

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly
Thursday 17th February 2022
2:00 p.m. – 5:20 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly:

Cllr Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Rosy Moore (Vice-Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Simon Smith	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Alex Beckett	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Brian Milnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Neil Shailer	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Heather Williams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Christopher Walkinshaw	Business Representative
Karen Kennedy	University Representative
Helen Valentine	University Representative

Officers:

Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Niamh Matthews	Assistant Director: Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Heather Richards, Claire Ruskin and Councillor Ian Sollom.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Beckett declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a resident of Coldham's Lane.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Joint Assembly meeting, held on 18th November 2021, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the removal of the word "reluctant" from the last paragraph on page 13 of the agenda, and were signed by the Chairperson.

4. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that twenty public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in Appendix A of the minutes. It was clarified that those submitting questions had been offered the option of attending the meeting in person or having their question read out by an officer.

It was noted that four questions related to Agenda Item 6 (Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update), three questions related to Agenda Item 7 (Chisholm Trail: Phase 2), six questions related to Agenda Item 8 (Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review), and seven questions related to agenda item 9 (Milton Road).

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that a further question had been received from James Littlewood in relation to the Cambridge South East Transport project, but as there was no item related to the project on the agenda, the question had been deferred to the following meeting, which would include a report on the project.

5. Petitions

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly that no petitions had been submitted.

6. Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update

Four public questions were received from Councillor Mike Harrison (on behalf of Royston Town Council), Councillor Paul Bearpark, Camcycle, and Jim Chisholm. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, County Councillor for the Melbourn and Bassingbourn division, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. Highlighting that the 2011 census had identified the A10 corridor between Royston and Cambridge as well-suited to active and sustainable travel, she welcomed the progress that had culminated in the development of the Melbourn Greenway. She encouraged the GCP to prioritise safer junctions for cyclists and pedestrians along existing and future multi-use paths, in line with the updated Highway Code and other guidance from the Department for Transport, to avoid dissuading cyclists from using the routes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress of the Greenways network, prior to an Outline Business Case and delivery programme being presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in September and October 2022 respectively. Attention was drawn to the work already underway across the wider network, as set out in paragraph 2.2 of the report, and the work on specific Greenways and planned engagement, as set out in section 3 of the report.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Queried whether potential flooding in the Swavesey area had been taken into consideration during the design of the St Ives Greenway. Observing that much of the St Ives Greenway's infrastructure was already in place, the Transport Director confirmed that flooding issues were being addressed.
- Sought clarification on the level of funding that had been budgeted for maintenance of the Greenways once they had been completed, including the greenery alongside the routes. The Joint Assembly was informed that proposals for maintenance had been made by the County Council and were being discussed.
- Argued that the requirements of equestrians needed to be further taken into consideration on the Greenways projects. While observing that equestrians were not a key element of the City Deal or delivering sustainable economic growth, the Transport Director confirmed that the GCP would not worsen the current infrastructure available to them and would make improvements whenever it was reasonable and cost-efficient to do so.
- Suggested that the planned engagements should be made as accessible as possible to stakeholders who were not familiar with the terminology that was normally used, or who wished to submit responses as groups, rather than as individuals.
- Observed that there were a large number of communities in the area surrounding Royston that were not currently connected to public transport routes or active and

sustainable travel networks, and requested that future opportunities be taken into consideration in the design stage of current schemes. It was also argued that similar lack of infrastructure and services was evident in the north-east area of Greater Cambridge. Acknowledging the observations, the Transport Director noted that any such opportunities would be subject to obtaining future funding, although he confirmed that the GCP would be mindful of whether existing and planned schemes could be extended in the future to incorporate a wider geography.

- Expressed concern about inconsistencies with the layout of existing cycle paths, noting that although future schemes would be aligned to the Local Transport Note 1/20, existing ones did not all currently conform with the requirements. While retrofitting its own schemes was part of the GCP programme, it was clarified that the GCP could only provide a supporting role to the relevant authorities for those schemes that had been implemented by a different organisation.
- Emphasised the importance of working with local partners. Noting that the GCP held a defined role in the region, the Transport Director agreed that more could be achieved through working collectively with other public bodies and local groups.
- Requested an update on the issue of land purchases for the Greenways network.
- Commented that it would be beneficial to have access to more detailed and specific information on the individual Greenways as they progressed, in order to monitor them, provide clarity on their timelines and progress, and ensure transparency for the wider public. Acknowledging that greater levels of information and transparency could now be achieved following the completion of early quick wins, the Transport Director undertook to reflect on the issue in the next report on the Greenways projects.
- Highlighted the importance of integrating the Greenways scheme with other programmes, both of the GCP and local partners, such as the City Access Strategy, Active Travel Strategy, Making Spaces for People, and the Local Plan, to identify how the wider network was interconnected, and to provide a context for the allocation of future funding.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded there had been general support for the proposals, although he highlighted a general impatience for progress of the Greenways schemes, calls for the planned engagement to be made accessible, and an increase in transparency to ensure that members of the public could track progress and understand any issues on an ongoing basis.

7. Chisholm Trail: Phase 2

Three public questions were received from Camcycle, David Stoughton, and Jim Chisholm. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which outlined proposals for Phase 2 of the Chisholm Trail, which would be delivered in several component parts rather than as a single project. Various public engagements were scheduled to be held throughout 2022, and it was noted that the Executive Board would be consulted on the use of compulsory purchase orders as part of the scheme's development.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the completion and opening of Phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail, noting that it had already become a popular and well-used route, and served as an effective demonstration of how Cambridge could become a truly cycle-friendly city.
- Expressed concern about the crossing of Coldham's Lane and the significant problems faced by cyclists with the existing infrastructure, and it was suggested that further consideration needed to be given to the crossing, with the possible addition of a second bridge for cyclists. Acknowledging the problems with the current infrastructure on the junction and the need for improvements, the Transport Director emphasised that the Chisholm Trail only included the Coldham's Lane crossing, rather than the whole junction itself. While consultations would be held during the summer, further consideration of potential improvements to the junction would be made as part of the ongoing Road Network Hierarchy Review and the City Access Strategy, as well as through discussions with the relevant highway authority.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring safe ingress and egress to the Chisholm Trail, particularly in dangerous areas such as Mill Road, Coldham's Lane and Cherry Hinton Road, some of which already benefitted from cycle improvements that would not connect to the trail. It was also observed that the trail needed to provide connectivity with routes coming into the city, such as the Fulbourn Greenway, and it was suggested that further clarity could be provided on how the Chisholm Trail connected to other such projects. While acknowledging the concerns, the Transport Director cautioned against mission creep, and emphasised that accessibility needed to be maximised once the project had been completed, both by the GCP and partner organisations. He also noted that two additional segregated cycle schemes across the city as part of the Cycle Plus scheme would provide additional interconnectivity between Greenways on opposing sides of the city.
- Expressed concern that pedestrians could be dissuaded from using the Chisholm Trail if too much attention was given to its benefits as a fast cycle route, given the multi-use nature of the path. Members identified a general need for greater segregation between cyclists and pedestrians across the network, as well as electric bikes and electric scooters. Observing that there was not always sufficient available space for greater segregation, the Transport Director acknowledged the concerns over safety, and recognised the need to consider the matter further.
- Expressed concern about the slow progress of the project and the number of proposed public consultations on a scheme that received wide public support, although it was acknowledged that Phase 2 was more complex and involved a greater number of stakeholders.

