

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 10th November 2016

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 12.45 p.m.

Present: Councillors: I Bates (Chairman), D Connor (substituting for Councillor Clark), G Gillick (substituting for Councillor Lay), L Harford, R Henson, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, M. Mason, J Schumann, M Shuter, A Taylor (substitute for Councillor Cearns) and J Williams

Apologies: Councillors. E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), J Clark, A Lay and M McGuire

Also present: Councillors: B Chapman, D Giles, T Orgee and J Whitehead

259 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Taylor declared a personal, non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Item 4 as she had a child at the local secondary school.

Councillor Bates declared a personal, non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct during Item 5 as there was discussion of the City Deal Board of which he was a Board member.

260. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th October 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

The Minutes action log was noted and the following issue raised:

- a. 'Minute 247 - Member Review Analysing Completed Cycle Schemes – Councillor Taylor asked whether it was possible to provide a timetable for when the Review Group was to meet and when it would report back to Committee. The Chairman explained he was not able to provide this level of detail at the current time as the names of the nominated members had only recently been received. A report would need to come back to Committee to agree the membership and the terms of reference. *(Note as an update to what was included in the Minute Action Log following discussion with the Chairman and Vice Chairman it had been agreed that the membership would be limited to two members each from the Liberal and Democrat and Conservative Groups (Councillors Taylor and Manning for the Liberal Democrats and Councillors Orgee and Smith representing the Conservative Group) and would also include Councillor Henson representing UKIP and Councillor Kavanagh representing the Labour Group. There was currently no Independent Group nomination and this was unlikely to change).*
- b. Minute 256 Finance and Performance Report – August 2016 – Guided Busway Response to Councillor Mason – as set out in the update, Councillor Mason in an apology to the Committee and the officers acknowledged that he had received the e-

mail the day before the October Committee but had not opened it until two days later (one day after the Committee). He did not however accept the text reading “Unless there is a different issue, this is seen as a definitive response”.

The Minute Action Log update was noted.

261. PETITIONS / PUBLIC QUESTIONS

One petition had been received with over 270 signatures reading “we the undersigned are opposed to both options set out by the Council for the layout of Queen Edith’s Way on the grounds of their unsuitability for traffic movement on this road and the damage they will do the environment and green residential character of Queen Edith’s Way. We ask the Council to reconsider their proposals”.

The speakers in support of the petition (Ms Dara Moorfield and Dr Richard Martin) spoke at item 4 titled ‘Queen Edith’s Way, Cambridge. Proposed Walking and Cycling Improvements’. As the petition related to an item on the agenda, the petition organisers would be sent a copy of the minutes of the meeting.

One Member of the public Wendy Blythe, Chair of the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations was invited to speak having registered a request in advance under the Council Constitution public speaking rights arrangements. Her question is set out as appendix 1.

The Chairman thanked Wendy Blythe for her questions, and as there were no questions of clarification from the Committee he confirmed that a **written response to the issues she had raised would be sent no later than 10 working days after the meeting.**

Action: M Davies

262. QUEEN EDITH’S WAY, CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

This report provided details of the consultation on proposed walking and cycling improvements in Queen Edith’s way and sought the Committee’s guidance on the next steps, taking account of the current opposition expressed by local residents.

It was explained that Queen Edith’s Way links Cherry Hinton to Addenbrooke’s with the road being predominantly residential in character. Currently the only cycling provision was a narrow, shared use path which gave rise to daily conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. As a result, many cyclists chose to ride in the relatively narrow road which was also a bus route. The report stated that the provision of high quality cycling infrastructure would make cycling safer for those already cycling, and, would make cycling an attractive option for those currently not cycling and for people moving into the area. In addition, without the provision of high quality infrastructure, further significant modal shift to cycling was unlikely to be achieved.

The report highlighted that:

- there had been 33 accidents in Queen Edith’s Way in the last five years, 25 involving collisions between cars and cycles. The accidents were generally

centred around junctions and the Fendon Road roundabout.

- Massive employment growth was planned at both the Addenbrooke's end of Queen Edith's Way (Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Astra Zeneca, Papworth Hospital etc) and near Cherry Hinton (Peterhouse Business Park and expansion of ARM). Current forecasts were that by 2026 a further 10,500 new jobs would be in place at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The traffic assessment for the site had set a target of 43% of employees arriving by bike.
- That it was an important route for young people accessing educational establishments as detailed in the report.

The officer in his presentation explained that an initial round of consultation on options in the summer of 2015 had received over 1,100 responses and revealed that 67% of people felt that improvements were needed to the cycling and walking facilities, and that 39% of people felt unsafe cycling on Queen Edith's Way. The need to improve safety at Fendon Road/Queen Edith's Way roundabout emerged as a major concern. In March 2016 a further stakeholder workshop was held attended by local residents and organisations including Stagecoach, Camcycle, Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations, Queen Edith's Community Forum and ARM. This workshop had helped shape the proposals for the next stage of the consultation. The proposals developed broke down Queen Edith's Way into sections depending on its width and the speed limit in place with the sections shown in Plan 2 attached to the report.

Further consultation undertaken on the options had taken place during the Summer of 2016 with the results detailed in Appendix 1 to the report. Amongst Queen Edith's Way residents there was greater opposition than support for both options. However, the proposed roundabout changes were well supported by Queen Edith's Way residents and non-residents alike. In addition, details were provided of a well-attended public meeting organised by residents. The Chairman and Vice Chairman had also met with the petitioners, and with the head teacher of Netherhall School. From these meetings and discussions, it was clear that residents were concerned about the loss of trees and grass verges, but their primary concern was the safety of young people cycling in the area. A preference to widen the existing shared use paths, with minimal loss of trees and verges emerged as the residents preferred option. Officers pointed out that such a layout would not give much of an improvement and would not deal with the projected growth in commuter cyclists and the likely conflict with pedestrians and other slower cycle users.

The report, in acknowledging the strength of local resident feeling, highlighted that the creation of a Local Liaison Forum and a period of further engagement would give an opportunity to share the monitoring results from the successful scheme already undertaken at Cherry Hinton High Street, re-examine the cross sections available, and give more time to develop a scheme which it was hoped could enjoy a higher level of local support. In undertaking further engagement, officers highlighted the need to balance issues around employment growth and the needs of commuter cyclists, with local concerns and the needs of younger people cycling to school.

The approach of further engagement was supported by the local member, and those active in organising the petition. In addition, it was explained that the County Council

was in talks the Dutch Cycling Embassy, a group of experts funded by the Dutch government created to support other European neighbours in developing cycling projects. It was hoped that the Dutch Cycling Embassy would help support the detailed design of the Dutch style roundabout, and to assist in the development of a better option for the main lengths of Queen Edith's Way. (QEW)

Following the presentation, the Chairman indicated that he would be allowing a number of speakers who had given the appropriate advance notice, and would allow the speakers to the petition additional time to the normal three minutes allowance.

