as intended or need to be modified.

#### **4.7 Public Health Implications**

- For an individual, the health benefits of increased walking and cycling markedly outweigh the risk of injury, and also offer a significant benefit to the health service, with reduced risk of many conditions in later life.
- As with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, emissions of pollutants from road transport – particularly nitrogen dioxide and fine particulate matter – have significantly reduced in the lockdown period.
- However, while monitored nitrogen dioxide concentrations in Cambridge have fallen by up to 60% in the City Centre, unusually settled dry weather in the first weeks of lockdown gave rise to higher than normal background particulate concentrations, and this has meant that fine particle concentrations did not markedly decline.
- If traffic conditions revert to pre-lockdown levels or greater, air quality will worsen.

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Sarah Heywood:
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?</b>	Yes Gus de Silva:
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Fiona McMillan
<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Elsa Evans
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	Yes Katy Rogerson
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Andrew Preston
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Emmeline Watkins

<b>Source Document</b>	<b>Location</b>
Government announcement	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/news/2-billion-package-to-create-new-era-for-cycling-and-walking">https://www.gov.uk/government/news/2-billion-package-to-create-new-era-for-cycling-and-walking</a>
Statutory guidance	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities</a>
16 June report to H&T Committee	See COVID-19 Temporary Cycling Proposals paper at: <a href="https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1528/Committee/62/Default.aspx">https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1528/Committee/62/Default.aspx</a>
Cambridgeshire Emergency Active Travel web pages	<a href="https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-projects/cycling-pedestrian-improvements/coronavirus-covid-19-walking-and-cycling-schemes">https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-projects/cycling-pedestrian-improvements/coronavirus-covid-19-walking-and-cycling-schemes</a>



## Appendix A: Tranche 2 bid submission and scheme list

The temporary scheme proposals in the tables below have been developed by officers at the County Council in discussion with the District and City Councils and the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The schemes are set out by district, with countywide programmes set out separately. Most (but not all) of the proposals on these list are intended for delivery from the first tranche of government funding that is being released for this purpose. A The programme

### Summary of Tranche 2 programme costs

Indicative Tranche 2 Programme Costs	
Greater Cambridge schemes	£782,900
East Cambridgeshire schemes	£169,000
Huntingdonshire schemes	£322,500
Fenland schemes	£57,000
<b>Cambridgeshire Tranche 2 total scheme costs</b>	<b>£1,301,400</b>
Monitoring	£100,000
Project Management and Communications (15% of total Cambridgeshire costs excluding monitoring)	£229,659
<b>Total (Cambridgeshire)</b>	<b>£1,631,059</b>
Peterborough City Council (PCC) schemes	<b>£550,000</b>
PCC monitoring	£30,000
PCC Project Management and Communications	£45,000
<b>Total (Peterborough)</b>	<b>£625,000</b>
eScooters trial Combined Authority costs	£20,000
<b>Total Tranche 2</b>	<b>£2,306,059</b>

### Tranche 2 bid submission

#### General

#### Q1. What is your local transport authority name?

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

#### Strategic Case

*A scheme is defined here as a single measure or group of related measures with the same objectives, for example to encourage more cycling/walking trips, reducing traffic flows, and shifting trips away from public transport whilst social distancing is in force. For example, a corridor scheme might be a series of investments along a given route to promote cycling and walking such as a new segregated cycle lane, junction improvements and new signage. Alternatively, an area-wide scheme might represent a programme of similar investments over a wider geographic area to achieve a given objective; for example, a programme of junction safety improvements to reduce cyclist casualties at collision hotspots.*

#### Q2. Please set out the context for the bid by briefly explaining the local transport problem, challenge or needs that your bid will help to address. These should be consistent with the objectives of the Fund set out in the bid invitation letter.

The programme of measures under Tranche 2 of the fund builds on our Tranche 1 programme, and has the same emphasis on reallocation of road space to non-motorised modes and providing for improved mobility and social distancing. The programme will improve the conditions for journeys, and the ease with which journeys can be made on foot and bike. It will provide more

space, more direct routes, and more segregation from traffic. The programme will support the local economies of the region by giving people more confidence to walk or cycle and by creating more space for people to socially distance.

In the Greater Cambridge area, where cycling and walking levels are already high, the programme focuses on the city centre and on a number of main road corridors into the centre which have high bus flows, and where substandard cycling facilities can be a barrier to cycling. We will see increased congestion, delay and air quality problems emerging on these corridors if we are unsuccessful in managing the resumption of travel sustainably. This approach carries through to the city centre. The linkage between the aims of this programme and the aims of the Greater Cambridge Partnership means that we are looking to take the opportunity to trial some measures on an experimental basis, including a number of point modal filters, which may be made permanent at the end of the experimental period.

In the north and west of Cambridgeshire, there is less reliance on walking and cycling than in Cambridge, but there is significant public transport usage, into, out of and within a number of the towns. As we come out of lockdown, we are seeing greater increases in longer distance trip making by car compared to shorter distance trips, which is likely to reflect a reluctance to use bus or rail for these longer trips at the current time. If we see the same pattern emerge for shorter distance trips we will potentially see congestion and associated negative impacts at worse levels than seen pre-COVID.

Peterborough has an extensive and well integrated road network, linked by a system of parkways which has resulted in the car being the dominant mode of transport. Congestion and delay are forecast to increase and so it is vital that walking and cycling are recognised as desirable travel choices. The installation of fully segregated cycle lanes along Oundle Road (and smaller infrastructure improvements along existing feeder off-road cycle routes) and on sections of Park Road and Broadway are aimed to encourage more cycling and walking trips, thus shifting trips away from public transport (while social distancing is in force), increasing safety and reducing congestion on these busy corridors. Increasing numbers of people travelling by walking or cycling will have positive impacts on a range of factors, such as congestion, health and wellbeing, the environment and on communities.