- Suggested that an alternative route along the edge of the railway rather than the edge of the Beehive Centre could be considered as part of the planning discussions for the potential redevelopment of the retail park. It was confirmed that the GCP would continue to support the statutory agencies throughout the planning process.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson welcomed the completion of Phase 1 and noted members' impatience for further progress, along with concerns raised with the Coldham's Lane junction, and ingress and egress to the Chisholm Trail.

8. Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review

Six public questions were received from Andy Kennedy, Andrew Milbourn, Owen Scarrott, Dr George Vardoulakis and Vincent Poole, Camcycle, and David Stoughton. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Cheney Payne, Cambridge City Councillor for the Castle Ward, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. While acknowledging the benefits of the road closure on Storey's Way in Eddington, she argued that it removed one of the few access routes to the M11 in the north-east of Cambridge, and encouraged the GCP to consider how the network could be restructured to improve such access. She also sought clarification on how Storey's Way could be identified as a Local Access Street when it was closed to motor vehicles. Expressing concern about the route along Lady Margaret Road and Albion Row being identified as a Primary Distributor Road, given that it was a narrow single-track street through a residential area that could not cater for large volumes of traffic, she argued that there should be mitigation made available to balance the impacts. Councillor Payne also suggested that it would be helpful for the review's map to be overlayed with cycling and pedestrian routes to demonstrate how they all linked together in a coherent way. Acknowledging that the allocation of routes for higher levels of traffic flow was a complex matter that would always lead to disagreements, the Transport Director emphasised that the report was a starting point to stimulate discussion, and he confirmed that the map would be overlayed with not only cycling and pedestrian routes, but also the wider GCP programme.

The Transport Director presented the report, which set out initial ideas for the development of a new road network hierarchy in Cambridge that sought to reallocate road space in favour of public transport and active travel. He informed the Joint Assembly that the proposals were a starting point and were intended to provoke discussion.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Acknowledged that the review could provoke disagreements but welcomed the discussion that it would stimulate, and highlighted its important role in developing a coherent, joined-up strategy across the GCP programme and wider Greater Cambridge area.

- Argued that people were discouraged from using alternative modes of transport to motor vehicles due to issues such as poor surfaces, inconsistent infrastructure and poor segregation. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns and informed members that the GCP continued to work with the County Council on such matters.
- Highlighted that the review should take into consideration developing and future travel modes, such as automated cars and electric bikes or scooters, in order to provide long-term resilience and flexibility.
- Sought clarification on why the train station was not included on the map.
- Argued that residents of primary distributor roads would suffer significantly due to increased traffic flows and higher levels of pollution, and suggested that mitigation measures could be considered as part of the consultation, such as 20mph speed limits or HGV restrictions. Acknowledging the importance of mitigation, the Transport Director observed that reducing traffic levels by 20% would represent a significant mitigation, although he assured the Joint Assembly that local mitigations would be considered where appropriate.
- Queried whether pedestrian and cycling priority at junctions could lead to a reduction in the time that they were required to wait at traffic lights after pressing a button to cross.
- Sought clarification on whether taxis would be able to use those roads identified as civic streets.
- Highlighted the importance of wide-ranging involvement in the consultation, including those coming into the city for reasons such as shopping, medical attention, education and socialising, as well as vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.
- Suggested that removing infrastructure from primary distributor roads would further increase their capacity and therefore reduce pressure on other roads.
- Expressed concern about access to the M11 in the north-east of Cambridge, and argued that the proposals would lead to higher levels of traffic being directed through narrow and inappropriate streets in Eddington, although it was acknowledged that the report and maps were indicative and would change as a result of the consultation.
- Argued that closing roads to motor vehicles encouraged people to use alternative modes of transport due to increased levels of security in the vicinity.
- Expressed concern about the potential negative impacts on taxi drivers, small traders and businesses, and emphasised the importance of engaging with such affected people and ensuring their participation in the consultations. Acknowledging the concerns and need for sensitivity during the consultations, the

Transport Director informed members that the GCP would also work with established partners, such as local authorities who dealt with taxi licenses.

- Suggested that it would be helpful to measure pollution levels at different points around the city at this stage in order to establish base data for any changes that may occur as a result of the displacement of traffic. The Transport Director agreed that establishing base data would be important.
- Highlighted the importance of installing adequate signage and engaging with satellite navigation systems to minimise confusion and avoid unintentional access of restricted streets.
- Argued that an Equalities Impact Assessment should be carried out and included as part of the consultations, and emphasised the importance of ensuring the maps and terminology used during the consultations were accessible and understandable to the wide range of stakeholders that would be involved. Acknowledging that equalities should be included as a central theme, as it was with the City Access Strategy, the Transport Director undertook to ensure that it would be included in the report to the Executive Board, and assured members that the consultation would be inclusive and accessible.
- Commented that the consultations should emphasise how the Road Network Hierarchy Review was inter-connected with the GCP's other projects and strategies, such as the City Access Strategy and Making Connections Work. It was argued that a reallocation of road space without a demand management system would be ineffective and simply lead to displacement of traffic between roads. The Transport Director recognised the importance of emphasising the interdependencies and benefits of reducing traffic by 20%.
- Argued that the report did not provide sufficient explanation about the different purposes of roads in the hierarchy and how they would change as a result of the project. The Transport Director undertook to ensure that the information was clearer and understandable.
- Observed that public transport held a significant role in the congestion issues in the city centre, and sought clarification on the impact of the proposed hierarchy on bus routes. It was suggested that an approach to managing bus travel towards the centre could be included as part of the consultation, including proposals such as a series of mini hubs around the city centre with inter-connecting, smaller services to reduce the impact on narrow streets and historic buildings. Acknowledging that one of the GCP's underlying objectives was to establish more and better public transport that was less focussed around the city centre, the Transport Director emphasised that the strategy needed to consider how the situation would look in the future, as well as the present, and he informed the Joint Assembly that discussions continued to be held with the Combined Authority on the matter.
- Suggested that taxis should be categorised separately to cars, rather than just treated as an exemption, as taxis effectively provided a form of public transport.