Dara Moorfield Chair of the Queen Edith's Residents Association spoke against the proposals suggesting that there was no real evidence that that QEW needed the proposed cycleway. She provided photographic mock ups from the current Cherry Hinton High Street Improvement scheme to support her contention that both moving cyclists from the shared pavement onto the road would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current arrangement, and installing floating bus stops would put pedestrians into the path of cyclists. She agreed that Fendon Road roundabout did require redesign. She also welcomed the proposal to consult further with residents and stakeholders and suggested the proposed spend of £1.4 million could be better used for cycling and walking improvements in the local area at sites such as at Coldhams Lane and at Lime Kiln Hill where there was currently no cyclist provision. More detail of her presentation is included at Appendix 2 to these Minutes.

Dr Richard Martin a local resident and a consultant in paediatric anaesthesia at Great Ormond Street Hospital also spoke against the options. His presentation highlighted that children who cycle on Queen Edith's Way were the second most vulnerable group of users of the road and should have been a priority when undertaking the consultation exercise and planning the proposed options. He believed their needs had not been catered for at any point in the consultation process, providing detailed data regarding them as a user group, as detailed in the fuller presentation included as appendix 3 to these minutes. He highlighted that the proposals would involve placing all children on a narrow road with the most dangerous vehicles and that parts of the road were too narrow for larger vehicles to pass each other. He also provided information to support the contention that children, especially those of secondary school age, were at greater risk on the road than when cycling in segregated areas and that pathways shared by cyclists and pedestrians, including those with disabilities, had been shown to be safe. He suggested that the planning process has not been carried out properly and resulted in plan which put children in harm's way suggesting the current infrastructure was safe and urging the Committee to reject the plans as currently proposed and to seek a solution that protects children.

The Chairman invited the Committee to ask any questions of explanation. In reply to a question of whether he would be willing to be involved in the further consultation / providing evidence to the forthcoming cycleway review, he confirmed he would be.

Another Member asked Dr Martin whether his rejection of the options also included the rejection of the proposed roundabout. He indicated in response that the roundabout plans as set out in the report required subtle changes to avoid the current acute angles as some of the manoeuvres that cyclists would have to make could result in cyclists skidding over in wet conditions or in the dark.

A representative from the Cycling Campaign supported proposals to protect cyclists and supported further consultation between the County Council and residents. The Cycling Campaign believed that there should be separate walking and cycling paths to avoid conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, with a protected green verge from the highway boundary. The Campaign supported the reconfiguration of the roundabout and the recommendations as set out.

The next speaker was Nigel Brigham Travel and Transport Sustainability Manager representing Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Cambridge Biomedical Campus as the Travel, Transport and Sustainability Manager. He highlighted their wish to be a good neighbour with Queen Ediths and the best way for this would be to encourage as many of their staff and visitors as possible not to drive to the Campus, but to use alternative means, as there was no alternative to using the road. He explained that currently they were concerned about the quality of routes to and into the Campus while also detailing the improvements they were making for cyclists on Campus. A more detailed presentation is included as Appendix 4 to these Minutes.

Councillor Tim Moore the local Cambridge City Councillor explained that his primary drive was to improve safety and to reduce the fatality and collision rate around Addenbrooke's and Fendon Road due to the current lack of safety features. He pointed out that another aspect of safety was to reduce the number of disabled and elderly people currently the victims of being hit by speeding cyclists on shared pavements and therefore he championed the need for separate paths for walkers and cyclists. As a result, he said many older people were frightened to go out. He also acknowledged the importance of ensuring the safety of children cyclists and advocated the need for further discussions with all stakeholders to look to find a compromise. Currently he had not seen a better design, but was required was a segregated cycleway wide enough so that speedier cyclists could overtake the elderly, slower cyclists and children in safety. He also highlighted the role of highway engineering measures in helping to slow down traffic and helping to enforce the 20mph speed limits.

The local County Councillor Amanda Taylor who had lived in the area for twenty years explained that the reasoning for the scheme had been to seek to reduce conflict between pedestrians, particularly the vulnerable elderly and disabled, and cyclists. She supported the proposals for zebra crossings on the roundabout proposal as a positive safety feature for those requiring to cross safely to the hospital. She stated that from the comments made from the earlier speakers it was clear that the report options had not reflected local users' needs and that the options presented, with the exception of the roundabout, were not right for the area. She also acknowledged the danger in the narrow parts of the road of vehicles being forced to the side of the road from large vehicles coming from the other direction. She indicated that she did not cycle on the road when she was with her own child and acknowledged an earlier speakers' concerns that she would also not feel safe with a cycleway like those in the Cherry Hinton scheme. She made the point that there would be no point in agreeing a scheme which would result in parents feeling it unsafe to let their children cycle and in many more parents reverting back to taking their children to school in their cars. She therefore welcomed both recommendations in the report.

Members of the Committee's comments / questions included:

- residents in Teversham / Fulbourn often complained to the local Member on the current cycling facilities on routes to the hospital, citing the Gog Magogs as an example and highlighting improvements along Fulbourn Road as facilities that would encourage more, safe cycling.
- There was support for segregating cycleways from roads and that proposals to put cyclists back on roads appeared to be a retrograde step.
- The need to learn from other roundabouts such as the one at Perne Road as one Member was not convinced of its benefits.
- Concern that some cycleways that had cost thousands of pounds in some areas outside Cambridge were hardly being used therefore did not represent value for money.
- The Council's Cycling Champion welcomed the new proposals for what was currently a very dangerous roundabout. He made the point that there should not be any foliage / plants in the middle of roundabouts on safety grounds. He also commented that while he often heard about anti-social cyclists not obeying the Highway Code he also needed to highlight those drivers who ignored the speed limits or who parked their cars in cycleways. He considered that it was unfortunate that a scheme which had aimed to improve conditions had aroused such criticism. He supported segregated cycleways and indicated that dialogue might need to be undertaken with residents to convince them that perhaps giving up part of their front garden might be justified if it improved cycling, including importantly children's cycling safety. He also countered an earlier view that Perne Road roundabout had not been a success, citing that since its construction it was now a 100% safe route, when previously it had been one of the most dangerous for cyclists, and that everyone seemed to have benefitted from the roundabout.
- One Member queried that in relation to the cost referenced as £1.425m whether like Hills Road, it was likely to go over budget and cost the County Council more money as a result of the additional consultation now being proposed and the possible need for additional land take. In response it was explained that Hills Road and Huntingdon Road are part of an overall programme of schemes and there is flexibility across the programme in terms of spend, whereas Queen Edith's Way is financed from Section 106, so if further funding is felt to be required then a request would come back to the Committee seeking the use of further Section 106 Funding. The scheme would not involve additional land take as there were hundreds of properties along the road of the proposed scheme and therefore proposals would be limited to the space currently available.
- There was a question regarding the earlier discussion on potential minor improvements being required to the roundabout and whether this required a change to the recommendations. It was clarified that the officers could make minor improvements within the current authorisation, if approved.