Current levels of people living and working in the locality are high. 45% of Peterborough residents live less than 5km from their workplace (compared to 35% nationally) (Census, 2011). The Council's Traffic Data Report 2016 identifies that 48% of car trips are less than 5km, and 21% are less than 3km. This reflects the huge potential to increase numbers of people who opt to travel sustainably if the infrastructure is in place. As a direct result of the reliance on car use, the city suffers from higher than average obesity levels (70.8% of adults are overweight (6% higher than the national average)). Diseases related to inactivity cost the Peterborough Primary Care Trust £2.7 million in 2013 (Sport England, 2013) which highlights the scale of potential savings that could be realised if the City achieves its aim to double walking and cycling activity by 2025.

Peterborough is recognised as one of the UK's fastest growing cities. DfT data estimates that between 2013 and 2017 the number of miles travelled on Peterborough roads increased by 15% (from 1.08 billion to 1.24 billion). This compares to a 12% increase in road traffic across the East of England (source: <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/regions/7>) and an 8% increase across Great Britain (source: <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/summary>). In July 2019, PCC declared a 'Climate Emergency' and committed to reduce organisational carbon emissions to net-zero by 2030. Around a quarter of the UK's greenhouse gas emissions come from transport, in 2017 90% of total domestic transport greenhouse gas emissions were from road transport and it is responsible for some 80% of roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations (Department for Transport, Transport Statistics Great Britain 2017, November 2017, page 13).

We recognise that cycling and walking schemes enhance housing and development by providing areas for physical activity and social inclusion. The Peterborough Local Plan (adopted July 2019) identifies the need to build 17,470 new homes and create 17,600 new jobs by 2036. In addition, a new University of Peterborough will have capacity for 12,500 by 2035. Research by TfL research in 2019 as part of their Liveable Neighbourhoods project identifies that revitalisation of local high streets is realised through the delivery of spaces and streets that prioritise active travel. The changing and growing landscape of Peterborough makes a compelling case for strategic planning of future walking and cycling networks and the potential opportunities to increase numbers of people travelling in a sustainable and active way.

**Q3. Please provide a summary of the proposed scheme(s). For example, locations, measures to be adopted, and whether they are temporary or permanent measures. Please explain how the scheme(s) will help to address the local challenges you have set out above, consistent with the objectives of the Fund. This should include how you have considered any mitigating impacts on other transport modes.**

We have prepared a CPCA-wide programme of temporary and experimental measures which are suited to the particular locations needs and demand and are focussed on our larger villages, towns and cities. Our programme is tailored to the indicative funding allocation for the CPCA from Tranche 2, but it is scalable. We are continuing to develop proposals and assess suggestions that have been made. There is a sizeable further list of interventions in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough that could be taken forward, and that might have been included in this bid with more time to develop.

The measures outlined will provide for improved mobility and enable social distancing by, reallocating road space to non-motorised modes and filtering / traffic restrictions. This will improve the conditions for, and ease with which journeys can be made on foot and bike, providing more space, more direct routes, and more segregation from traffic. The majority of initiatives will also support the local economies of the region by giving people more confidence to walk or cycle.

In Cambridgeshire:

The programme includes interventions in all five Cambridgeshire districts.

In Cambridge, the programme will build upon the modal filters implemented in Tranche 1, with a focus on reallocation of road space on a number of the main road corridors into the city. Over 40 individual interventions are planned, grouped in the following schemes:

- Milton Road (see scheme 1, questions 7-11)
- Cambridge City Centre and surrounding area (see scheme 4, questions 22-26)
- Between Cambourne and Cambridge (See scheme 5, questions 27-31)
- Barton Road (road space reallocation for segregated cycle route)
- Trumpington Road (measures to increase space for pedestrians and remove parking to provide cycle lanes on Station Road).
- Newmarket Road / routes from east Cambridge (on road segregated cycle lanes, junction improvements, potential modal filters).
- Residential areas (modal filters)

The package of measures in and around the Cambridge city centre includes measures to support the work of Cambridge's City Centre Restart Group which will benefit pedestrians, cyclists and businesses.

In Huntingdonshire, measures to reallocate road space are planned in Huntingdon and Godmanchester (Scheme 2, questions 12 to 16), St Ives, St Neots and in a number of villages. Measures on the Huntingdon Ring Road and on Town Bridge Godmanchester that were originally planned for Tranche 1 will now be implemented early in Tranche 2, and will involve a modal filter on the bridge and reallocation of a lane of part of the ring road to cyclists. These measures are now supplemented by further proposals on other routes into the town centre.

In Ely, Soham, Wisbech and Whittlesey, packages of measures to reallocate road space are being developed for the city and town centres, and will provide space for segregated cycle facilities and for widened pavements. Cycle parking will be provided in a number of locations across the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, reflecting that one of the barriers to cycling in many areas is the lack of secure parking, especially when compared to the much more comprehensive provision in the Cambridge area.

In South Cambridgeshire, without any large towns, proposals are focussed on villages where modal filters or reallocated road space will lead to increased walking and cycling.

Cambridgeshire County Council has liaised with the bus companies throughout the development of both the Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 programmes. A number of the modal filters proposed in Cambridge will be bus gates with camera enforcement, to avoid disadvantaging local bus services any further than is already the case with COVID-19. We now know from our monitoring of bus journey times in the past 5 months that normal levels of congestion add around 40% to timetabled journey times on average in the Cambridge area. We are very keen to ensure that we try and lock in benefits for buses from this programme.

In the north of Cambridge, we are looking at the phased implementation of some point closures on major routes / modal filters, to allow us to assess and review how one is operating and changing traffic patterns, and if necessary amend plans before we implement the next.

In Peterborough:

The current pandemic has provided an opportunity to challenge the existing and future road layout and to determine the priorities moving forward, particularly the role of sustainable and active travel in the future. The schemes help to address the local challenges faced by the large scale highway infrastructure investment in the 1970s, to deliver new town development, which resulted in Peterborough having good accessibility by car.