- Argued that there should be different levels of consolidation in order to support businesses in the centre, as large outlets with their own nationwide supply chains could be unwilling to change their delivery process in the way that was proposed. Although he acknowledged that some businesses could be unwilling to consolidate, the Transport Director emphasised the importance of incentivisation through measures such as clean air zones, charging, or access restrictions.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that members had welcomed the review as important and necessary, and he highlighted some issues that had been raised, including ensuring the consultation was accessible and understandable, taking account of equalities and the wide range of stakeholders, clarifying the impacts on buses, and emphasising its relationship with other projects and strategies. He also noted that some specific issues had been raised that would be covered as part of the consultation process.

9. Milton Road

Seven public questions were received from Sue Purseglove, Michael Page, Andrew Milbourn, Rosalind Lund, Maureen Mace, Beatrice Rhind and Anna Crutchley, and Camcycle. The questions and a summary of the responses are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

Councillor Jocelynn Scutt, Chairperson of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum, attended the meeting to present feedback from the public meeting held on 3rd February 2022. Noting the importance of ensuring that local residents were kept informed throughout the duration of the project about details including section closures and parking or delivery restrictions, she highlighted concerns related to the loss of resident parking during and after the construction works and emphasised the need to provide immediate mitigation for affected residents. Confirming that resident parking would be prioritised as part of the delivery programme, the Transport Director assured the Joint Assembly that regular communication and information would be provided throughout the duration of the project.

The Transport Director presented the report, which contained a budget estimate for the Milton Road project, proposed construction and traffic management plans, and a proposal to award the construction contract to Milestone Infrastructure. The Joint Assembly was informed that a budget estimate was still being calculated, although it was confirmed that it would be in the region of £23m-£24m. Milestone Infrastructure had successfully managed and carried out similar works in and around Cambridge, including the Histon Road and Greenways projects for the GCP, and it was highlighted that the preferred traffic management option would retain two-way traffic flow along Milton Road for the duration of the project.

While discussing the report, the Joint Assembly:

- Welcomed the preference to retain two-way traffic flow, although observed that the construction works would still lead to disruption and therefore the likely displacement of traffic to other routes.

- Requested information on any planned provisions for ensuring that Milton Park and Ride remained a feasible and attractive option throughout the duration of the project. The Transport Director confirmed that the matter had been considered and would be reviewed during the project if it became necessary.
- Expressed concern about impacts on resident parking, and emphasised the need to ensure mitigation was provided for affected residents.
- Observed that horse-riders would also be affected by the construction works and sought clarification on how they would be able to use Milton Road throughout the project, and whether there would be any signage to provide them with assistance. The Transport Director undertook to investigate and provide further information to the Joint Assembly.

In summarising the Joint Assembly's discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there had been no objections to the report's proposals, although concerns had been expressed about impacts on resident parking.

10. Quarterly Progress Report

The Assistant Director of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Joint Assembly which provided an update on progress across the GCP's whole programme, and which also included the multi-year budget strategy. The wider programme continued to be over-programmed, although it continued to be refined as it moved into a period of significant delivery. Noting that Phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail had been completed and opened for use, thus changing the RAG status of the project to green, she informed the Joint Assembly that officers were reviewing the implications of an approved planning application for a new Retirement Care Village along the route of the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme.

While discussing the Quarterly Progress Report, the Joint Assembly:

- Queried whether there was any ongoing work specifically related to green jobs as part of the Skills programme. Observing that it was challenging to define what green jobs were, the Assistant Director confirmed that discussions had been held with Form the Future and there was ongoing work with Cambridge Regional College to establish greater understanding on the matter.
- Clarified that although the budget included an allocation of £20m for the City Access Strategy, there was a further Future Investment Strategy allocation of £75m for public transport improvements and sustainable travel that should be considered alongside the specific City Access Strategy allocation.
- Acknowledged that over-programming provided flexibility and opportunities, but expressed concern about its long-term implications and the fact that schemes would have to start to be prioritised if there were not sufficient financial resources available in the future, and it was suggested that it would be helpful and would increase transparency to receive a report considering such risks, the factors that could affect them, and the various options that would be available to the GCP in

such a situation. Emphasising that it was typical to over-programme in such a way, the Chief Executive informed the Joint Assembly that the GCP was investigating various ways in which additional resources could be obtained, including through Section 106 funding and potential charging schemes. However, she acknowledged that prioritisation or requests for further funding through the Gateway Review in 2024/2025 could become necessary, and agreed that a report would be presented which would effectively be a refresh of the Future Investment Strategy.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on Thursday 9th June 2022.

Chairperson
9th June 2022

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – 17th February 2022
Appendix A – Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

No.		Question	Answer
1	Cllr Mike Harrison (Chairman General Purposes and Highways. Royston Town Council)	<p>Agenda Item 6 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>I would be very interested to learn when you anticipate building the Melbourn Cycleway, and I am assuming you still plan to join this to the cycleways that exist already in Royston, so that there is a direct cycle link from Royston to the city of Cambridge,</p> <p>This would of course require a bridge over the A505 on the North side of Royston and just. to the East of the current junction of the A10 and A505 roads. Many organisations have said they would help fund the project including Royston Town Council, Hertfordshire County and North Herts District Councils. Many businesses have also offered financial help to the fund the bridge. Can you confirm that it is still the plan for this project to go ahead, and if all the funding required is now in place.</p>	<p>The Melbourn Greenway is being progressed with the next stage of technical design is ongoing.</p> <p>The crossing of the A505 is a key element in this Greenway. The GCP agreed to fund the design of the bridge and continue the dialogue with partners on securing a final funding package.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with Hertfordshire County Council about both the engineering design and options for funding. Some funding has already been secured through S106 with other options being actively explored.</p>
5	Paul Bearpark District Councillor for Milton and Waterbeach	<p>Agenda item 6 – Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>The ambition for Waterbeach New Town is for a high level of modal shift to minimise the impact on the A10 which National Highways describes as saturated and to reduce the negative impacts of car dependency. The Waterbeach Greenway is an important element of this ambition. The apparent very slow progress of the development of the Greenway looks to be well behind the occupation of the</p>	<p>The Greenways network is an extensive segregated cycleway system developed over multiple routes.</p> <p>Delivery of the network has required mobilisation of extensive resources including; client project management, consultancy</p>