On being put to the vote it was resolved by an overwhelming majority to approve:

a) The implementation of a Dutch style roundabout at Queen Edith's Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road junction; and,

b) To undertake further public engagement with residents and stakeholders on improvements for walking and cycling in Queen Edith's Way.

263. HUNTINGDON ROAD PHASE 2 CAMBRIDGE, PROPOSED CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

Phase One of Huntingdon Road was approved by the Economy and Environment Committee in July 2014, and works were completed in April 2016. The scheme successfully provided segregated cycle lanes with a good quality surface, clear priority over side roads, and also installed floating bus stops to remove conflict between cyclists and buses. Phase Two now sought to continue a segregated cycle lane towards the Victoria Road/Histon Road junction and, subject to funding, to add a newly surfaced, red cycle lane on the outbound side of Huntingdon Road, thus providing completely updated provision for cycling on this important route. The report set out details of the two options for extending the segregated cycle lane towards the city as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

The report provided the results of the consultation and now sought Committee approval to their implementation based on the feedback received. It was highlighted that Stagecoach and the Bus Quality Partnership still had reservations about floating bus stops and felt that the current design could be improved by providing 2.5 metres of width on the boarding islands, to allow traffic to pass a bus that had stopped, and for buses overtaking buses not to encroach onto opposing cycle lanes. Camcycle had expressed concerns about all of the proposed options, however, they highlighted Option 2 as their preferred option.

The report proposed the implementation of Option 1 with as many crossing islands as possible retained, and a reallocation of lane space approaching Histon Road junction. It was also recommended that Option 3 should proceed if there was sufficient funding. Through detailed design it was proposed to develop a design for Westfield Road bus stop that would also provide reassurance to bus operators.

Matthew Danish from the Cycling Campaign spoke explaining that the scheme was not living up to the goal of the Cycle City Ambition. Going for Option 1 was seen by them as a missed opportunity to create a protected cycle lane that would be attractive to people new to cycling and requested that Option 2, with the cycle lane protected by parked cars, be put back into consideration. They supported improvement works on the junction.

The Chairman drew attention to a written submission from Mark Taylor Access Officer Planning Department Cambridge City Council which the Committee had already received in advance, raising the concerns of disabled people regarding floating bus stops. This has been included as Appendix 5 to these Minutes. The Chairman also invited him to address the Committee. As part of his presentation he highlighted that for people with sight issues and those led by a guide dog, the automatic response when leaving a bus was to go to the pavement. The engineering measures put in place along Hills Road had not slowed down cyclists. He also highlighted that in over 90% of the

interactions between cyclist and pedestrians, the pedestrian gives way, whereas the idea of the interaction was that cyclists should slow for pedestrians. He highlighted that the Cambridge Sustrans report did not even mention disabled people and that under the Equalities Act, the Council's duty of care required it to give disability issues advantage over any other concern. As a response later in the meeting, the officer indicated that 25% of disabled people cycled to work and therefore the proposals had taken them into account.

Questions of clarification to Mark Taylor included asking whether he was speaking as a Cambridge City Council Officer or as a private individual. In response he indicated that he was speaking as an officer in his professional capacity, but not specifically on behalf of Cambridge City Council.

In the ongoing discussion, some of the issues / questions raised by Members included:

- Supporting the need to look to improving cycling proposals in terms of those less mobile / able and ensuring that they could step off buses in safety. In response the officer indicated that they had engaged with disability groups and that three bollards were proposed on the floating bus stop to help with safety. He made the point that the width that a pedestrian was required to cross was only 1.5 metres while a lot of schemes in other parts of the Country were operating a five metre double cycle lane.
- Schemes should, where possible, involve continuous cycling routes rather than being undertaken in sections,
- In response to a query on whether the cycling scheme ran all the way to the junction at Girton College this was confirmed
- The point was made by one Councillor that people were not seen with guide dogs near the cycleway in Hills Road as they did not feel safe, A later response from the officer stated that he was not aware of any accidents incidents on the floating bus stops in operation over the 18 month period that they had been installed and that the previous arrangements where they had been a shared use path would create more opportunities for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
- A query was raised regarding Page 47, Appendix 1 Option 1 and the reference to the removal of the speed camera with the Council Cycling Champion making the point that he hoped this was just a relocation and not permanent removal as he believed the camera was the major safety measure to ensuring drivers stayed within the 30 mph limit. In response the officer confirmed the intention was that the speed camera and island would stay where they were.
- One member suggested that the width of the floating bus stop island was very important and suggested that the east side of Hills Road was not wide enough and the same was being proposed for the Huntingdon Road proposals.
- One Member expressed her concern regarding whether the Section 106 monies would be available in respect of Girton College to finance the scheme as the first

phase of their development was over 6 years which could extend to 10 years. In reply it was indicated that the Girton section was not currently funded and would therefore only take place when the funding was available. This could be from S106 or other funds, but officers felt it was beneficial to seek approval now in order to have a 'shovel ready' scheme available.

- In response to a question regarding the constraints on the funding, it was clarified that it was available until March 2018. There was an element of flexibility as the money was drawn down in stages so provided that the schemes could be shown to have started ("shovel in the ground") the funding would be secured.
- One Member expressed concern regarding recommendation C in respect of Histon Road / Victoria Road when these might later become part of the City Deal initiatives and was therefore reluctant to support the proposals without having details of the Histon Road proposals, as there was potential overlap. The Chairman highlighted that Councillor Hipkin, the local Councillor, supported the scheme. As a clarification the officer provided reassurance that the same officer team was working up the schemes for both the City cycling initiatives programme and the City Deal Schemes, confirming that there was no conflict with future proposals.

To take account of the issues that had been raised, the Chairman proposed that there should be an addition to Recommendation b) to include the addition of wording reading "and disabled groups and cycling groups". This was seconded and in being put to the vote it was agreed by a clear majority.

Councillor Taylor moved an amendment to add an additional recommendation reading "scheduling and working practices should take into account findings from the Council's review of cycling projects as they emerged". This was seconded by Councillor Williams. On being put to the vote it was agreed by a clear majority.

