

Questioner	Question
<p>Robert McCubbin Parish Councillor Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>Little Wilbraham, Great Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom have no active travel possibilities, with no cycle paths and only narrow, unlit roads connecting our communities to basic amenities such as schools, GP surgeries, shops, leisure facilities and places of work.</p> <p>Although the Greenways scheme will provide sustainable connections to key sites and centres of population, it does not provide any radial routes to allow villages such as ours to connect to this network, leaving dangerous sections preventing anything but a car trip. This is despite our being within easy cycling distance of Cambridge and other centres. There is no bus service except once in the early morning and back in the mid evening, yet are within easy distance of Fulbourn and Bottisham both of which will be on Greenways routes and are on regular bus routes. Our roads are also used extensively by HGVs travelling between the A11 and the A14, adding significantly to the difficulties for cyclists.</p> <p>A survey of residents here in December 2021 had a 31% response rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 98% wanted a safe cycle path from the villages • 45% have household members that currently rely on others to drive them • 89% enjoy and are willing to cycle • 92% currently don't cycle because parts of the cycle route feel too dangerous/ unsafe • 97% said safer cycle routes would increase the chances of their cycling <p>The recent death of a local cyclist from injuries suffered at the junction of the Wilbraham Road and the A1303 where there is no safe cycle crossing is reported here:</p> <p>https://www.elystandard.co.uk/news/little-wilbraham-road-crash-cyclist-dies-8693206</p> <p>https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2022/03/camcycle-calls-for-safer-rural-routes/</p> <p>Website: https://cyclewilbrahams.wixsite.com/cycleway</p> <p>There has been another cyclist fatality in February near Little Wilbraham. Will the links between the Bottisham and Fulbourn Greenways via The Wilbrahams and Six Mile Bottom be prioritised as part of the next phase of the Greenways project?</p>
<p>Iris Bostanci Meldreth</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>Three years ago, I went to Cambridge GP to ask how old I would be by the time the bike path to Royston is finished. I am now 10 and going to secondary school next year. It feels like there has been no progress. How old will I be when I can ride my bike safely to Royston? I don't really want to have to buy a car when I'm older.</p>

<p>James Talbot The Eversdens Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>Agenda item 7 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>Whilst we recognise that the focus of the current work is the agreed Network, we agree strongly with the view that the Greenways do not extend far enough, there being too much focus on the improvement of existing corridors rather than the development of new ones. The Eversdens, with their growing population, lie in a 10 mile square patch with no cycle paths and no bus services. Please may I ask when the next opportunities may arise to provide us with much-needed safe cycling connections to locations such as our catchment schools, in Comberton, and to Barton, from where we may safely access the Greenways and Cambridge.</p>
<p>Matthew Danish Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda item 7: Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>On Friday, Camcycle placed a ghost bike at the junction of Little Wilbraham Road and the A1303, where a collision led to the death of a man who was cycling there earlier this year. Three years ago, responding to the GCP Bottisham Greenway consultation, the local Cycling UK group - CTC Cambridge - called for a safe crossing here. Locals from the Wilbrahams and Six Mile Bottom have also asked for safe connections to the Greenways as the villages are less than 10 miles from Cambridge but fall between the Fulbourn and Bottisham routes.</p> <p>It is a scandal that in 2022, so many people from rural communities have to weigh up the risk to their lives before walking and cycling for everyday journeys because there are no safe routes for them to use.</p> <p>We'd like to ask the GCP if they could include a safe crossing from Little Wilbraham Road to the Bottisham Greenway and to add in safe routes from the Wilbrahams as part of forthcoming active travel projects?</p>
<p>David Stoughton Chair Living Streets Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 - Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>As you know Living Streets Cambridge campaigns for pedestrians and you may be aware of our current campaign to curb the bane of pavement parking. The recent publication of the revised Highway Code is a big step forward for walkers and we are pleased that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is committed to reviewing the road user hierarchy with a view to seeing the provisions of the new code implemented.</p> <p>However, it will require significant change to driver knowledge and behaviour if benefits such as priority for pedestrian and cyclists heading straight on at side road junctions are to be realised safely. The transition could easily increase the danger to pedestrians as the hierarchy and relative priorities change. Long-standing patterns of behaviour will adjust at different rates among road users and individuals. So pedestrians and cyclists who are, so to speak, early adopters may find that some motorists have not yet made the adjustment. Care and respect between road users of all kinds will be required.</p> <p>To ensure that the transition is both safe and rapid will require a number of measures. These could include road markings, signage, public information and speed restrictions. Consideration should be given to zebra crossing markings at</p>