During the production of our LCWIP, Oundle Road (scheme 3, questions 25-30, Peterborough LCWIP route C03), Park Road (section of LCWIP route C05) and Broadway (section of LCWIP routes C10 & C11) were identified as priority routes with significant potential to increase the numbers of people walking and cycling. To assist the appraisal and prioritisation process a BCR calculation was completed using high level infrastructure design concepts (identified using the Route Selection Tool). The key benefits resulting from upgrading each of the routes were identified as:

- Improved safety for trips using active modes
- Improved uptake of active modes of travel
- Reduced traffic congestion as a result of less driving commuters

The PCT was used to ascertain the number of trips currently made using the existing infrastructure, and how many trips would use it in a "Government Target" scenario. Oundle Road realised an increase of 216 trips per day, Park Road identified an increase of potentially 612 additional daily cyclists (across the entire route, including the Peterborough Regional College campus) and Broadway estimates show an additional 222. If the infrastructure was improved to a high standard the estimated BCR (ratio of the PVB to the PVC) (using the AMAT) of the Oundle Road scheme is 2.31, Park Road (entire scheme) realised an estimated BCR of 2.99 and Broadway potentially has a BCR of 2.80. The DfT guidance states that all schemes represent high value for money.

Creating segregated cycle lanes in these key corridors will realise several objectives by helping PCC to create environments that are safer for both walking and cycling and allowing cycling (in particular) to replace journeys previously made by public transport or the private car. The schemes will have an essential role to play in the short term, helping avoid overcrowding on public transport systems and localised congestion caused by single occupancy car travel. Longer term, the schemes will reinforce other proposals set out in the LCWIP to help deliver significant health, environmental and congestion benefits in the future.

The Combined Authority has recently undertaken a competitive tendering process to appoint an electric bike and e-scooter operator Voi for the 12 month trial as part of a DfT initiative. Throughout the process of the trial the current budget required will be to cover the continual monitoring and evaluation and integration of the data. The funded activity will be:

- Data collection and analysis to support the monitoring and evaluation of the trial. This will include both the use of data generated by the deployment but also contextual data already being collected by the trial
- Feeding data from the trial into the ITO platform and then onto Apple maps and Google Transit as well as other journey planning tools as appropriate
- Convening local stakeholders such as Centre for Diet and Activity Research (CEDAR) part of the University study for the trial and other depts. Such as the computer lab to support the evaluation of the deployment
- Support in integrating the scheme into the wider transport ecosystem

This trial will receive a small level of support from this programme to cover CPCA management costs. All other costs will be borne by the operator.

The top five schemes detailed in parts 4 to 8 of this form represent around half of the total programme cost by scheme value. Details of the whole programme can be submitted separately.

**Q4. What prioritisation has been undertaken to identify these proposed scheme(s)? Please tick all that apply**

Scheme(s) identified in Local Cycling Walking Investment Plan (LCWIP)

Scheme(s) identified in Local Transport Plan

Scheme(s) identified through consultation with stakeholders

### LCWIPs

**Q5. Which LCWIP does the scheme(s) fall under?**

Cambridgeshire LCWIP

Peterborough City Council Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan 2019 - 2029 (Draft)

**Q6. Please provide URL to LCWIP if available**

The Cambridgeshire LCWIP is currently in draft and is yet to be approved. The draft LCWIP can be made available on request

Peterborough City Council Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan 2019 - 2029 (Draft)  
<https://www.peterborough.gov.uk/council/strategies-policies-and-plans/transport-strategies/local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-2019-2029>

### Scheme 1

**Q7. Scheme Name**

Milton Road Corridor, Cambridge

**Q8. Total scheme cost**

£74,000

**Q9. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including:**

- the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;
- types of road that they are located on;
- the location of any junction improvements and point closures;
- the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters;
- whether interventions are temporary or permanent.

If possible, a map should be emailed separately to [Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk).

Measures to provide more space for walking and cycling between the villages of Waterbeach and Milton and Cambridge City Centre. This scheme includes the temporary widening of footpaths in Milton village, reallocation of road space for physically segregated cycle provision on Cowley Road and Milton Road, which will allow the off-road paths to be used by pedestrians without conflict and allowing for social distancing, and measures to shrink the entries, exits and circulatory areas of the Milton Road / Elizabeth Way roundabout to reduce speeds and improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.

**Q10. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered. \***

New segregated cycleway (temporary)

New temporary footway

Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. closing bays or complemented by increasing fees)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Other (please specify): reallocation of road space to cyclists by shrinking entries / exits / circulatory areas on Milton Road / Elizabeth Way roundabout to reduce speeds and improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.

**Q11. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles**

2.6 miles

**Q12. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)**

1 temporary footway with reduced speed limit on adjacent road

2 stretches of temporary segregated cycleway

**Scheme 2**

**Q13. Scheme Name**

Godmanchester and Huntingdon- Improvements for cycle access into and around Huntingdon including cycle parking improvements

**Q14. Total scheme cost**

£140,000

**Q15. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including:**

- the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;
- types of road that they are located on;
- the location of any junction improvements and point closures;
- the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters;
- whether interventions are temporary or permanent.

If possible, a map should be emailed separately to [Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk).

A package of measures including:

- An experimental point closure on 14th Century Grade 1 listed Old Bridge between Huntingdon and Godmanchester, with exceptions for cyclists, buses and taxis (this proposal is made possible by the imminent opening of the Pathfinder link as part of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon scheme which will provide alternative vehicular access between Godmanchester and Huntingdon, pedestrians will still use the adjacent footbridge).
- Bi directional cycle route using reallocated traffic lane on Riverside Road and Castle Moat Road, between Hartford Road, the old Bridge and Huntingdon bus station.
- Raised table at junction of High Street and Hartford Road near Hunts Post Office.
- Contraflow cycle lane on Priory Road between the ring road and Avenue Road.
- Bi-directional cycle lane on Ambury Road between the Ring Road and Avenue Road.
- Bi-directional cycle lane on Hartford Road between High Street and ring road.
- Modal filter to allow cyclists to exit ring road along disused exit road near Huntingdon Sainsbury Petrol Station
- North side of Hartford Road from Primrose Lane to Owl Way - on carriageway cycle lane
- Cycle parking improvements at sites including: Princes St Car Park , Car park near St Germain St, Hinchingbrooke School, Huntingdon Railway Station, Huntingdon Bus Station, George Street / High Street (behind All Saints Church), St Benedicts Court, Commemoration Hall, Sainsbury's, One Leisure (St Peters Road)

**Q16. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered. \***

New segregated cycleway (temporary)

Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer

Point closures of main roads to through traffic, apart from buses, access and disabled

Provision of secure cycle parking facilities

Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. closing bays or complemented by increasing fees)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

**Q17. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles**

Not applicable

**Q18. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)**

1 point closure of main road to through traffic (likely to maintain bus and taxi access)

1 modal filter

1 junction improvement

6 sections of temporary segregated on road cycleway

At least 10 areas with new / expanded secure cycle parking

**Scheme 3**

**Q19. Scheme Name**

Oundle Road, Peterborough

**Q20. Total scheme cost**

£400,000

**Q21. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :**

- the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;
- types of road that they are located on;
- the location of any junction improvements and point closures;
- the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters;
- whether interventions are temporary or permanent.