On then voting on the recommendations as amended:

It was resolved by a clear majority to:

approve the extension of cycling improvements on Huntingdon Road, consisting of:

- a) a continuation of the raised cycle lanes from just beyond Oxford Road towards the junction of Histon Road/Victoria Road;
- b) A floating bus stop near Westfield Lane, subject to some further development work with the Bus Quality Partnership and disabled groups and cycling groups.
- c) Resurfacing and reconfiguration of cycle lane and traffic lanes approaching Histon Road/Victoria Road; and,
- d) An improved outbound cycle lane towards Girton.

e) For the scheme scheduling and working practices should take into account findings from the Council's review of cycling projects as they emerge.

264. A10 HARSTON PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

Cambridgeshire County Council and Greater Cambridge City Deal had been working to develop and improve a continuous, safe cycle route from Cambridge to Royston along the A10 corridor. The proposals set out in the report aimed to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists on the A10 through Harston. Currently there were narrow shared use paths on both sides of the A10 through Harston. The proposed scheme sought to implement a three metre wide shared use path on the west side of the road, together with a new controlled crossing on the A10, and improved crossings of accesses and side roads. To accommodate the improved foot and cycleway a layby was to be reduced in size on the west side, with some spaces retained and additional spaces added on the east side.

The consultation on the proposals had resulted in 85% supporting the initial proposals. The proposals were then modified into a final scheme, taking into account the issues raised and comments made. A further consultation exercise was undertaken on the modified scheme in June 2016. The most common comments made related to concerns about loss of some parking bays, loss of a length of guardrail on the bend north of Church Street junction. Officers proposed to narrow the carriageway at this location in order to widen the foot and cycleway and retain the guardrail. Drainage issues at property entrances was a concern for some residents and as a result, the scheme would now include the provision of drainage measures across driveway entrances feeding into a drainage system.

Concerns had also been expressed regarding the Church Street junction with a number of suggestions made relating to remodelling Church Street junction. However, due to constraints, including much of the land at the location not being part of the public highway and as there was also a historic pump at the location, and the likely costs, such remodelling was beyond the scope of the project.

CTC (Cyclists Touring Club) Cambridge were keen to see an improved crossing facility included between Church Street and Station Road which has been accommodated in the proposals. Camcycle requested that priority be offered to cyclists at the two Church Street junctions which had been investigated. The final proposals included shortening the crossing points and making it easier to cross, but not including cyclist priority.

Councillor Susan van de Ven provided comments in support which Members received in advance of the meeting and are included as Appendix 6 to the minutes. Both local members and the Parish Council broadly supported the proposals. Councillor Orgee spoke as one of the local members and clarified his support for retaining the railing was as a result of it already having been knocked over a number of times and by its presence provided an element of protection. His main other issue regarding parking had been the post office and ensuring its continued viability. He was pleased to confirm that along with Councillor Kenney, as a result of the consultation all local members main concerns had now been addressed. He highlighted that the project completed a missing section of cycleway to ensure a good long cycleway would now be achieved.

It was unanimously resolved to agree to:

- a) An improved foot and cycleway on the west side: and
- b) A new controlled crossing located between Church Street and Station Road.

265. TRUMPINGTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE PHASE 2 PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

Phase One of Trumpington Road was approved by the Economy and Environment Committee on 18 September 2014. Phase Two sought to add some additional elements, and if approved both phases were likely to be delivered as one scheme early in 2017.

Phase One of the project focussed on the east side of Trumpington Road and the issues of cyclists safely passing parked cars, and accommodating cycle and pedestrian movements on top of the grassed bank outside the Botanic Gardens. It includes the removal of a length of metred parking with space for cycle provision. Phase Two looked at the western side, and the bus stop designs within the whole scheme. The proposals had emerged from the consultation on Phase One. The key proposal was to widen the existing shared use path from three metres wide to four metres wide by narrowing the parking bays and taking a 500mm strip of land from the adjacent common. The other proposals were the conversion of two bus stops to floating bus stops, and the creation of a short length of raised cycle lane. The scheme had been amended in response to the consultation exercise undertaken, but still offered major benefits to cyclists and pedestrians, and should improve road safety and the perception of safety. Both local members (for Newnham and Trumpington) were fully supportive of the recommendations.

From the consultation undertaken between June to July 2016 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report there was good support for most of the measures proposed in the scheme, though many concerns were raised relating to loss of green space and the view that the common should be protected. The report highlighted that to construct works on common land would require consent in accordance with Section 38 of the Commons Act 2006 and would be a challenge to gain the necessary consent given the objections in place. Upon reflection the costs associated with relocation of railings and posts, as well as earthworks needed, were seen as not providing value for money. It had therefore been proposed to improve the current layout to increase useable width by relocating street furniture, with minimal impact on the common, and without the need for Commons Consent the detail of how this would be achieved as set out in the report.

CTC (Cyclist's Touring Club) Cambridge strongly supported the proposed improvements, particularly the segregated cycle lane behind the parking area. CTC also welcomed plans for introducing further floating bus stops. Stagecoach and the Bus Quality Partnership still have reservations about floating bus stops and felt that the current design could be improved by providing 2.5 metres of width on the boarding islands, and ensuring that the remaining road space allows traffic to pass a bus that has stopped, and for buses overtaking buses not to encroach onto opposing cycle lanes. As road widths in Trumpington Road are relatively generous it should be possible to accommodate the concerns raised and suggestions made.

Stagecoach and the Bus Quality Partnership still had some concerns about the use of floating bus stops. The outbound bus stop on the east side was well used and a point of conflict between cyclists and buses, but the inbound stop experienced much less use, and thus less conflict. It was therefore proposed to leave this stop as a standard bus stop.

The Cycling Campaign representative who had given notice to speak explained that his organisation had mixed views on the scheme and while they welcomed removal of the current dooring lane, highlighted their concerns regarding Brooklands Avenue Junction which had many conflict points for cyclists as well as expressing concern about the expansion of shared use. Their view was the whole scheme represented a set of compromises.

Jean Glasberg Chair of Newnham Croft Residents' Association had requested to speak and as she was not present when the report was reached, Wendy Blythe undertook her presentation set out in Appendix 7 to these minutes. Her main contention being that new cycling infrastructure should always aim to achieve physical separation from other traffic and that residents and disability groups should be fully consulted on the design of any floating island bus stops, with priority always given to pedestrians in line with Department of Transport Guidance.

In discussion Members of the Committee raised issues including:

- that the previous report did not have floating bus stops and that the current report did not include plans showing details of its exact location and how it would be work.
- Being pleased to see the provision of the buffer strip between parking and the cycle lane and asked whether there were any proposals to make this strip more attractive. In response it was clarified that there was no scope for landscaping as it would be walked across.
- Better clarity should be included in reports such as this showing diagrams and being clear whether what was being proposed was a shared or separate paths for cyclist and pedestrians.