**17th March 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>key junctions, speed limits of 20 miles an hour or less on all urban streets and a substantial public information campaign.</p> <p>Will this partnership ensure that sufficient funds are allocated to clear visual and informational communication and guidance for all users to embed the adjusted priorities implied by the revised hierarchy?</p>
<p>Matthew Danish Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 - Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>Camcycle would like to thank officers and the Joint Assembly for their helpful feedback on our questions last month. We welcome this review of the road network which will ensure active and public transport journeys are prioritised within Cambridge.</p> <p>We support the comments made for the need to overlay sustainable transport routes with the plans for changes to the road network so that local people can understand the overall vision of this project, and the call for clearer explanation and mapping of the proposed street categories.</p> <p>We have additional questions on this report:</p> <p>Under the characteristics of a Civic Street, there is the suggestion that, where possible, alternative routes would be provided for cycle trips. It is essential that there are safe, direct routes via the city centre at all times of day, therefore we welcome the suggestion of finding better options for streets with high footfall provided that cycling access is maintained and any alternative route ideas are brought forward for genuine consultation beforehand.</p> <p>Could the GCP confirm that safe, direct cycle routes will be maintained and access for disabled people using cycles as a mobility aid will not be affected?</p> <p>Item 10.1 says that quick wins arising from this project will be met from the 2022/23 budget. What does that mean in terms of timescale for installation of new roadspace reallocation trials?</p> <p>Item 7.2 says that a consultation on road hierarchy will coincide with a second Making Connection consultation with links between the two.</p> <p>Is there any reason why these can't be joined into one consultation to better reflect the holistic nature of the City Access programme?</p> <p>Following on from that, are the public transport improvements still on track to be delivered next year as shown in the City Access timeline presented in Sept 2021?</p>
<p>Lilian Rundblad Chair HRARA</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</p> <p>This is a revised version, now showing the diversion via the A14 instead of Kings Hedges Road. As a result, pressure will come directly down Histon Road and perhaps increase HGV numbers (page 83).</p> <p>To ensure that the road signage is set up, thereby reducing speeding, noise and air pollution, and ensuring safety for the residents along Histon Road it is imperative that the actual signs are in place. PRO 763 and 764 impose a 20mph limit between Akeman Street and the Victoria Road Junction plus 30mph from</p>

**17th March 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Kings Hedges Road to Akeman Street, both recently approved. They are essential and should be set up before the Diversions start. With the very positive recommendations at the 8th March Highways meeting regarding 20mph, its funding and also additional staff to be hired, there should be no hindrance to having this work done urgently.</p> <p>The enforcement of the speed limits also needs to be improved urgently. The MVAS sign in the northern part of the road was removed at the start of construction on Histon Road and the Speed Camera near Carisbrooke Junction is out-of-order. Both the MVAS sign and the Speed Camera are important deterrent features preventing speeding and should be reinstated urgently and before the Diversions start.</p> <p>Both the speed limit signage and the reinforcement of speeding are an important factor to reduce the congestion and pressure on the Huntingdon/ Histon/Victoria Junction as the Signalling System at the Junction is not working properly due to damage to the loop under the junction.</p> <p>HRARA asks that GCP make every attempt to have in place at the time of the Milton Road Project start in April-May 2022 both the speed signage, the speed enforcement tools and the signalling system at the Victoria Road Junction.</p>
<p>Maureen Mace</p> <p>Milton Road Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</p> <p>a) Woodhead Drive will be used as a base for the contractors when Milton Road is constructed. Could you ensure that a footpath and cycleway remain between Milton Road and Woodhead Drive. This is the main route for schoolchildren from East Chesterton over the pedestrian crossing to the rear of the North Cambridge Academy through the car free zone of Downhams Lane. This route is also a well-used cut through by residents in the Woodhead Drive and Arbury areas to cycle and walk to local shops, the pub, the Post Office, the Science Park, Business Centre and Cambridge North.</p> <p>b) At the Joint Assembly I asked if there will be advertising displays on the new bus shelters as one was awaiting approval by the planning authority.</p> <p>Mr Blake's answer was that he would be in discussion regarding this with the planning authority. The advertising on this particular bus shelter has since been removed. Thank you. Can you confirm that there will be NO digital or other advertising on any of the new glass bus shelters anywhere along Milton Road after the reconstruction, including in front of both sets of shops. Not only is digital advertising very distracting but any advertising stands will block views of residents exiting from their drives.</p>
<p>Charles Nisbet</p> <p>Chairman Milton Road Residents' Committee</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</p> <p>If all goes according to plan, once the reconstruction works on Milton Road are completed, there will be attractive grass verges/swales along much of the road. Unfortunately, it will not be long before large lorries and delivery vans find it convenient to park on these verges while delivering to properties on the road, and much of the good work will be undone.</p>