If possible, a map should be emailed separately to [Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk).

Oundle Road is a busy route extending from the City Centre to the Peterborough Business Park at Lynch Wood. The extension is in the urban fringe and passes through extensive residential areas with several schools and parklands fronting onto the road. It serves as a key link from the city to the expanding Business Park. Two bus routes serve Oundle Road and so it is generally not overly congested with bus traffic, but it is a busy arterial for private vehicles.

The route currently has very narrow (less than the recommended 1.5 metres) and at times broken advisory cycle lanes and is characterised by intermittent on-street parking and school traffic. There is some off-carriageway cycle provision towards London Road. Long expanses of the route have no centre line provided (considered a benefit to cyclists as evidence suggests the removal of the centre line helps to reduce vehicle speeds). As a result there is a lack of comfortable cycling space.

The installation of fully segregated cycle lanes on each scheme proposed (Oundle Road, Park Road and Broadway), including some smaller infrastructure improvements along existing feeder off-road cycle routes, is aimed to make the routes safer and more comfortable for cyclists (and pedestrians due to reduced pavement cycling) and will encourage more cycling and walking trips, thus shifting trips away from public transport (while social distancing is in force), and reducing congestion on busy commuting corridors.

The schemes will address the issues identified by the current infrastructure; lack of dedicated cycling space, illegal cycling on footways, narrow shared use footways making social distancing difficult, lack of space for comfortable cycling on-carriageway, low quality cycling infrastructure, clarity and consistency of signage, on street and illegal parking and maintenance issues - cleanliness, soft landscaping, graffiti etc.

Proportional space will be applied to provide additional protection from passing vehicles and will also assist pedestrians crossing the cycleway, with the intention that the environment will be more appealing to new cyclists and to encourage less confident cyclists to make more journeys by bicycle or foot. The complementary smaller improvements on the feeder off road cycle networks identified will provide a direct and joined up route to improve access to major trip generators, transport hubs and key local destinations.

**Q22. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered. \***

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

**Q23. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles**

Up to 2.1 miles

**Q24. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)**

Not applicable

## **Scheme 4**

**Q25. Scheme Name**

Cambridge City Centre Area wide Improvements

**Q26. Total scheme cost**

£167,000

**Q27. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :**

- the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;
- types of road that they are located on;
- the location of any junction improvements and point closures;
- the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters;
- whether interventions are temporary or permanent.

If possible, a map should be emailed separately to [Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk).

A package of measures in and around Cambridge City centre, including:

- A sequential introduction of point closures with monitoring of impacts on Arbury Road, Milton Road (south of Gilbert Road) and Victoria Avenue.
- Modal filters on Union Lane, and at a number of locations in the city centre.
- Experimental Traffic Orders to restrict vehicular access and increase available safe space for pedestrians, social distancing and outdoor seating/ tables and chairs, whilst still allowing for emergency access and deliveries within defined hours on key streets in the city centre (Wheeler Street/ Bene't Street/ Peas Hill / Guildhall Street, Market Street, Green Street)
- Removal of parking to allow widening of footways and provision of cycle parking on Regent Street
- Measures to shrink the entries, exits and circulatory areas to reduce speeds and improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced, at the following junctions.
  - Royal Cambridge (Trumpington Road / Lensfield Road / Fen Causeway)
  - Chesterton Road / Elizabeth Way
  - Mitchams Corner (Milton Road / Victoria Road / Victoria Avenue / Chesterton Road)
  - Queens Road/ Northampton Street / Madingley Road
  - Queens Road / Barton Road / Fen Causeway
  - Change in priority at the Mill Lane / Pembroke Street junction



**Q28. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered. \***

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer

Point closures of main roads to through traffic, apart from buses, access and disabled

Widening existing footway

Provision of secure cycle parking facilities

Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. closing bays or complemented by increasing fees)

Area wide interventions (e.g. pedestrian and cycling zones and modal filters / filtered permeability)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Other (please specify): changing the priority to routes with stronger cycle flows at two junctions in the city centre. , Shrinking the entry / exit / circulatory areas of four major junctions in and around the city centre to reallocate road space to cyclists, reduce speeds and improve safety.

**Q29. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles**

Not applicable

**Q30. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)**

Up to 3 point closures of main roads to through traffic (they will be implemented in sequence with monitoring to assess impact and need for further intervention).

Up to 3 further modal filters / traffic restrictions delivering an area wide intervention

6 junction improvements

## **Scheme 5**

**Q31. Scheme Name**

Cambourne to Cambridge Cycle Improvement

**Q32. Total scheme cost**

£161,000

**Q33. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including:**

- the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;
- types of road that they are located on;
- the location of any junction improvements and point closures;
- the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters;
- whether interventions are temporary or permanent.

If possible, a map should be emailed separately to [Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk).