Due to the issues around floating bus stops the Chairman proposed that the same amendments to the recommendations were again proposed to the current report as had been agreed to the earlier Huntingdon Road Phase Two Proposed Cycling Improvements Report which was seconded by Councillor Conner and supported by the overwhelming majority of the Committee.

It was resolved:

To agree the implementation of improvements for cyclists and pedestrians on Trumpington Road, consisting of:

- a) An improved segregated foot and cycleway on the west side;

- b) A new floating bus stop on the east side subject to some further development work with the Bus Quality Partnership and disabled groups and cycling groups.
- c) For the scheme scheduling and working practices should take into account findings from the Council's review of cycling projects as they emerge.

266. TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP) AND ST NEOTS SECTION 106 PRIORITISED SCHEMES

At its meeting in July 2016 Members of the Council's E&E Committee approved the new Transport Investment Plan (TIP) approach in relation to:

- a) managing information relating to transport infrastructure investment;
- b) managing the pooling of Section 106 contributions and other funding sources; and
- c) the future sign-off process for schemes in the TIP.

The TIP for Cambridgeshire sets out the transport infrastructure, services and initiatives that are required to support the growth of Cambridgeshire. In line with the approach being taken across Cambridgeshire, a district-wide transport strategy was to be developed next year for Huntingdonshire replacing the existing Market Town Transport Strategies (MTTS). However, as there was a significant amount of S106 money from the Loves Farm development that needed to be spent by July 2018, work had been prioritised to amend the St Neots MTTS in order to identify additional schemes that could be delivered in this timescale.

This Committee in June had considered the recommendation of four schemes for the allocation of S106 St Neots MTTS monies. Given the age of the existing St Neots MTTS (adopted in 2008), Members had highlighted the need to ensure projects aligned with more up to date priorities in the new St Neots Neighbourhood Plan. This Committee therefore deferred the recommendations and asked officers to consult with St Neots Town Council regarding using the S106 monies for identified Neighbourhood Plan transport improvement priorities. A prioritisation assessment of the schemes in the Amended St Neots MTTS, as included in the Cambridgeshire TIP, has been undertaken and the proposals included in the revised report.

The TIP policy document attached in Appendix 1 to the report described the uses of the Plan, the links to policies and strategies, the layout of the TIP list and the process for updating the list. The full list presented in District order as at the end of August was attached in Appendix 2. The list once approved would be updated regularly throughout the year and brought to Members of the E&E Committee on an annual basis in September/October.

The report explained that to comply with the Loves Farm S106 Agreement MTTS obligations, any amendments to the MTTS required be approved for allocation of the S106 monies. As a result, the amended schemes had been included in the proposed Transport Investment Plan list 2016. Given the urgency of the work and the fact that a district-wide strategy was to be developed next year, a full review of the Strategy had not been undertaken. Instead, a review of the scheme list was undertaken. Working in

conjunction with local Members and the Town Council, a long list of schemes was compiled from schemes in the MTTTS that had not yet been implemented, infrastructure requirements identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process and from needs identified in the St Neots pedestrian and cycle audit. This long list was then assessed against the relevance for a Market Town Transport Strategy to derive a Qualifying List. Schemes that were deemed not relevant under these principles were:

- Schemes on strategic routes, such as the A428 highway improvements and East-West Rail, have much wider impact than St Neots town – these schemes are considered as part of the Transport Investment Plan
- Schemes that have implications on the local highway network much wider than St Neots town – these schemes will be considered as part of the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy next year
- Transport concepts rather than schemes such as Northern Link Road A428-A1 are not developed enough for inclusion in a scheme list – these will be considered for the TIP should they become more developed.

Through dialogue with the Town Council, the issue of a second pedestrian/cycle bridge (northern crossing) had been raised. However, early high level work on this scheme had identified key risks, resulting in a relatively low deliverability score as detailed in the report with the cost of the bridge likely to be significantly higher than the S106 funds available and would result in additional funding being required. To enable a more robust cost and delivery issues to be understood, it was recommended that funding was made available from St Neots S106 to develop the business case for such a crossing/bridge which could then inform the allocation of St Neots S106 funding to schemes for delivery.

The report highlighted that the St Neots MTTTS S106 fund currently contained £1,270,358 of which £463,844 from the Loves Farm development needed to be spent by July 2018. The remaining funds £806,514 should be spent by November 2020 and beyond. An estimated further £138,000 was expected when the obligation triggers were met on current developments in the town. Section 5 of the report detailed the Prioritisation methodology undertaken with the prioritised schemes shown in Appendix 5 of the report in the order of their Total Objective Score with the Weighted Deliverability Score alongside for reference. It was highlighted that the scheme that scored highest on Meeting Strategy Objectives was the bridge. However, until the business case for the bridge was completed (4- 5 months), it was not be possible to ascertain how much, when and whether further S106 funds could be spent on detailed design works and planning application before the spend deadline of 2018.

The report therefore recommended that the prioritised projects in Appendix 5 were approved in order that options were available to spend £413,844 (funds left after an estimated £50,000 for the bridge business case). Should there be a strong business case and a full funding package could be sourced, then it was proposed that the bridge would be the top priority with as much of the £413,844 as possible to be spent on it. Any remaining balance that could not be used on the bridge by 2018 would be spent on the next possible project(s) on the project list depending on the amount of money available. As time was critical for the spend, it was proposed that once the prioritised order of schemes was approved, officers would proceed with delivery without going through Committee approval again. This approach was endorsed. As the St Neots MTTTS S106 alone (£1.4 million) would not be able to cover the full costs of the

proposed Northern Crossing, other sources of funds suggested could include existing and future Community Infrastructure Levy that would be collected by St Neots Town Council. In addition, there was also the possibility of agreeing to use a portion of the Cambridgeshire Integrated Transport Block funding.

Councillor Chapman as one of the Local Members highlighted that the top priority was to address the current Bridge bottlenecks due to the number of vehicles using it and the blockages caused by buses. He welcomed the Northern Crossing feasibility study but wished to see the District Council, who currently took the lion's share of CIL monies, coming on board and contributing to the scheme, urging the County Council to use its influence to facilitate this. He also expressed concerns regarding the high priority given to the Riverside Park scheme to improve the path / cycle routes (TIP ID 720) as this was District Council property and he did not think it appropriate, suggesting it should be funded by the District Council. On TIP 626 'Improvements to Bus Stop infrastructure including investigation of a potential bus station' with an allocation was £40k, he highlighted it was not sufficient, especially if they were needed to support development.

Councillor Giles who was the other local member and also the Mayor of St Neots highlighted the previous lack of co-ordination between the County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and the Town Council. He pleaded that in future the County Council, which had previously directed that St Neots needed cycleways, should consult with parish councils to better establish their priorities and aspirations. He highlighted that in the past a huge amount had been spend (he quoted £1/4m) to improve cycleways which were little used.