**17th March 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Would the Board therefore please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct the relevant officers to ensure that some form of physical barriers to inhibit parking on verges are included in the detailed plans, e.g. high kerbs and substantial, short, wooden, boundary posts; and • investigate the possibility of legally enforceable penalties for parking on such verges, including the cost of making good any damage.
<p>Rosalind Lund Chair Arbury Road East Residents' Association (ARERA)</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</p> <p>In our view, Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) looks likely to be the most appropriate vehicle to ensure that residents of Milton Road and adjoining streets are kept regularly informed of progress on the road so that problems are dealt with quickly and effectively. Arbury Road East Residents' Association (ARERA) came into existence after the LLF was set up.</p> <p>We therefore ask that ARERA be treated as a full member of the LLF for the duration of the project and that communications between the contractors and residents are facilitated through the Chair and Secretary of ARERA whenever issues which will impact on residents come up, for example road closures. As well as residents, we include a number of traders on Arbury among our members.</p> <p>If for any reason the LLF is discontinued, please ensure that the contractors deal directly with all three local residents associations including ourselves.</p>
<p>Susan Jackson Committee member Windsor Rd Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 - Milton Road Development</p> <p>The present signalling system at the Huntingdon Road Junction has not yet been repaired, and this is already leading to un-necessary queueing along both Histon and Huntingdon road, with increased air pollution, before the traffic can move forward to Castle Street and Mount Pleasant.</p> <p>We join with others in asking that the damaged Loop be repaired before the Diversions from Milton Road start in April-May.</p>
<p>Dr Jocelynn A. Scutt Chair Milton Road Local Liaison Forum</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 – Milton Road Development</p> <p><u>Public Art</u> Public art was from the outset part of Milton Road Project plans. May a proper and adequate sum be set aside, determined in conjunction with Milton Road and associated roads residents recognised by the art community</p> <p><u>Construction Compound – Milton Road Project</u></p> <p>Woodhead Drive is proposed as main construction compound, for storage, administrative offices, rest-area, blocking off Woodhead Drive. Residents request alternatives be explored – for example Cowley Park/Way - security there</p>

	<p>includes CCTV and a secure perimeter fence. If a Woodhead Drive compound is required, could the scale be reduced for traffic and privacy requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Woodhead Drive closure means sole use of Downhams Lane for Milton Road access, an intersection already highly congested. 2. Provision will be required for utility vehicles to Citygate (cnr Woodhead Drive and Milton Road) and nearby properties, adding to Downhams Lane congestion. 3. Emergency vehicle access to Woodhead Drive will be affected time-wise by going via Downhams Lane. 4. Residents' privacy, particularly of Citygate flats will be impacted by the Compounds needs. <p><u>Parking Mitigation and Milton Road Project</u></p> <p>An undertaking was made to residents from Milton Road Project outset that parking mitigation would be included. Will the Executive Board honour that undertaking affecting Ascham (has residents' parking) and Hurst Park Estate and Elizabeth (no residents' parking) by supporting its proceeding, so as not to await an outcome of any GCP overall plan, which will take time to be devised.</p> <p>The GPD overall plan will necessarily take account of existing residents' parking schemes, including the Romsey scheme (proceeding under existing rules), so including Elizabeth/Hurst Park would not inhibit the overall plan.</p> <p>Requiring Milton Road Project residents to await an overall plan ignores the undertaking to Milton Road Project residents.</p>
<p>Matthew Danish Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 - Milton Road Development</p> <p>The Milton Road project has been a case of the good, the bad and the ugly.</p> <p>First, the good: the project team worked well with the community to design a tree-lined road that will be a genuine improvement for everyone living, working or passing through, along MOST of its length.</p> <p>The bad: north of Lovell Road, the designers have shoehorned in a bus lane, cutting to the bone the space for active travel. They needed extra land to make the bus lane fit, but they didn't get it. Instead of reversing the decision to extend the bus lane, they've chosen to prioritise bus company convenience ahead of people's safety, like the fiasco on Histon Road.</p> <p>When the land negotiation failed, and the extended bus lane conflicted with the necessary safe space for walking and cycling, why didn't you choose safety? How will you fix this?</p> <p>The ugly: during construction, everyone walking and cycling will be jammed into the narrow north-western pavement. This will be very hard, especially for the numerous families that currently walk or cycle their kids to school here.</p>

17th March 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

	<p>Will you instruct the officers to work out a construction plan that has more space for walking and cycling? And how?</p> <p>It's not enough to say some cyclists will mix with motor traffic. If the usual number of cars tries to push through the work zone, junctions like Arbury Road will be gridlocked. We've recommended convening a working group to find traffic reduction measures, but the project team has resisted this so far. It's a pity: the Milton Road design worked well because of successful collaboration between residents, stakeholders and the GCP.</p> <p>Why is the GCP now afraid of such collaboration with local residents' associations and stakeholders, which has worked so well before? How will you fix this?</p>
--	--