Corridor improvements for cyclists and pedestrians between Cambourne and Cambridge, including:

- A modal filter and / or physically segregated cycle lanes on St Neots Road, Hardwick
- Segregated cycle lanes on Madingley Road where space allow, accompanied by works to cut back vegetation, narrow the junction and widen the crossing at the junction between Madingley Road and Coton Road.
- Change priority at the junction between the Coton footpath and Adams Road
- Modal filter on Grange Road

- Sidgwick Avenue made one way with segregated contraflow cycleway
- Remove parking on Queens Road and replace with segregated cycle lanes
- Change priority at Silver Street / Kings Parade junction

**Q34. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered. \***

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer

Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. closing bays or complemented by increasing fees)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

**Q35. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles**

9 miles

36. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

### Finance case

**Q37. Total DfT funding sought (£) \***

£2,299,000

**Q38. Total DfT capital funding sought (£) \***

£1,839,200

**Q39. Total DfT revenue funding sought (£) \***

£459,800

**Q40. Total local authority contribution, if applicable, (£)**

Peterborough City Council have committed £500k of developer funding to improve a number of key off-road routes to further support walking and cycling.

Cambridgeshire County Council will be undertaking maintenance work to address some areas that would not be fundable under the guidance. The Greater Cambridge Partnership will be undertaking complementary works in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as was the case in Tranche 1. Up to £2M is available from GCP.

### Management case

**Q41. When do you expect to commence construction? (DD/MM/YY) \***

01/09/2020

**Q42. When do you expect to have completed the work? (DD/MM/YY)**

31/03/2021

**Q43. Please describe the project review and governance arrangements in place, and any assurance arrangements, e.g. to ensure that accessibility requirements will be met \***

As the accountable body for the funding the Combined Authority will be allocating the funding to the two local Highways Authorities. The Combined Authority is placing assurance on the existing governance arrangements in place within each of the local Highways Authorities, as set out below, and will be working closely with the Highways Authorities to ensure funds are used in line with the grant requirements.

The programmes in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough will be overseen by the relevant committees in each authority. These are Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and

Transport Committee and Peterborough City Council's Cabinet. Appropriate delegations to officers and lead members have been agreed. The project / programme management processes that have been put in place for Tranche 1 will continue into Tranche 2.

Cambridgeshire County has established a Programme Board for its elements active travel programme that meets weekly, with a programme manager, programme delivery lead, area project managers, transport strategy, communications, finance, Greater Cambridge Partnership, and term contractor representation. An Equality Impact Assessment is in place for the Cambridgeshire elements of the programme, and separate assessments may be undertaken for individual proposals if and as required.

Peterborough City Council has a highways project board which meets monthly and has senior officers from the council and Skanska (the highway contractor). This is a decision making board that discusses progress on schemes and resolves any issues. A Cabinet Member Decision Notice has already been approved which will allow works to commence when funding is awarded.

**Q44. Please indicate what community engagement will be undertaken as part of the scheme development and that stakeholders have been consulted on matters such as accessibility issues, impacts on local businesses, freight deliveries and bus and taxi operators \***

Peterborough City Council has been at the forefront of a number of successful behaviour change programmes for many years, working with schools, businesses and the community through the sustainable travel initiative, branded locally as Travelchoice. The Travelchoice initiative has built key relationships with businesses, schools and communities and will be pivotal to undertake engagement activities with the local community. Surveys, bespoke personalised travel planning, adult cycle training, school and business travel planning and community events will be undertaken as part of the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme and to target schemes in the future. Consultation with all relevant stakeholders will be undertaken once plans have been drawn up.

In Cambridgeshire, Local Members across the county and the constituent districts have had input into the development of the Tranche 2 programme and bus companies and the emergency services have been engaged through the Transport Restart Group run by the CPCA. There is also continuous liaison with city and town centre restart groups and with other groups such as Cambridge University Health Partners and Cambridge Ahead on transport restart issues. Local businesses and stakeholders will be engaged as schemes are brought forward. Additional dedicated communications resource to deal with the Tranche 1 work and with the large amount of correspondence it has generated, and this resource will be maintained into Tranche 2.

**Q45. Please state which design standards have been followed in developing your scheme(s) \***

As part of the development of our LCWIPs it was important to consider the attributes of the existing transport network and its suitability for cycling before converting desire lines into preferred routes to create a cycle network.

Based on established best practice both internationally, (Dutch Design Manual for bicycle traffic (CROW): <http://www.crow.nl/publicaties/design-manual-for-bicycle-traffic> and nationally, the DfT new national guidance for highway authorities and designers – [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/904088/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/904088/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf), - and TfL research that points to safety, traffic and facilities being key barriers: <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/analysis-of-cycling-potential.pdf> good routes for cycling realise the core design outcomes suggested by the Cycling Level of Service (CLoS) tool in the London Design Standards - <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets-toolkit#on-thi-page-1>, as noted below:

- Coherent  
The network must be coherent, it must link all the places cyclists want to start and finish their journeys with a route quality that is consistent and easy to navigate. Abrupt changes in the level of provision for cyclists will mean that an otherwise serviceable route becomes disjointed and unusable by the majority of potential users.
- Direct  
Routes for cyclists must provide direct and fast routes from origin to destination. In order to make cycling preferable to driving, routes for cyclists must be at least as direct – and preferably more direct – than that available for private motor vehicles. An indirect route for

cyclists may result in some of them choosing the more direct faster route, even if it is unsuitable for cycling.

- **Safe**  
Cycle networks must not only improve cyclists' safety, but also their feeling of how safe the environment is. Consideration must be given to reducing the speeds of motor vehicles to acceptable levels, particularly when cyclists are expected to share the carriageway. The need for cyclists to come into close proximity and conflict with motor traffic must be removed, particularly at junctions, where the majority of crashes occur.
- **Comfortable**  
Smooth surfaces with minimal stopping and starting, without the need to ascend or descend steep gradients and which present few conflicts with other users creates comfortable conditions that are more conducive to cycling. The presence of high speed, high volume motor traffic affects both the safety and the comfort of the user.
- **Attractive**  
Cyclists are more aware of the environment they are moving through than people in cars or other motor vehicles. Cycling is a pleasurable activity, in part because it involves such close contact with the surroundings. The attractiveness of the route itself will therefore affect whether users choose to cycle.

**Q46. Consultancy spend should be limited and where needed, existing framework contractors should be used. Are you intending to use consultants? \***

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details

Most work will be undertaken internally and by Skanska, the term contractors of the two Highway Authorities. For some schemes in Cambridgeshire, we may utilise additional consultant resource for design work where there are links with work previously undertaken and therefore potential efficiencies over other procurement routes.