In subsequent questioning with reference to paragraph 4.1 of the report highlighting that the St Neots Northern Crossing second pedestrian / cycle bridge was identified within St Neots Town Council Neighbourhood Plan as a priority, the local Councillors were asked if the Town Council would contribute a large amount to the project? Councillor Chapman confirmed that the Town Council did have some money available from the Neighbourhood Plan, but highlighted that it was only 15-25% of the CIL with the rest going to the District Council which was why they should be asked to contribute part of their share.

In order to ensure that the best use was made of the Section 106 monies, the Chairman in supporting the need for the three authorities to work collaboratively proposed that an addition be made to recommendation d) for the officers to contact the District Council and Town Council to open negotiations / prepare a business case seeking financial contributions. This was seconded by Councillor Henson and unanimously approved
Action: Jeremy Smith / Elsa Evans

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the Transport Investment Plan 2016
- b) approve the amendments to the St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy Scheme List
- c) approve the allocation of S106 funds to develop the business case for a northern crossing in St Neots

- d) approve the prioritisation of St Neots schemes for S106 funds and ask officers to open negotiations with regard to seeking financial contributions from the District Council and the Town Council.

267. BUS SERVICE FROM NEWMARKET ROAD PARK AND RIDE VIA ABBEY WARD TO ADDENBROOKES HOSPITAL

The Committee was reminded that at its meeting on 17th November 2015, Members had agreed to confirm the allocation of funds from the Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan for a trial of an hourly bus service from the Newmarket Road Park and Ride site to Addenbrooke's Hospital via the Barnwell area of Abbey Ward. It had also asked to receive a progress report six months from the commencement of the service.

The report explained that the service had commenced on 3rd May 2016. In terms of publicity, this had been carried out locally on the Council's behalf by the local Member as detailed in the report. The report highlighted an analysis of the ridership data which while increasing steadily after the initial start date, had appeared to have plateaued at an average of 73 journeys a week with the income generated being a long way short of what is required to make the service commercially viable. (The daily cost of providing the service was £405 and based on the highest period of figures to date, the average daily income, from both fare paying passengers and concessionary fares, was only £21) It had been hoped that there would be sufficient patronage for the service to continue until funding was available from the Wing Development. However, the start of this development was now 2019 and the bus service funding was not due until three years after first occupation, which was estimated to be September 2022.

The total amount of funding made available for this service was £95k and based on the average net daily cost of £384 (£405 cost - £21 income) the service could run for 41 weeks, or until 10th February 2017. However, in view of the performance of the service so far, and the low likelihood of the service growing sufficient patronage, Members were asked to consider whether they wished to end the pilot early. 56 days' notice was required legally before the service could cease and if the decision was made at the current meeting, the earliest date would be 9th January 2017.

The local Member from Abbey Ward Councillor Whitehead, who had originally requested the service, had been consulted and as set out in the report indicated that her preference was for the service to run for the full trial period to give it every opportunity to grow. Speaking at the meeting she thanked the Committee for allowing the pilot to take place, explaining that the lack of patronage was not through any failure to publicise the service locally. She highlighted a failure by Addenbrooke's Hospital to inform the East Area Committee that one of their staff shifts started at 8.00 a.m. and the timetabling of the buses had resulted in no bus being available to transport staff at that time. She reluctantly concluded as an update that the Pilot should cease and that the use of the £10k or so remaining (by finishing the Pilot in January), should be investigated further in terms of funding alternative more flexible provision such as mini buses / community transport provision. (as opposed to the current more costly buses).

Taking account that the Local Member considered that realistically there was not going to be an upsurge in patronage by the end of the Pilot period and that as the Pilot continued to lose money, the Chairman proposed as the recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Henson, that the provision should cease in Mid-January and that the use of the £10k should be used for other initiatives. **Action: Paul Nelson**

On being put to the vote by an overwhelming majority it was resolved;

That having considered the performance of the trial service to date, to agree to cease the provision of the bus service in Mid-January and the use of the money saved to be investigated further.

268. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2016

This report with the detail included in Appendix A, provided the financial position for the whole of the ETE Service up to the end of September 2016.

The headlines set out in the covering report were as follows:

Revenue: There were no significant variances and ETE was showing a £81k forecast underspend.

Capital: The capital programme was forecast to be on target and £4.6m of the estimated £10.5m Capital Programme Variation has been met. King's Dyke had a forecast variance of -£2.6m and Connecting Cambridgeshire was forecasting a -£1.1m variance as the planned expenditure had been re-profiled. It was anticipated that additional variation would start to appear to contribute further to the overall Capital Programme Variation in future months.

Of the fourteen performance indicators, two were currently red, two amber and ten were green. The indicators that were currently red were:

- Local bus journeys originating in the authority area.
- The average journey per mile during the morning peak of the most congested routes.

At year-end, the current forecast was that one performance indicator would be red (local bus journeys originating in the authority area), eight would be amber and five green.

Members' comments / questions included:

- One Member commenting that bus journeys had not changed since the previous month's report suggested that the City Deal initiatives needed to improve bus patronage and to also make bus travel more attractive, as it appeared that currently not enough people liked using buses.
- One Member commenting on the King's Dyke forecast variance, asked whether its slippage would result in the Council incurring more interest charges on the borrowed money. It was explained in response that slippage would mean the money was not spent with the money only borrowed when required.

Having reviewed and commented on the report contents:

It was unanimously resolved to note the report.

269. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

It was resolved:

to note the agenda plan as set out, subject to the changes orally reported as follows:

- Noting the change of date of the December meeting from 1st to the 16th December.
- As a result of the above change, moving the report titled 'Cambourne West Planning Applications Draft Section 1906 Heads of Terms' currently shown for the 12th January 2017 meeting forward to the new December meeting date.

Chairman
16th December 2016

APPENDIX 1

PUBLIC QUESTION FROM WENDY BLYTHE

My question today is about seeing cycleway schemes as **streetscape & neighbourhoods** not simply commuter highways and asking you to consider the need for **professional design**. The landscaping of Hills Road, one of the city's main roads has not been a success, a point on which residents, City Council Leader Lewis Herbert and Bob Menzies ,who is here today, all agree:

- a) How can the lessons learnt from Phase 1 of the Hills Road scheme and input from residents feed into the design of future cycleway schemes including Queen Edith's Way, Trumpington Road and Hills Rd, Phase 2, which is funded by City Deal, and due to start in February?
- b) Little regard seems to have been paid to the character of Hills Road, which was described in the City Council's Heritage Suburbs and Approaches report as being '**bosky**' with '**softly landscaped boundaries**'. Phase 1 has resulted in a considerable loss of this greenery. There is a lot of unhappiness about the ugliness of the scheme: its casual vandalism, the sedum "ashtrays", the white plastic "cemetery" posts, the red gravel filled trenches, bus shelters with all night illuminated advertising, the 2 years this work has taken, the congestion it has caused, the rubbish left , the flooding of 3 front drives caused by poor workmanship, the fact that vehicles can drive and park in the cycle lanes, the officers references in print to Cambridge residents as "nimbies" & "academics" & "well-connected folk" with "time on their hands" and more recently as "interested parties". Now a number of Hills Road residents have just been informed they will lose hedges and in one case 4 metres of front garden and trees to accommodate phase 2 of the Hills Road cycleway plans:

On 8 July, 2014, Graham Hughes informed the Economy and Environment Committee of Cambridge County Council ,Paragraph 3.4 of his Report that:

'in Hills Road Option 2 from the consultation....existing pedestrian refuges would be retained, as would the existing widths of verge and footway in most cases'.