	<p>New Town which is expected to begin this year. The GCP Exec Board approved an outline budget of £8m for the Waterbeach Greenway on 19 Feb 2020.</p> <p><i>In the two years that have passed since this date what progress has been made?</i></p> <p>The GCP website for the Waterbeach Greenway doesn't appear to show any tangible progress. Atkins were appointed as consultants for this project.</p> <p><i>What progress has been made by Atkins on the design?</i></p> <p>On 19 Feb 2020 the GCP Exec Board approved Phase 1 of the Waterbeach Greenway but not Phase 2. Phase 2 extends Phase 1 both north and south. The north and south sections are fundamentally different in scope. The southern section requires an underpass or bridge for crossing the A14. The northern section of Phase 2 will provide a valuable segregated route bypassing the village centre to the new houses currently being built. I have been informed by the GCP that the budget available allowed for the entire Greenway to be taken forward.</p> <p><i>Could the GCP provide clarity on whether the intention is to bring forward Phase 2 with Phase 1?</i></p> <p><i>If not, could the northern part of Phase 2 be brought forward with Phase 1, even if the southern section takes longer to deliver?</i></p> <p>During the recent GCP North Cambridge forum there were no representatives from the Greenways team. Questions were fielded by Paul van de Bulk. I understand that the Greenways project was being undertaken by the County Cycling Projects Team but transferred to a different team</p>	<p>support, land agents and contractor support. These resources have been put in place.</p> <p>The next stage of technical design is underway for the Waterbeach Greenway. Environmental constraints have been mapped, meetings with stakeholders including the local developers have taken place and the programme remains on track.</p> <p>The scope of design work that the consultants are working to includes the entirety of the Waterbeach Greenway not just Phase 1.</p> <p>Design consultants were appointed before work was transferred from the County Cycling Projects Team and that work has remained on programme.</p> <p>Yes, the Team is fully resourced.</p> <p>The next key milestone will be the public engagement where the full preliminary technical design will be presented. This is scheduled for September/ October 2022.</p> <p>The Waterbeach Greenway is currently scheduled for completion in 2024.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>within the GCP in September 2021.</p> <p><i>Can the GCP confirm whether a team was available to continue the work on the Greenways when it was transferred from the County Cycling Projects Team?</i></p> <p><i>Is the team fully resourced?</i></p> <p><i>What is the expected date of delivery of the Waterbeach Greenway and what are the intermediate milestones against which progress can be measured?</i></p>	
18	Camcycle	<p>Agenda item 6 - Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>Camcycle is highly supportive of the Greenways projects. We're glad to see some progress finally being made, because it has already been five years. There is tremendous need for safe, fully accessible and easily usable active travel routes in the wider region so the Greenways project cannot come soon enough. It is especially crucial both in the light of the climate crisis and the importance of sustainable transport for the future.</p> <p>However, we also note that the Greenways programme is threatened by regressive thinking at the county council, among those who still do not accept or understand the principles of LTN 1/20, the Gear Change policy and the revised Highway Code.</p> <p>For example, with the Linton Greenway design, at the 'farm shop' junction along the A1307, we see the county is again trying to remove priority for active travel and give it to motorists instead - but perversely making it more dangerous for all. They think that making unfounded claims</p>	<p>Delivery of the Greenways is moving forward with work commissioned for the next stage of the programme.</p> <p>As outlined in the report, GCP will utilise CPO if required. Indeed, the GCP Board has previously made clear its desire to use CPO powers if required</p> <p>As part of the ongoing stage of works we are approaching land owners for both access for surveys as well as to understand whether they are willing to either transfer land, or provide rights for the Greenway routes.</p> <p>The GCP clearly takes into account LTN 1/20, Gear Change and the updated Highway code in design of active travel schemes.</p> <p>GCP has procured design teams from the Joint</p>

		<p>about 'safety' will block scrutiny of their mistaken design choices. They are wrongly ignoring the principles of safe junction design found in LTN 1/20, which already balances the needs of all road users. These attempts to reimpose the old fashioned car-centric way of doing things are inappropriate and must stop.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What else will be done to expedite delivery of the Greenways, including steps to make Compulsory Purchase Orders if landowners will not be reasonable? - How will the GCP ensure that designs will be in compliance with the safety and accessibility principles of LTN 1/20, the Gear Change policy, and the updated Highway Code? - How will the GCP give its project managers the confidence to challenge outdated and dangerous car-centric thinking at the county council in order to make the Greenways programme the best it can be? 	<p>Professional Services Framework who are experienced in designing schemes to this guidance and standards.</p> <p>In addition, the designs are checked through an independent design review, Road Safety Audit review and will be presented to the public as part of the engagement process set out in the paper.</p> <p>The purpose of the Greenways is to provide new and improved access for Non-Motorised Users. The designs will utilise the most up to date guidance including LTN 1/20.</p> <p>GCP continue to work closely with County Council colleagues, including the Independent Road Safety Audit process, and stakeholder groups such as Camcycle, to deliver the best possible schemes.</p>
23	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda item 6 - Greater Cambridge Greenways Progress Update</p> <p>This is my first 'in person' since before the Pandemic, which has, I'm well aware, made life and work difficult for all. But the slow, if not snails pace of this project is more than concerning.</p> <p>This folder is on a 'Green Wheel' project. It was facilitated and funded by Marshalls, and involved much support from their company secretary Jonathon Barker, with fieldwork by</p>	<p>Greater Cambridge has an engaged and knowledgeable public – with differing views and opinions on many aspects of transport policy.</p> <p>The GCP continually seeks to consult and engage effectively, bringing parties together to deliver the best possible schemes whilst trying to manage the competing demands on our congested environment.</p> <p>Greenways were first considered by the County</p>