### **Commercial case**

**Q47. Is the authority ready to commence work and, if applicable, are contractors/ procurement / delivery partners in place? \***

Yes

Please provide details

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council have resource available internally and from their framework contractors to deliver the Tranche 2 programme. This resource is already engaged in delivering Tranche 1 schemes. The Combined Authority made available funds up to its indicative allocations under both Tranches available to the County and City Councils prior to the commencement of delivery of Tranche 1.

In Cambridgeshire a number of Tranche 2 proposals in Cambridgeshire have already been approved by Members as part of the process of developing the Tranche 1 programme. In Peterborough, a Cabinet Member Decision Notice has already been approved which will allow works to commence when funding is awarded. This will allow a smooth transition from the delivery of Tranche 1 to Tranche 2.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Q48. Has monitoring and evaluation been considered for all scheme(s)? \***

Yes

If yes please provide details

We are aiming to meet the principles and requirements of the recently published guidance on monitoring. We will be utilising existing data gathering and supplementing this with additional data for a number of schemes or groups of schemes. The current circumstances mean that the identification and attribution of changes in travel behaviour to specific measures or to other factors may be challenging. We will not be individually monitoring scheme usage on a number of

the smaller interventions, as the cost of such monitoring would be disproportionately high compared to the cost of these interventions. We would note that at the current time, as we are not seeing the same peaks as we were pre-COVID (in quantum or in profile through the day), limited hour surveys may not be as useful as they would be in more normal times.

**Q49. Using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided, please outline briefly how you will monitor and evaluate each permanent scheme costing at least £2m. (If no individual scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable") \***

Not applicable

**Q50. Reporting Officer details \***

Name\*  
Telephone number\*  
Email address\*

**Q51. Senior Responsible Officer details \***

Name\*  
Telephone number\*  
Email address\*

**Q52. Section 151 Officer (or equivalent) details \***

Name\*  
Telephone number\*  
Email address\*

**Q53. Please add further details or clarification**

Scheme lists and mapping

We will forward mapping for schemes 1 to 5 and a complete scheme list next week (w/c 10 August)

Delivery dates

Peterborough schemes will commence delivery on 23/11/2020 and be completed by the 01/03/2021. Cambridgeshire County Council may commence delivery of Tranche 2 schemes without pause from the Tranche 1 programme, taking advantage of the flexibility given by the forward funding that has been made available by the CPCA. All funding will be committed and or spent by the 31/03/2021.

## Greater Cambridge

Location	Description	Indicative cost
<b>Cambourne to Cambridge</b>		
St Neots Road, Hardwick	Modal filter buses & cycles only, or physically segregated cycle lanes if space allows.	100,000
Madingley Road, Cambridge	Segregated cycle lanes where space allows, cutting back vegetation, narrowing junction at Coton junction, widening crossing at Coton turn.	30,000
Adam's Rd / Coton footpath junction, Cambridge	Change priority and remove chicane as per West Cambridge Section 106 proposal and remove parking.	To be reviewed
Grange Rd, Cambridge	Prohibit motor vehicles at all times except local buses on a short section of Grange Road north of West Road. (Optional measure: make a short section of Grange Road one-way southbound except for cycling between West Road and Cranmer Road to prevent rat-running from Barton Road to Queen's Road via West Road).	GCP
Sidgwick Ave, Cambridge	Make one-way & remove parking to widen footway and provide segregated contra-flow cycle lane	8,000
Queens Road, Cambridge	Remove parking and replace with segregated cycle lanes	19,000
Silver Street / Kings Parade junction, Cambridge	Change priority to N/S	4,000
<b>Cambridge City Centre</b>		
Regent Street	Remove parking and widen footways or install cycle parking	6,500
Arbury Rd, north of Leys Rd	Modal filter, allowing bus / cycle / emergency services access. Needs to be considered in context of works on Histon Road.	10,000
Milton Road south of Gilbert Road	Modal filter, allowing bus / cycle / emergency services access.	75,000
Maids Causeway / Victoria Avenue	Prohibit motor vehicles at all times except local buses on a short section of Victoria Avenue adjacent to the Jesus College entrance except for local buses.	GCP funded
Union Lane	Consider a modal filter or make it one way and then include a segregated cycle lane.	10,000
City centre	Review exemptions for private hire vehicles at city centre closure points	2,000
Granta Place, opposite the Mill public house, Cambridge	Additional gate from Granta Place to Laundress Green to allow more space for social distancing at busy pinch point for pedestrians and cyclists	4,000
Benet Street	Barriers / cones to widen footway	1,500
Park Terrace, Cambridge	Suspend pay and display parking to allow more space for cyclists	6,000
Various city centre streets	"Development of ETROs to restrict vehicular access and increase available safe space for pedestrians, social distancing and outdoor seating/ tables and chairs, whilst still allowing for emergency access and deliveries within defined hours (to be determined), on following key streets:	6,500
Mill Lane / Pembroke Street junction	Change priority from N/S to E/W	4,000
Royal Cambridge junction (Trumpington Rd / Lensfield Rd / Fen Causeway)	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000