- d) Can these cycleway schemes benefit from **professional landscape expertise** as officers have advised there were no designs for Hills Road Phase One? City Deal have appointed an **architect for Milton Road**. Phase 2 of Hills Road is City Deal funded.
- e) The County Council would like to encourage residents and businesses to support gardening maintenance on roads. AstraZeneca is paying £5,000 a year for verge maintenance on the A10 cycleway highway. Portland, Oregon, America's premier cycling city, has pioneered citizen participation in an **exemplary system of environmental stewardship** involving **Green Streets**. Shouldn't Cambridge be doing the same?

Wendy Blythe,

Chair, FeCRA

APPENDIX 2

PROVIDED SPEECH FROM DARA MOORFILELD CHAIR QUEEN EDITH'S WAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Thank you for letting me speak on behalf of QEW Residents Association. You all know that there is growing opposition to the cycleway plans for QEW. This is not because we are NIMBYs, although the loss of 58 cherry trees and miles of grass verge is something most people would regret.

No, the main opposition is because this scheme moves cyclists from the shared pavement onto a shared road. It also suggests floating bus stops which put pedestrians into the path of cyclists. The more you examine the plans the more illogical they seem.

There is not any real evidence that QEW needs such a cycleway. The West part of QEW, for example, has had no accidents in the last 5 years. There are no side roads, bus stops or schools on this stretch of road. The East part of QEW has a good comparative safety record, although this stretch of road has had some accidents.

Fendon road roundabout is difficult, and does need to be redesigned, we agree.

QEW is not a main arterial route. There is not an untapped army of commuters living in Fulbourn or Cherry Hinton waiting to exchange their cars for bikes. The majority of cycling along QEW is by schoolkids and their parents. Safely. How did the plans get so far? I suggest it is because QEW residents, many of whom have lived here for over 30 years, were not *properly* consulted. The local schools were not *properly* consulted. Disability groups were not *properly* consulted.

We thus very much welcome the proposal to consult further with residents and stakeholders.

£1.4 million is a lot of cash and could be used to make real cycling and walking improvements in the local area.

Let's Get it Right.

APPENDIX 3

PROVIDED SPEECH FROM DR RICHARD MARTIN - ITEM 4 QUEEN EDITHS WAY CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

As a consultant in paediatric anaesthesia at Great Ormond street hospital I accept responsibility for the safety of 6 to 700 children each and every year. Despite this, I came here today with the sense I am carrying a great weight of responsibility in speaking today. This is because I came here to give a voice to of all children who cycle on Queen Edith's Way. As the second most vulnerable group of users of the road, their interests should have been made a priority concern during the consultation and planning process for our road. However, when evaluating the proposals, it is clear their needs have not been catered for at any point in the consultation process. The plans under review today are testament to this fact.

Either those making these plans were unaware of this group and their needs or they ignored them. I am uncertain which of these it was. In order to rectify this issue I would like to share some information regarding this user group on Queen Edith's Way.

The Netherhall school confirm that roughly 750 pupils cycle to and from school each and every school day representing 1500 child journeys. This is in addition to journeys made by children travelling to Queen Edith's and Queen Emma primary schools, and extremely small children accompanied by their family as they learn to cycle.

In order to illustrate the patterns of use this group make of the road, we carried out a cctv survey during rush hour and a period when the children were leaving school. Data captured showed that:

73% of non motor vehicle users are cyclists.

56% of all cyclists are children - a majority within this user group during these periods.

69% of all cyclists - adult and children - use the shared pathway.

83% of children use the shared pathway.

As a majority user group and the second most vulnerable group, the numbers, pattern and interests of children cycling on the road should have been assessed and their needs catered for as part of consultation and planning. This does not appear to have happened.

We are not aware that any census was carried out to establish the size, use of the road or needs of this group as part of the planning process, but to be sure we have made a FOI request to establish if any such census was undertaken.

We are aware following another Freedom of Information request that a census of traffic and specifically patterns of pedestrian and cycling use was carried out on 6th October 2016 on behalf of the Cambridge County Council Cycling Projects Team. If this were to be the only such census undertaken by the council for this purpose it would mean that the planning process was not completed with due diligence as the user data was gathered after the plans were drawn up. If this was the case it might explain the lack of consideration given to the needs of this group in the planning process.

In addition to this concern, there is another with respect to the consultation questionnaire sent out by the council in order to canvas opinions from user groups. There were only 1106 responses to this questionnaire. Despite the fact that children are a majority user group and the second most vulnerable, they do not appear to have been surveyed at all as part of this part of the process. Some 33 responses were from people under 24 but none were from children. This shows that this part of the planning process is also flawed. Due diligence has not been observed.

These errors in the planning process have resulted a design that will force vulnerable children of all ages onto the road. This is a road that will be narrower than at present and cyclists will be in advisory lanes that will be used by buses, HGVs and cars when they pass each other. This will put these children at increased risk of serious harm and death.

This statement is supported by current research and guidelines that state the following:

- When appropriate measures are applied to interaction between cyclists and motor vehicles at

junctions, children are at greater risk on the road than when cycling in a segregated areas.

- Children of secondary school age are at particular risk when cycling.
- Pathways shared by cyclists and pedestrians including those with disabilities have been shown to be safe.

To illustrate the last point I would like to illustrate the safety of the shared pathway on Queen Edith's Way by looking at the reported accidents on the road over the last 5 years:

- There have been no reported accidents involving children cycling on the shared pathway.
- There have been no reported accidents involving a pedestrian and cyclist.
- There have been no reported accidents involving a cyclist and car coming out of a driveway.

The only reported incidents where children were hurt whilst cycling occurred when they were cycling on the road or were forced onto the road.

So, in summary:

- The planning process has not been carried out properly.
- The result is a plan that puts children in harms' way.
- Current infrastructure is safe.

So I ask this committee to reject the plans as they currently stand and advise that a solution that protects are children is sought.