		<p>Nigel Brigham of Sustrans. The first meeting was 19 years ago and proposed a wheel and spokes design with links between villages, as well as spokes into Cambridge.</p> <p>If we are ignoring the collaboration between the County and Sustrans, that resulted in the Genome and Jubilee paths, in the early 2000s, it is hard to find any new or improved route that are not within an existing Highway boundary or RoW.</p> <p>It must be clear, that the benefits, of health and wellbeing, pollution reduction, independence for young and old and even Climate requirements are huge from such projects. They should be capable of being delivered far more easily and at a far lower cost than huge P&R sites. Back of envelope calculations suggest that for the same area of surface needed for 1,000 P&R spaces you could construct 4kms of Greenway at 20% of the cost.</p> <p>The first 'Greenways' report was in 2016. Six years later I see little progress, with suggestions in this report that apart from improving existing RoWs we cannot expect to see 'shovels' in under 3 years, some 19 years from original conception! New routes can and should, benefit Nature, as can now be seen on parts of the Chisholm Trail. That must also be part of the plan.</p> <p>Can I ask how it is possible for schemes, especially with such good public support, to take so long to develop and construct?</p>	<p>Council in 2016. The GCP subsequently picked up the baton, delivering Greenways quick wins in 2018 and 2019. Securing approval for the wider network in 2019 and 2020, and as outlined in the report, on-site delivering shorter term improvements from 2021.</p> <p>The GCP remains committed to deliver the Greenways network, as planned, by 2025.</p>
19	Camcycle	<p>Agenda item 7: Chisholm Trail: Phase 2</p> <p>Camcycle would like to thank the GCP and everyone who has worked so hard to deliver Phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail, a route which has already been enjoyed by many</p>	

	<p>people walking and cycling in the local area. In the 56 days it has been opened, it has already transformed thousands of journeys. Thank you! However, there is still some work to be done even there. Many issues remain, such as the dangerous and exclusionary barrier that was installed on the northern bridge ramp at the last moment without stakeholder consultation or consideration of LTN 1/20. Or the missing lighting in some sections, which is creating personal security concerns for many people.</p> <p>We welcome this agenda report and hope to see Phase 2 open as soon as possible. We agree with the Atkins Report that 'it is essential that all routes proposed are of high quality (including surface quality, convenience, alignment with desire lines, wayfinding, road markings, continuity)'. However, we are concerned that Figure 2 shows parts of the Phase 2 route have now been marked as 'existing routes'. Especially the section with the Beehive Centre and the Coldham's Lane bridge, both of which are currently in terrible condition. We also note with concern that the map has not been updated to include the Station Square cycleway that has been agreed upon with the developers of the B2/F2 sites.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What steps will be taken to ensure compliance with LTN 1/20 and its accessibility and safety principles, on Phase 1's remaining issues, and Phase 2's development? - How will problems be fixed on so-called 'existing routes' like the Beehive Centre and Coldham's Lane bridge, which are not suitable as-is and need updating 	<p>The Chisholm Trail project team is continuing to work to finalise the outstanding elements of the Phase 1 scheme.</p> <p>Further matters on the Phase 1 scheme will not be reviewed until after the Road Safety Audit 3 produces its recommendations.</p> <p>LTN 1/20 accessibility and safety principles have been incorporated into the Phase 2 proposals. The draft plans will be published in the summer as part of the engagement process, as outlined in the report</p> <p>Phase 2 of the Chisholm Trail is seeking to improve the non-motorised route from end of the Phase 1 scheme at Coldham's Common to the main Cambridge Station.</p> <p>Schemes such as Coldham's Lane bridge or the Beehive Centre will be considered by other GCP or County Council workstreams - specifically, the Network hierarchy paper that is considered elsewhere on this agenda.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		to bring them to the LTN 1/20 standard for all ages and abilities cycling?	
13	David Stoughton Chair, Living Streets Cambridge	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Chisholm Trail: Phase 2</p> <p>Agenda item 7 addresses development of the Chisholm trail. The concern Living Streets Cambridge wish to raise is the Increasing competition for use of shared facilities such as are referred to in paragraph 4.3 for provisions on the Cromwell Road. Whilst greatly welcoming the improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure, concern amongst our members about shared-use schemes is growing, especially about those that do not provide designated, and properly signposted, separation between sides of the tracks used by pedestrians and those for cyclists and others.</p> <p>For elderly and disabled walkers and especially for the blind and visually impaired, sharing the path with travellers on wheels can be alarming. Without wishing to impugn the steering of wheeled users it is the unexpectedness of silent vehicles and their, often necessarily, close passage that can be distressing. In addition to cyclists who will want to use these tracks as fast routes to their destination, increasing use by eScooters, electric delivery bikes and other forms of wheeled personal transport has greatly increased the sense of the visually impaired or frail that these facilities are not safe for them. What is being done to ensure that all pedestrians can walk safely on these shared-use facilities without being concerned by wheeled vehicles whizzing around them, often at high speed?</p>	<p>The GCP is conscious of the increasing demand for eScooters and eBikes.</p> <p>The latest design guidance is followed when bringing forward these schemes, so for example LTN 1/20 will be followed.</p> <p>Each scheme goes through an independent Road Safety Audit which takes this into consideration the shared facilities proposed</p> <p>The Chisholm Trail paper proposes consultation over the summer and we welcome Living Streets involvement in that process.</p>
23	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda item 7: Chisholm Trail: Phase 2</p> <p>All those years ago, and in the last century, after putting my</p>	<p>The question reflects the rich governance</p>

