

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

From	Question
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 - Madingley Road Walking and Cycling Improvements</p> <p>The glacial pace of the Madingley Road scheme is extremely frustrating. Four years after the last consultation, this proposal fails to impress. While some improvements have been incorporated, other aspects have worsened or been removed entirely, with little to no justification.</p> <p>Camcycle structured its consultation response around the following topics. We reiterate them here as we feel these papers and consultation report fail to reflect the level of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced scope: The exclusion of the Eddington Avenue junction and the link to the Park & Ride is a major loss, making the scheme significantly less effective for those cycling from Eddington or using the Park&Ride. ● Weaker protection for cyclists: The design now includes extended sections of stepped cycle tracks instead of fully protected lanes, making the route less inclusive and less safe. While we acknowledge constraints, the design should strive for greater protection. ● Unresolved junctions: Little to no progress has been made on improving several critical intersections. The scheme still fails to address issues at the Northampton Street junction, and the Grange Road junction fails to connect people to onward routes. <p>The report now asks members to "note progress," yet it offers no real detail on what changes will be made in the final design.</p> <p>Section 2.4 refers to "ensuring consistency with planned development"—a vague phrase that appears to justify the removal of the Eddington Avenue junction upgrades. How can continuing to limit active travel journeys enable development...</p> <p>Similarly, Section 3.5 states that concerns about the project's two most expressed comments (geographical scope the Queens Road junction) will be "addressed"—but does this mean real design changes or just words to address inaction.</p> <p>Can the GCP confirm whether the design will reinstate the Eddington Avenue junction and address concerns at the Northampton Street Junction ?</p>
<p>David Stoughton Cambridge Living Streets</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greenways Overall Programme Update</p> <p>Cambridge Living Streets has regularly commented on the proliferation of shared paths and our concern that the lack of any demarcation creates, especially for less able and older walkers, disincentives that reduce the likelihood that pedestrians will use them.</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Today I want to draw attention to the same lack of concern for pedestrians when consideration is given to the termination of Greenways in the city. There seems to be an underlying assumption that walkers and cyclists have similar destinations in mind and will travel to them by broadly similar routes. Thus, terminating a Greenway where it connects to cycle lanes and where footways are available is considered to cater for the needs of both.</p> <p>This ignores some key differences. Walkers have more options, using one-way streets and open spaces for instance, and may therefore take entirely different routes as well as possibly having different destinations in mind. Secondly all the research shows that the condition of the footways and perceived safety are critical determinants of the choice to walk. Put bluntly if walkers exit the Greenway to find they must negotiate broken and cluttered footways, vehicles parked on the pavement and high levels of traffic on their preferred routes, the number of walkers using any Greenway will quickly diminish.</p> <p>Will the GCP please consider ensuring that the footways on the routes most used by pedestrians when they exit a Greenway are in good condition and invest in improvements where appropriate? Secondly, when consideration is given to where Greenways terminate will they also consider whether walkers can easily access a route with low volumes of regular traffic?</p>
<p>Anne Miller Chair of Carbon Neutral Cambridge</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greenways Overall Programme Update</p> <p>Re. Comberton Greenway, Burrell's Walk Bridge</p> <p>Carbon Neutral Cambridge is very pleased that GCP is proposing to widen Burrell's Walk Bridge. Our survey of residents and users showed 90% support for widening (94 in favour, 9 against, 1 don't know)</p> <p>However, responses also made it clear that it's important to "DO IT PROPERLY" This encompasses: 1) widening it enough to provide segregated paths for pedestrians and cyclists 2), improving sightlines at the junction with the main part of Burrell's Walk and 3) Biodiversity Net Gain measures.</p> <p>Residents were concerned that widening it just to a shared use 3m wide path would not be enough to protect pedestrians from fast moving cyclists, so we suggest it's widened to 4-4.5m, to provide segregated paths for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>This is particularly important as we understand that soon there will be 3,000 more homes and 2,000 student bed-spaces at Eddington, and thousands more employees, researchers and students will be travelling to the new employment and research sites in West Cambridge and Eddington every day. Experts tell us that even at 3m,</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>the bridge would remain a pinch-point on the route, exacerbated by the tidal flow due to the traffic lights.</p> <p>The second element of “doing it properly” is improving sightlines at the blind junction with the main part of Burrell’s Walk, which was frequently mentioned as a safety problem. Trinity College, who own the land there, are likely to be supportive.</p> <p>The 3rd element is Biodiversity Net Gain measures at Cobbetts Corner, such as the extra planting and habitat improvements recommended by the City Council Biodiversity Officer. This was also important to residents.</p> <p>Can you reassure us that you will work together with the County Council & City Council and include all 3 elements of “doing it properly”.