Location	Description	Indicative cost
Chesterton Road / Elizabeth Way	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
Mitchams Corner	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
Queens Road/ Northampton Street / Madingley Road	Single traffic lanes only into roundabout, with remaining space made into temporary on-road cycle lanes to reduce traffic speed and make cyclists safer on road	7,000
Queens Road / Barton Road / Fen Causeway	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
<b>East Cambridge to City centre</b>		
Newmarket Road, Cambridge	Cone or barrier off on-road cycle lanes where possible.	50,000
Newmarket Road between Swanns Rd and Coldhams Common crossing	Temporary bidirectional on-road segregated cycle lane on outbound carriageway.	10,710
Elizabeth Way and Newmarket Road, Cambridge	Temporary bi-directional on-road segregated cycle lane between St Andrews Road junction on Elizabeth Way and Abbey Street crossing on Newmarket Road Widen footway and remove guard railing on the footway adjacent to the cycle way at the roundabout.	12,418
East Road between Newmarket Road and Mill Road	Cone off on-road cycle lanes where possible; remove guardrail Mill Rd/East Road junction	10,892
Coldhams Lane	Modal filter, or investigation of alternative measures if not feasible.	75,000
East Road / Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Way	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
Newmarket Road / Barnwell Drive / Wadloes Road	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
<b>Milton / Milton Park and Ride to city centre</b>		
Butt Lane between Milton and Histon	Side out and cutback vegetation on existing cycle path on Butt Lane between A10 and Histon	10,000
High Street, Milton	20mph speed limit (subject to speed data), widen footway between White Horse and Lion and Lamb	6,500
Cowley Road, Cambridge	Remove car parking on east side to segregated cycleway from shared use path allowing more space for social distancing.	10,000
Milton Rd, Cambridge	Temporary on-road cycle lanes to encourage cycling on road rather than on narrow shared use path, facilitating social distancing.	44,380
Elizabeth Way / Milton Road	Look to shrink entries / exits / circulatory areas to reduce speeds to improve safety, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, while traffic flows are reduced.	7,000
<b>Trumpington Park and Ride to city centre</b>		
Shelford Road / Hauxton Road junction	Remove guard railing on west side of footway	2,000
Station Road, Cambridge	Remove parking and create light segregated cycle lanes. Reduce splays at Tenison Road junction	10,000
<b>Residential areas in Cambridge</b>		

Location	Description	Indicative cost
Addenbrooke's area	Temporary measures in advance of permanent works to improve cycle access via Red Cross Lane.	To be determined
Vinery Road	Modal filter	10,000
Church Street, Chesterton	Consider modal filter at junction with High Street, between Lynfield and Chapel Street	10,000
Birdwood Road, Cambridge	Investigate measures to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Mark out cycle lanes? Install speed cushions to slow traffic?	45,000
Fallowfield	Flatten pavement kerb at bollarded section to allow larger bikes though. Increase signage to show cycle route through fallowfield to Green End Road. Remove pram arms at Fallowfield/Franks lane cut through BUT include a filter at Franks lane end to prevent motorbikes from using it.	10,000
<b>Other main roads</b>		
Barton Rd	Barrier off part of road over M11 bridge to provide bi-directional cycle lane	10,000
<b>South Cambridgeshire villages</b>		
Bassingbourn	Temporary village wide 20 mph speed limit. Place water filled barrier passing place priority chicane features only, as will be issues with compliance for 20 mph limit.	10,000.00
Eastgate, Cambourne	Investigate making Eastgate a one way street in north easterly direction from Lancaster Gate. and reduce speed limit to 20 mph. Use water filled barriers to narrow road to 3m, with space freed up to be used by cycles, with footpaths / cycle paths free for use by pedestrians.	20,000.00
Cottenham	Cycle parking at Pound Car Park, Co-Op and Butchers	10,000.00
Duxford	Measures to provide safer crossing of the A505 between Duxford and Sawston to allow for school trips by bike.	To be determined
Grantchester Road, Grantchester	Modal filter for safe walking/cycling route to Cambridge, possibly look to reduce speed limit also in stretch where more walkers and cyclists, one suitable point for closure near vprish boundary sign nr Broadway.	15,000.00
Back Road, Hildersham	Modal filter for safe walking/cycling	15,000.00
Station Road, Histon	Modal filter between the Baptist Church and Chequers Way.	5,000.00
Dry Drayton Road & Cambridge Road, Madingley	Cambridge Road made one way north westwards from the A1303, with water filled barriers or similar segregating a bi-directional running lane for cyclists. Reduce speed limit to 40mph. Consider same approach on Dry Drayton Road.	30,000.00
Melbourn	Cycle parking in village centre and at leisure centre.	10,000.00
Way Lane, Waterbeach	Chicanes - suspend parking	5,000.00



## East Cambridgeshire

Location	Description	Indicative cost
Ely City Centre Improvements	Improvements to Ely City Centre for walking and cycling - scheme to look at all Ely proposals as a package to understand the implications on the road network and achieve maximum benefit for cyclists and pedestrians.	50,000
Ely	Cycle parking	9,000
Littleport	Cycle parking	15,000
Mepal	Cycle parking	12,000
Soham Town Centre improvements	Improvements to Soham Town Centre for walking and cycling - scheme to look at all Soham proposals as a package to understand the implications on the road network and achieve maximum benefit for cyclists and pedestrians.	50,000
Stretham	Cycle parking	3,000
Sutton	Cycle parking	12,000
Wicken	Cycle parking	3,000
Wilburton	Cycle parking	3,000
Witchford	Cycle parking	3,000
Witchham	Cycle parking	3,000
Haddenham	Cycle parking	3,000
Little Thetford	Cycle parking	3,000

## Fenland

Location	Description	Indicative cost
Freedom Bridge, Wisbech (A1101 / B198 junction)	Improvements to the roundabout and surrounding area for pedestrians and cyclists. Potential interventions that require further investigation are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of road space on Lynn Rd through Freedom Bridge roundabout to allow for more space for walking and cycling</li> <li>Improve cycle parking in front of the police station</li> </ul>	30,000
Whittlesey and March – Town wide improvements to pedestrian / cycle connections between town centre and residential areas and access to schools.	Locations for further investigation include A605 through Whittlesey, Drybread Road, Park Lane, New Road	20,000
Wisbech – Horsefair Shopping Centre	Secure Cycle Lockers to encourage multimodal journeys- bus/cycle interchange	7,000