	<p>original ideas ‘in print’ I met with a helpful Officer from Railtrack to discuss the practicalities of permitted cycling and walking routes in the environs of Cambridge over rail land. His post disappeared in the collapse of Railtrack. I felt at that time that huge benefits could be gained from simple routes within a mile of the station. Add to that integration, within potential developments sites. That, together with linking to an Eastern Entrance to the station as first proposed in the Halford report of 1950 would multiply benefits for all. The dragging of feet on this section, and the failure of those with responsibility to push for progress, especially with Network Rail, has led to developers not effectively incorporating the route into their sites. I do, at least, see hints of progress with the essential matter of the ‘Driver’s Walking Route’.</p> <p>As an example of future failures, I note that the linked Atkins ‘desk’ report dated just last month, makes no reference to the obvious benefits of an easy to achieve and vastly improved route though the Beehive area where ‘pre application’ consultations are apparently occurring. That could even use a spare arch beneath Coldham’s Lane to create improved ‘grade separated’ cycling and walking access to the ‘sheds’ off Newmarket Road.</p> <p>Yet again dragging of feet from people behind desks lose much time, opportunities and money. How can we speed up these final steps?</p> <p>Can I ask that we have some consistency of more senior management, and from people prepared to gain local knowledge so as to speed up the process. Why keep repeating mistakes of the past?</p>	<p>environment across this geography.</p> <p>GCP has a specific role and remit delivering the City Deal. We seek to proactively engage with developers to ensure that the continuity of the Chisholm Trail is represented – as is our remit, supporting others.</p> <p>However, we must recognise that planning applications for developments must be considered by the statutory authorities as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the Chisholm trail can only be delivered with the agreement of several key landowners including Network Rail. We have been actively engaging with NR for some considerable period of time and are following their prescribed process to ensure delivery of the project.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8	<p>Andy Kennedy Secretary, Mill Road for People</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 – Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>We are supportive of the ambitious changes we see coming to Cambridge to reduce vehicle movement and improve routes for active travel. We would like some clarity on what this means for Mill Rd.</p> <p>The Road Network Hierarchy Review shows Mill Road as an ‘Area Access Street’. The definition of this type of street includes the words ‘These streets do not facilitate movements between distributor roads other than by public transport or active travel modes.’</p> <p>Can you confirm that this means that through traffic would no longer be permitted, including routes via side streets, e.g. from East Road to Hills Road via Mill Road and Tenison Road? If this is the case, how would this be enforced?</p> <p>Is this designation contingent on the outcome of the present Mill Road consultation? If the results of the consultation support it, will it be changed to a ‘Local access’ or ‘Civic’ street?</p>	<p>Mill Road is currently the subject of review, including a wide-ranging public engagement process. The outcome of this review will determine the next steps for the management of Mill Road.</p> <p>The GCP will complete the current process and report the outcomes to the County Council’s Highways & Transport Committee as planned.</p> <p>The outcome of the Mill Road review will be fed into the Network Hierarchy review process.</p>
10	<p>Andrew Milbourn Chair Hurst Park Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 - Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>A 20 mph limit is planned for Milton Road during construction. Given the priority of active travel would it not be better to plan for a permanent 20 mph limit now as part of the Milton Road plan rather than to have to add it later? There have been 2 fatalities of vulnerable road users on Milton Road. The improvements to the road will not actually reduce the dangers vulnerable road users are exposed to</p>	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Zero Vision Partnership (Road Safety Partnership) is currently developing a Speed Management Strategy to target a reduction in road casualties.</p> <p>As outlined in the Road Hierarchy Report, any permanent changes to speed limits should be</p>

		when crossing the road if there is still fast traffic.	made in the context of this work, and the wider review of the hierarchy.
15	Owen Scarrott	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>Eddington Avenue / Turing Way, as part of the flagship sustainable Eddington development was not designed or built as a bypass between two A-roads and the motorway (Huntingdon Road and Maddingly road / M11). Whilst designated on the road hierarchy as an “area access street”, providing a link between major distributor roads with no restrictions – it should not be – given the nature of the development as high-density residential and containing three educational establishments.</p> <p>The closure of Storey's Way and lack of through-traffic filters has made this road into an effective bypass for drivers using the route as a shortcut, rather than using larger A designated roads (A14-Histon Road and M11-Bar Hill).</p> <p>This is resulting in thousands of vehicles a day transiting through Eddington - including HGVs/motorway traffic running alongside a school playground.</p> <p>Eddington is a high population density, heavily pedestrianised and cyclable sustainable development. There are no formalised pedestrian crossings because the level of through traffic experienced today was never forecast for the development. It has resulted in the need for the school to request a crossing person, because the traffic volume is so bad.</p> <p>It is having a direct impact on the safety of schoolchildren</p>	<p>The review will include the route through Eddington and through movements between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road.</p> <p>This will be the subject of consultation and reported back to the Board and County Council.</p>

		<p>as well as air quality impacts alongside a school. The descriptor for an area access street in the papers is that they are not subject to restrictions unless a suitable alternative is available. However, the A14 and the Bar Hill route are both far more suitable access routes to the M11 than Eddington, so I think that some restrictions on through traffic should be added to reflect and protect the nature of the Eddington development.</p> <p>Will the committee recognise this planning oversight and make Eddington Ave / Turing Way non-thoroughfare for non-residents, and keep safety and sustainability a top priority for Eddington and Cambridge?</p>	
	<p>Dr George Vardoulakis and Vincent Poole</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review (but also relevant for item 9)</p> <p>“Don't look up” Arbury Road east! Speeding and congestion on this narrow residential road is shocking yet ignored. No action has been taken to address its uniquely inappropriate characteristics. Arbury Road suffered <u>two road deaths</u> and many accidents in last 10 years.</p> <p>Arbury Road east is just 7.3m wide. It has narrow pavements, no grass verge protection, no space for cycle lanes (no driveways or alternative parking capacity nearby).</p> <p>Arbury Road east has the same width as Union Lane. The LCWIP identifies them <u>together</u> as a <u>priority cycle route</u>, yet it's marked separately as 'area access' in the <u>draft hierarchy</u>. The draft categorises Arbury Road together with <i>wider roads</i>, many with space for cycle lanes and verges.</p>	<p>The highway network hierarchy review is a key component of the City Access agenda.</p> <p>A new highway network hierarchy is intended to provide a clear framework for the future management of the Cambridge highway network – exactly as proposed by Dr Vardoulakis.</p> <p>A review of the network hierarchy will require the setting of clear priorities, assessment of traffic modelling, alongside factors such as accident records, traffic volumes, bus routing and active travel patterns, to provide a composite, network-wide assessment.</p>