</p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greenways Overall Programme Update</p> <p>The decision to address the Burrell’s Walk footbridge barrier is welcome and long overdue. This simple yet effective change will improve access and enhance the usability of Adam’s Road—a scheme we eagerly anticipate.</p> <p><i>Melbourn and Meldreth Greenways</i></p> <p>In 2022, Camcycle submitted a detailed consultation response on the Melbourn Greenway, providing 51 specific, constructive comments aimed at shaping the design. We hope this level of detail starts a conversation with the GCP and evolves into ongoing discussions that foster a collaborative co-design process to achieve good outcomes.</p> <p>This collaborative approach cannot be taken for granted. Without it, schemes such as Milton Road would be a shadow of the scheme we have today. However, to achieve that outcome on Milton Road, Camcycle and others had to fight to have a seat at the table. We simply do not have the capacity or often the knowledge to fight every time the GCP enters a design period. More collaboration, such as involvement in design workshops, would aid the GCP and the community in achieving better designs, faster.</p> <p>These papers now ask members to approve changes without any details as to what those changes are.</p> <p>For example, the report mentions a "need" to change the design from red surfacing. What exactly is this need? Cost? Practicality? While trade-offs are sometimes necessary, they should be transparently discussed—not framed as non-negotiable necessities.</p> <p>Good outcomes, like those on Milton Road, required a collaborative process with key stakeholders working together to balance needs. This approach must be actively embedded in the GCP’s design process.</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p>Will the GCP release the latest designs for the Melbourn Greenway and provide the necessary context to support its decision making?</p>
<p>Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Greenways Overall Programme Update</p> <p>The detailed plans for the Greenways are being submitted for Stakeholder comment without any of the rights of way network being shown.</p> <p>For the Barton Greenway alone, it is not possible to determine whether the tarmac route of the Greenway is actually on the bridleway or a route alongside. It is not possible to determine whether the route highlighted for equestrian and other soft surface users is part of the right of way or some other piece of non-public land.</p> <p>I have asked on many, many occasions for the right of way network to be clearly shown on all GCP plans, public documents, etc but this still has not happened. Please could the Assembly require that this information is included on all future documents.</p> <p>Burrells Walk should be available to all non motorised users including horse riders. There is currently a plan for a long distance route (which will be open to cyclists) from Stevenage to Cambridge which will require access into Cambridge over this path. All safe off road access should be available to all vulnerable road user. We therefore request that equestrians are included in this route.</p>
<p>Darren Green</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>Regarding the proposal for Mill Road to become an active travel route as part of the Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>(a) As the bus gate is now in operation and Mill Road is attracting a greater number of active travel users, will GCP consider expediting the work on Mill Road as part of the Fulbourn Greenway and bring this forward to phase 2 (in place of the planned work from Yarrow Road to A1134, if necessary). The benefit of this change of scheduling is that the very poor condition of the roadway along Mill Road would be improved for active travel users at the earliest opportunity and the potential of this route for active travel for both local residents and commuters could be reached at the soonest possible date; and,</p> <p>(b) With the expectation that the route along Mill Road will become an exceptionally popular active travel route, what other specific actions will GCP take to ensure the route along Mill Road will be felt to be safe (and therefore a viable option) for the most vulnerable road users, such as children cycling to school.</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Linda Jones Cambridge Living Streets</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>Cambridge Living Streets welcomes the proposal for Fulbourn Greenway to be routed along Mill Road East (Romsey). It is the most direct route and with careful investment can become a safe and attractive route for pedestrians - wheelers and walkers - as well as cyclists. Some stretches of the road further towards the Mill Road-Perne Road junction have houses with narrow pavements and hardly any frontage and this area needs special attention to make it safe for pedestrian movement. Pedestrians need to be catered for as befits the major mode of transport on Mill Road and a group designated as top of the transport and active travel hierarchy.</p> <p>Of course, a key issue then arising is why no provision is being made to improve Mill Road West (Petersfield) where pedestrian traffic is so much greater. The average daily pedestrian flow in February 2025 is 7491, over three times higher than in Mill Rd East; cycle traffic is over twice as great. Pavements are unsafe, on the North side because they are far too narrow, with stretches waterlogged in winter, and on the South because of pavement parking and street clutter. Moreover, because of car and taxi movements to and from the station the level of motor traffic is likely to remain quite high and add to pedestrian exposure. Many people walk and cycle to the rail station, yet their safety is being ignored.</p> <p>We ask the GCP Assembly to look again at plans for Mill Road and invest in the whole road. The Petersfield stretch has a wide range of shops, cafes and restaurants attracting people from around/beyond Cambridge and bringing economic benefits to the city. Most of these visitors walk or cycle. Safe active travel is surely as important for them as for pedestrians and cyclists in Romsey?</p>