In doing this, you the committee, in the same manner that I have done by speaking today, would be accepting the weight of your responsibility. The responsibility to speak for our children, to represent them and protect them.

APPENDIX 4

PROVIDED SPEECH FROM NIGEL BRIGHAM TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT SUSTAINABILITY MANAGER REPRESENTING CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST AND CAMBRIDGE BIOMEDICAL CAMPUS AS THE TRAVEL, TRANSPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY MANAGER REGARDING ITEM 4 QUEEN EDITHS WAY CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

We want to be a good neighbour with Queen Ediths and the best way we can do that is to try and encourage as many of our staff and visitors as possible not to drive to the Campus, but to use alternative means. In 2018 the number of staff and visitors to Campus will increase significantly, with 5,000 + more staff.

we already have a lot of staff living in South-East Cambridge and we want to encourage them to cycle and walk but are concerned about the quality of routes to and into the Campus.

We are working on making improvements for cyclists on Campus including increasing cycle parking, we are keen to see improvements at the hospital Hills Road front and are already working on plans to change the entrance from Red Cross Lane. Cherry Hinton High Street has recently been improved. This would leave Queen Ediths Way and the Fendon Road

roundabout as the priority areas on the whole route between Cherry Hinton, Fulbourn etc and Campus in terms of areas needing improvements for cyclists and pedestrians.

The Hills Road scheme has greatly improved things for cyclists and pedestrians along Hills Road, so something that achieved a similar outcome along Queen Ediths Way would be welcome.

Our priority is encouraging those who are intimidated from cycling and improving things for walkers – e.g. a nurse moving to Cherry Hinton and working here.

APPENDIX 5

SUBMISSION FROM MARK TAYLOR, ACCESS OFFICER, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING HUNTINGDON ROAD PHASE 2 CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

Ever since floating bus stops were proposed, Camsight, Cambridge Guide Dog users, Cambridge City Council Disability Panel, and other disabled people have had fears about the floating bus stop design.

When first proposed a moratorium on their construction was offered until their use was fully surveyed, yet this moratorium was never adhered to.

The County Council's own safety audit could not say the design was safe.

The signage, raised platforms and chicanes are not slowing cyclists down.

Disabled and older people really on buses as their primary form of transport.

Reports in London and the 2015 Sustran report on Cambridge all show the hierarchy of the road is not observed.

In over 90% of the interactions between cyclist and pedestrians, the pedestrian gives way, whereas the idea of the interaction is that cyclists should slow for pedestrians.

The Cambridge Sustrans report does not even mention disabled people.

The Equalities Act says the Council's duty of care must give disability issues advantage over that of any other concern.

There are threats of legal actions about the floating bus stops.

Simple mitigation measures such as zebra crossing style markings on the crossing platforms have been dismissed by the Highways team, although they are used in other places.

The whole scheme seems to be driven by the desire of fit, fast, cyclists and the officers representing them do not consider how difficult it is for a blind person dependent on buses for transport to get from the bus to the pavement without being endangered by bikes. A bike

would hit someone with the impact of 800 joules. Guide dogs cannot help blind people cross cycle routes as they would not realise these are roads.

For cyclists and pedestrians there are safer options.

Appendix 6

COUNCILLOR SUSAN VAN DE VEN COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF A10 HARSTON PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

As local member for A10 villages directly south of Harston corridor (Foxton, Shepreth, Meldreth and Melbourn) and as chair of the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign, I wholeheartedly support this scheme. The cycle path component of the scheme offers a direct opportunity for modal shift to cycling for local trips through Harston, mitigating against a growing problem of traffic congestion throughout the corridor. People in the villages south of Harston know they could help alleviate congestion by cycling through for many sorts of trips – but currently conditions in Harston discourage cycling.

Speaking as someone who tries to get around by bicycle and avoids roads whenever possible, Harston is a place where I often leave the path and move into the road. I want to get out of the way of pedestrians, who are confined to a very narrow dual use path that is flanked by numerous driveway entrances with poor visibility.

As the report states, the relatively compact A10 corridor is dotted with high employment centres and there is great opportunity for short trips by bicycle. The A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign includes many people who live in Harston or travel north or south through it on a daily basis to work.

A high quality cycle path will soon extend from Melbourn to the southern edge of Harston. This scheme offers the chance to get through the village itself, and creating a safe and attractive route for pedestrians too.

Thank you to the officers for their great work in communicating closely with all concerned in an effort to get the best possible scheme.

Appendix 7

SUBMISSION FROM JEAN GLASBERG REGARDING ITEM 7- TRUMPINGTON ROAD CAMBRIDGE PHASE 2 PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

I am the Chair of Newnham Croft Residents' Association, which joined together with 8 other Newnham and Trumpington RAs to comment on the proposals for Trumpington Road. We are pleased that officers have responded to the concerns we and the Cambridge Wildlife Trust expressed about taking land from Two Bit Common, and that they have decided this will not now be necessary.

We also welcome the fact that '*The approach within the scheme recognizes the variety of cyclists and differing levels of confidence and needs*' 5.4 and aims at physical segregation of cycle lanes from other traffic, which is also strongly supported by the Cyclists Touring Club (CTC) 3.3.

It is also recognized in the report that *'currently many people feel unsafe cycling'* 7.2 and that *'efforts should focus upon interventions that mitigate any barriers like perceived safety risks'* 8.6

It is therefore unfortunate that Hills Road had to be designed and implemented to a very tight timescale. Several key features of this scheme were highly experimental, as is noted in the minutes of the last E&E meeting (13th October 2016) in response to the concerns raised by Wendy Blythe, the Chair of FeCRA *'Segregated cycleways had not previously been delivered in Cambridgeshire (and indeed in few places in UK at that time) and other features such as the Cambridge kerb, sedum and floating bus stops had never been used in schemes.* Appendix 1.2

The new cycleways on Hills Road are not in fact separated from other traffic, and the Cambridge kerb is a small slope specifically designed to allow other vehicles to drive onto the cycle lane. This 'over-run' by other vehicles now happens so frequently on the new cycle lane on Hills Road that white posts have been installed to protect the sedum troughs between the footpath and the cycleway - but there is no protection for the cyclists.

As a member of the FeCRA committee I, like Wendy, have been hearing from residents across the city who are extremely worried about the safety of these experimental features, especially unsegregated on-road bike lanes and the new floating island bus stops.

Many of these people are the parents of young children, elderly or disabled- the most vulnerable in our communities.

We therefore ask that you take these concerns very seriously and make sure that:

- a) new cycling infrastructure always aims to achieve physical separation from other traffic
- b) residents and disability groups are consulted fully on the design of any floating island bus stops, with priority always given to pedestrians in line with DoT guidance.