		<p>What are the objective and quantifiable criteria will be used in categorising roads in the draft/final road hierarchy?</p> <p>Arbury Road is a signposted “cycle route” and “traffic-calmed area.” It has two schools directly on it, yet schoolchildren cyclists are forced onto pavements, overtaken dangerously or passed closely at speed when walking. The road is also used as access for students going to The Grove, Arbury and Milton Road primary schools, Colleges Nursery School, and Chesterton Community College.</p> <p>Arbury Road East is an important, but unimproved part of a major cycle route already used by many cyclists as well as by cycling parents with primary age children, but it carries dangerous levels of speeding through-traffic including HGVs</p> <p>Will the committee ensure a joined-up approach for Arbury Road east considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LCWIP <u>recommendations</u> 2. <u>Cambridge Citizens Assembly</u> 3. Hierarchy review principles (<i>objective h Encouraging the use of the <u>most appropriate routes</u> for general traffic</i>) 4. The <u>tranche 2 EATF consultation?</u> 5. Milton Road redevelopment effects on Arbury Road and junction with Milton Road. <p>If we are to fulfil the GCP's aims of creating safe spaces for active travel, reduce pollution the logic must point towards the previously welcomed experimental modal filter</p>	<p>This will encompass to areas highlighted; LCWIP / ETROs / future programme of schemes</p> <p>Public consultation is an essential component of this work - It is intended that the initial ideas set out in the report will be the subject of public consultation later this year.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>on Arbury Road East, intended for Tranche 2 of Government spending</p> <p>What actions will the Committee/GCP take to join-up existing plans, recommendations and priorities for Arbury Road East?</p> <p>We cannot 'sit tight and assess' anymore..</p>	
20	Camcycle	<p>Agenda item 8: Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes this report, which has the seeds of an ambitious vision. We are pleased that the report has been inspired by places such as Waltham Forest and Ljubljana and is focused on how a city can best serve people. If followed, such a holistic vision will provide essential guidance as the GCP develops active travel and public transport networks. It will also help guide the future of streets including Mill Road, Arbury Road and Coldhams Lane where councillors and residents have repeatedly highlighted the lack of any strategic plan to solve problems.</p> <p>With the potential for a transformative change to local transport options, we agree that public conversation will be essential. The overall vision, benefits and reasons for change should be communicated as widely, clearly and inclusively as possible.</p> <p>Some of the street category descriptions are ambiguous; it is not clear how they will lead to concrete plans to reallocate road space. There appears to be little difference</p>	<p>The Network Hierarchy Review is a key component of the City Access agenda.</p> <p>A new highway network hierarchy is intended to provide a clear framework for the future management of the Cambridge highway network</p> <p>A review of the network hierarchy will require the setting of clear priorities, assessment of traffic modelling, alongside factors such as accident records, traffic volumes, bus routing and active travel patterns, to provide a composite, network-wide assessment.</p> <p>It is intended that the initial ideas set out in the report will be the subject of public consultation later this year. The consultation will include on-line/in person meetings.</p> <p>Whilst Area Access Streets and Local Access Streets are intended to have the same movement function, in terms of the trips they will</p>

		<p>between 'Area' and 'Local' Access Streets; these could be merged and reconsidered.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will plans proceed for consultation and engagement on this important review? Will they include both in-person and online options? How will this exercise differ from previous consultations? - What is the true difference between 'Area' and 'Local' Access Streets? Their descriptions seem to be nearly identical. - Their descriptions also include the weasel words '<i>wherever highway space permits</i>'; however this defies policy, because it is on narrow roads that it is most important to give priority to walking and cycling. Why would the GCP suggest abandoning its own principles, LTN 1/20, Gear Change and the Highway Code at exactly those places where people need them the most? How can you assure us that you are serious about making real change to prioritise sustainable transport? 	<p>facilitate, they serve different geographies with Area Access Streets being the primary route for access/egress for a wide area with Local Access Streets then providing access/egress for smaller neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The GCP is not abandoning its principles – This comprehensive review seeks to create conditions for significant changes to road space allocation. This obviously needs to reflect safety considerations and will be the subject of public consultation.</p>
14	David Stoughton Chair, Living Streets Cambridge	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Cambridge Road Network Hierarchy Review</p> <p>Living Streets are very pleased with the provisions of the new highway code and we in Cambridge are especially pleased to see that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is committed reviewing the road user hierarchy with a view to seeing the new provisions implemented. However, it requires significant changes to driver understanding and</p>	<p>As indicated in the report, any permanent changes to speed limits resulting from the network hierarchy review should be made in the context of the emerging Speed Management Strategy being developed by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Zero Vision</p>

		behaviour if benefits such as pedestrian priority at junctions are to be realised safely. Will plans include communicating the change of rules to drivers through signage and/or some form of media coverage, and will a speed limit of 20 miles an hour or less on all but primary distributor roads be implemented to ensure the safety of pedestrians?	Partnership. A communication strategy will be developed to raise awareness of the new network hierarchy, supporting the local and national road safety initiatives including the recent changes to the Highway Code.
2	Sue Purseglove 185 Milton Road	<p>Agenda item 9 – Milton Road</p> <p>What provision is being made for vehicles like removal lorries and builders' vans etc. to park where they cannot get into driveways, or where properties don't have driveways?</p>	<p>The current design for Milton Road includes double yellow lines along the length of the carriageway. This allows for loading and unloading of vehicles.</p> <p>The introduction of more restrictive loading bans on Milton Road has been raised by stakeholders and is worthy of further consideration.</p> <p>Public consultation on the final Traffic Regulation Order proposals will be undertaken as scheme delivery progresses.</p>
6	Michael Page	<p>Agenda item 9 – Milton Road</p> <p>In its letter to the Joint Assembly and Local Liaison Forum dated 14 Sept 2016 the GCP Executive Board gave support for <i>“an avenue of mature trees as a core design element along Milton Road, and also the provision of grass verges . . planting . . and effective wider public realm and landscaping”</i>. The drawings accompanying today's papers are civil engineering drawings which do not show all the details of the landscaping which is critically important to the project. The following are missing:</p>	<p>The GCP is committed to that shared vision.</p> <p>The landscaping drawings are published on the GCP website.</p> <p>This includes the latest design for Elizabeth Way Roundabout which was commissioned by the current sponsor – Redgate.</p>