<p align="center">Andy Kennedy - Secretary Mill Road 4 People</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>Mill Road has not had significant public realm investment for many years, in contrast with other Cambridgeshire towns like St Neots and March. Mill Road has a similar population size to these towns, living within a 15 minute active travel journey of our High Street. So it's good to hear that you will be progressing improvements to Mill Road public realm and engaging with local stakeholders on the detail (we'd like to ask that Mill Road 4 People be included in that engagement). However there appears to be a significant gap between your ambition ("a possible street and public realm improvement scheme for Mill Road ... this could include pavement widening, continuous footways and improvements to the areas of public open space through the introduction of new planting and sustainable design features.") and the available funds (£601k) - is this the extent of the funding you've secured? If so, how will you be addressing what appears to be an order of magnitude funding shortfall alongside taking a design to public consultation?</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

<p align="center">Charlotte de Blois</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>Petersfield's stretch of Mill Road is used by visiting academics, investors and promoters as a route from the station to the 2 universities. Its poor upkeep and narrow pavements are unlikely to inspire confidence that Cambridge provides a safe environment for employees and clients and therefore it will deter investment rather than secure it. Surely it makes economic sense to find funding to deal with these problems?</p>
<p align="center">Richard Wood, Petersfield Ward/Division Resident</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>As a local resident, I join others, today, in welcoming the proposal (Agenda Item No. 9) to route the Fulbourn Greenway along Mill Road, and questioning the apparent termination of this active travel route immediately west of Mill Road Bridge.</p> <p>In addition to the points made by others about the desirability of enhancing the route through the Petersfield section of Mill Road, I would like to draw attention to the city's 'gateway' to Mill Road and the Fulbourn Greenway – the East Road-Mill Road-Gonville Place-Parkside junction.</p> <p>A R-A-G safety analysis – using Active Travel England's Route Check Tool (tab 3.1 Safety Check) – would score mainly red for walking, wheeling and cycling, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA02 Pedestrian and cyclist conflict with motor traffic • SA03 Effect of lane widths on conflict between cyclists and motor traffic • SA06 Ability of pedestrians to cross the street safely on desire lines • SA07 Suitability of pedestrian crossings in context • SA10 Required crossing speed at signal crossings • SA16 Guard railing used as standard without consideration of inherent safety risks. Guard railing used to control behaviour in complex environments. <p>This poor quality junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presents dangers to cyclists and pedestrians • blocks pedestrian desire lines to Parkside coach and busway stops • discourages cyclists from the carriageway, onto segregated footways, leading to cycle-pedestrian conflict across Donkey Common and Petersfield park. <p>Will the Greater Cambridge Partnership commit to a full analysis of this junction's deficiencies, using Junction Assessment Tool (ibid, tab 6) with a view to drawing down funding for future remodelling in line with the Partnership's policies for promoting active travel?</p>

**20th February 2025 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	<p><i>[Documents referenced: Route Check User Manual (PDF) Active Travel England, 2024 Route Check Tool (xlsx) Active Travel England, 2024]</i></p>
<p>Josh Grantham on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Fulbourn Greenway</p> <p>Today, over 4,000 people cycle and 7,000 walk on Mill Road. The bridge changes have led to major improvements, but this is just the beginning.</p> <p>The decision before the GCP today covers three key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agreeing an alignment for the Fulbourn Greenway ● Reallocating funding ● Bringing together stakeholders. <p>Officers propose an alignment that follows only part of Mill Road. While the defence will be that this is where the existing Greenway finished, cycling routes do not work in isolation. The original Fulbourn Greenway report identified Cambridge Station and the City Centre as key destinations.</p> <p>Previously, the route terminated at Cambridge Station because it used the Carter Bridge, where onward cycling links were at least functional. With the new Mill Road alignment, this is no longer the case—many thousands of users will continue to the city centre. The natural endpoint of the route is East Road and Mill Road, not the station. Why should the project boundary be based on the constraints of the old alignment.</p> <p>The proposed £600,000 funding reallocation is welcome but should be a starting point, not a cap. The original cost estimates are outdated and based on a different route.</p> <p>This is more than just a Greenway scheme—it is a major corridor for active travel and a key part of Cambridge’s transport network. The design process must not be constrained by funding decisions made under a different alignment.</p> <p>The third point—bringing together stakeholders—is critical. While the GCP has a role, this must be a wider effort involving the constituent councils and the community.</p> <p>Will the GCP commit to the Fulbourn Greenway reaching East Road, and will they allow the design process to explore a complete scheme rather than one capped by previous costings?</p>