## Huntingdonshire

Location / Intervention	Description	Indicative cost
Alconbury Weald	Cycleway along B1043 from Alconbury Weald to Alconbury to link with new cycleway along the A1 to Brampton	5,500
Ramsey	Cycle Parking at: Great Whyte (Opposite Jolly Sailor PH), Great Whyte (near bus stop), Ramsey One Leisure, St Georges Field, Mill lane Park	18,000
Northern end of Buckden High Street	Investigate measures to reduce speeding issues on the northern end of the High Street (which is straight and wide and where people come off from the A1 slip way and don't transition down to low enough speeds). Feasibility study recommends a refuge crossing point to provide safer facilities for pedestrians, reduce speeds turning into the High Street and to remind drivers to reduce down from the 50 mph limit.	To be determined
Buckden Parklet	Cycle Parking at Parklet	3,000
Cycle parking at bus and rail Stations	Huntingdon, St Ives, St Neots & St Ives Guided bus terminal, plus Huntingdon & St Neots Railway Stations - Additional / enhancing Parking / Secure cycle parking	30,000
<b>Huntingdon and Godmanchester</b>		
Improvements for cycle access into and around Huntingdon and cycle parking improvements.	<p>A package of measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An experimental point closure on 14th Century Grade 1 listed Old Bridge between Huntingdon and Godmanchester, with exceptions for cyclists, buses and taxis to be considered in scheme design. (This proposal is made possible by the imminent opening of the Pathfinder link as part of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon scheme which will provide alternative vehicular access between Godmanchester and Huntingdon, pedestrians will still use the adjacent footbridge if limited vehicular access is maintained across the Old Bridge).</li> <li>• Bi-directional cycle route using reallocated traffic lane on Riverside Road and Castle Moat Road, between Hartford Road, the old Bridge and Huntingdon bus station.</li> <li>• Consider option to head north-west on Nursery Road from Hartford Road (south side).</li> <li>• Raised table at junction of High Street and Hartford Road near Hunts Post Office.</li> <li>• Contraflow cycle lane on Priory Road between the ring road and Avenue Road.</li> <li>• Bi-directional cycle lane on Ambury Road between the Ring Road and Avenue Road.</li> <li>• Bi-directional cycle lane on Hartford Road between High Street and ring road.</li> <li>• Modal filter to allow cyclists to exit ring road along disused exit road near Huntingdon Sainsbury Petrol Station</li> <li>• North side of Hartford Road from Primrose Lane to Owl Way - on carriageway cycle lane</li> <li>• Cycle parking improvements at sites including: Princes St Car Park , Car park near St Germain St, Hinchingsbrooke School, Huntingdon Railway Station, Huntingdon Bus Station, George Street / High Street (behind All Saints Church), St Benedict's Court, Commemoration Hall, Sainsbury's, One Leisure (St Peters Road)</li> </ul>	140,000
Cambridge Road, Godmanchester	Investigate pop up cycle lane from White Hart pub to Cow Lane. Measures could include: Installation of advisory cycle lanes on both sides Cambridge Street, removal of carriageway centre lines, 20mph speed limit, widening of shared use path where possible, installation of solar studs, and resurfacing of Cow Lane and Common Lane.	12,500

Desborough Rd to Mill Rd, Hartford	Upgrade of existing footpath to cycle path	7,500
<b>St Neots area</b>		
High Street & Great North Road, Little Paxton	Improved cycle path from junction with High Street & Great North Road over the bridge to the junction to Hail Weston Road. This is used to access Grafham Water and other cycle paths.	9,000
Brookside Industrial Estate	Improve access to employment areas	9,000
<b>St Ives area</b>		
Needingworth Rd, St Ives – from St Audrey’s Lane to The Quadrant.	Needingworth Rd, St Ives – from St Audrey’s Lane to The Quadrant relates to achieving a north – south route from St Audrey’s Lane to The Quadrant but on-street parking makes it difficult to put in a cycle lane. It’s been suggested that perhaps we could consider making the pavement on the west side a (sub-standard) shared use cycle path	13,000
Ramsey Road cycling route and crossing of St Audrey’s Lane	Cycleway	20,000
Broadway	Alternatives needed to Broadway North Road is a potential alternative – but that needs something too - and/or it might be possible to put cycles through the Globe Car Park.	4,000
Stock Bridge Way	Investigate pedestrian and cycle crossings	To be determined
Cycle parking	Locations: Co-op (Constable Road / Marley Road), Kings Hedges / Ramsey Road, One Leisure (Westwood Road), One Leisure (Outdoor Centre, California Road), Adjacent Norris Museum, Broadway, Bridge Street, Market Mill, Station Road (Waitrose), Quayside,	30,000
<b>St Neots area</b>		
Station Road Industrial Area	Investigate improvements to pedestrian and cycle access to employment areas	To be determined
St Mary’s Street / Berkley Street / Montague Street- the mini roundabout	Investigate measures to slow traffic into the junction to provide safer conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. (The mini roundabout and heavy traffic is an issue. If traffic could at least be slowed it would make it safer).	To be determined
Cycle parking	Locations: High Street, near M&S & Brittain’s shops, Market Place - near railings / mosaic man on corner with Market Place, Rowley Arts Centre, Huntingdon Street – near cinema complex, Tebbutts Road Car Park, Riverside Car Park, St Mary’s Street (Eynesbury).	21,000

**Appendix B: Text on Traffic Regulation Orders in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.11 of Agenda Item 7: “COVID 19 – Temporary Cycling Proposals”, Highways and Transport Committee, 16 June 2020**

- 2.6 For speed, a number of the schemes will be implemented under what are termed Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs), a process not often used in Cambridgeshire. This is like a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions such as road closures, controlled parking and other parking regulations indicated by double or single yellow line etc. The ETRO can also be used to change the way existing restrictions function
- 2.7 An ETRO can only stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while the effects are monitored and assessed. Changes but not additions can be made during the first six months of the experimental period to any of the restrictions (except charges) if necessary, before the Council decides whether or not to continue with the changes brought in by the ETRO on a permanent basis.
- 2.8 It is not possible to lodge a formal objection to an ETRO until it is in force. Once it is in force, objections may be made to the order being made permanent and these must be made within six months of the day that the experimental order comes into force. This will speed up the overall process.
- 2.9 The approval to make an ETRO permanent would be made by the Highways and Transport Committee or the Assistant Director, Highways under delegation. The approval route would be dependent on whether formal objections had been made. Proposals for schemes requiring an ETRO will be approved by the Executive Director Place & Economy in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman of this Committee.
- 2.10 Feedback or objections received during the experimental period may be significant enough to require a change to the experiment. Any changes will be approved by the Executive Director - Place and Economy or Assistant Director Highways in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this Committee.
- 2.11 If an experimental order is changed, then objections may be made within six months of the day that the experimental order is changed.