		<p>Landscape design and planting plan for the Elizabeth Way/Milton Rd roundabout.</p> <p>Planting specification for the swales which have replaced much of the traditional grass verges in the original plans. Residents would like to have confirmation that these will be specified as green grass. Currently they are labelled as 'wildflower swales' and there is concern that they will appear as barren brown patches for the majority of the year rather than as a green corridor lining the road.</p> <p>The woodland walk/nature reserve adjacent to the north-west entrance to Woodhead Drive that was originally proposed by WSP Consultants in their January 2019 presentation.</p> <p>Can these issues please be addressed and documents published so we can be assured that the original shared vision of the LLF and the Executive Board will be realised?</p>	<p>The planting specification of the swales will remain as predominantly grassed areas with a wildflower mix included.</p> <p>The planting that is specified along Woodhead drive is confirmed and GCP do not intend to make changes to the small area of woodland in question.</p>
9	Andrew Milbourn Chair Hurst Park Residents Association	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Milton Road</p> <p>1. There are concerns about dangers the construction could pose to children on the school run to schools such as Milton Road and Chesterton CC. What are the volumes of pedestrians and cyclists at pinch points, such as by St Laurence's Church, and how will the safety of the children be ensured by the construction plan.</p> <p>2. During the construction a number of cyclists will be sharing the main carriageway with cars. It is likely that cars will not be able to overtake for long distances at peak times. This could lead to a variety of dangers due to frustration on the part of drivers and a sense of being intimidated for cyclists. What are the volumes of cycle traffic in Milton</p>	<p>The contractor, Milestone, will ensure that construction works are well segregated from local residents and travelling public.</p> <p>There will be clearly defined zones for cyclists and pedestrians to travel along which will be kept clear from construction risks and activities.</p> <p>Milestone will look to moving plant/ site vehicles away from sensitive areas at sensitive times of the day, e.g. at School drop off/ pick up times</p> <p>All modes of transport will be accommodated for during the construction works for e.g. the length</p>

		<p>Road based, on pre-covid statistics, and how will the construction plan cope with these safely.</p>	<p>of the works will be regulated so shared lengths are not excessive and once the area is passed there is an opening up of the area to allow safe overtaking by vehicles.</p> <p>Additionally, the contractor will seek to ensure that cyclists will be accommodated in their own travel lane as far as practicable (could be shared with pedestrians).</p> <p>The traffic management plan will be a live document that will be updated appropriately</p>
11	<p>Rosalind Lund Chair Arbury Road East Residents Association (ARERA)</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Milton Road</p> <p>Traffic flow on Arbury Road East is already excessive with back-up at busy times from Milton Road to North Cambridge Academy. Arbury Road Residents Association (ARERA) anticipate that once work starts, the Arbury Road/Union Lane junction will become a serious congestion point on Milton Road with significant traffic flow problems causing delays for buses and all traffic. There is also likely to be dangerous congestion on Arbury Road itself with risks to pedestrian and cyclist safety, especially for children and others travelling to the schools within half a mile or so.</p> <p>What mitigation is planned for this?</p> <p>Will the contractors be encouraged to work in a joined-up way with the GCP? For example, the proposals for an ETRO to enable a temporary modal filter for the eastern end of Arbury Road were agreed as part of Tranche 2 spending on promoting Active Travel.</p>	<p>The project team will manage the Arbury Road junction in line with the Construction Management plan.</p> <p>As with all areas of the site, the Arbury Road junction will be regularly assessed and if necessary, changes made to the traffic management layout and operation, following the successful approach recently taken on Histon Road.</p> <p>The Milton Road project team will not introduce a modal filter on Arbury Road – future ETROs will be considered under the Network Hierarchy paper on the agenda.</p>

		<p>If a modal filter were put in place on Arbury Road that would not only reduce traffic joining Milton Road at the junction to almost nothing, it would also prevent rat running through the Hurst Park Ave/Leys Road estate, and reduce the risk of accidents to children going to and from the seven schools in the vicinity, as well as for any vulnerable pavement users. Can we expect the temporary modal filter to go ahead?</p>	
16	<p>Maureen Mace Milton Road Residents' Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Milton Road</p> <p>At present, there are 13 bus stops along Milton Road, 6 have a bus shelter. After the reconstruction all stops will have a shelter where people will be able to sit in the dry for transport to arrive. Thank you.</p> <p>Now Histon Road's re-construction has been completed we have looked at that project and admired the simple, effective bus shelters. Not only do they provide shelter and seating but are predominantly glass so will not impede the view of residents exiting from their driveways. Milton Road residents would be happy to have the same/similar shelters.</p> <div data-bbox="530 1056 1001 1415" data-label="Image"> </div> <div data-bbox="1061 1040 1339 1415" data-label="Image"> </div>	<p>As part of the scheme, it is planned is to remove all of the old shelters and replace them with shelters similar to those on Histon Road</p> <p>The project team will review the advertising shelters with the relevant authority and provide a response to Maureen Mace.</p> <p>The area adjacent to 194 Milton Road is one of the few areas with space to locate the new inbound stop - Parking issues along the Milton Road will be included in proposals for a future residents parking zone, as was the case for the Histon Road project</p>

		<p>Bus shelter on Histon Road Number 194 Milton Road where the new bus stop will be sited.</p> <p>However, there is a problem. The Planning Department has put in an application for the bus shelter outside 214 Milton Road to have an Adshel double sided illuminated 6-sheet bus shelter with digital advertising displays.*</p> <p>The GCP moved the bus shelter because it causes queues that block the junction with Arbury Road. Instead, the bus stop will be outside number 194.</p> <p>I visited the new bus stop's location. The family who live there do not want any illuminated, digital, advertising in front of their house and are concerned it will be lit all night and may have moving images on it.</p> <p>Could the GCP ensure none of the bus stops along Milton Road have advertising on them especially any digital advertising that is lit up during the night, this has never been discussed with the residents.</p> <p>The people at number 194** are also concerned as they park in the layby outside their house which will be removed. An alternative could be their front garden becomes a drive for 2 cars, they need the reassurance that if this did happen the bus stop does not block their entrance.</p> <p><i>[Notes: *22/00072/ADV Replace existing double-sided internally illuminated 6-sheet Bus Shelter advertising displays with double-sided digital advertising displays. Advertising Right Adshel No 1501/0026 Bus Shelter Adjacent 214 Milton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1LG</i></p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p><i>**Number 194 is the Caretaker's house for Milton Road Junior School so it is doubtful if they should personally find the money to finance a drive. There are no Residents' Parking Schemes close to this area they could join. Could the GCP help in some way?]</i></p>	
	<p>Beatrice Rhind Histon Road resident and Anna Crutchley HRARA & BenRA member</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 Milton Road</p> <p>We remember hearing that after all the disruption for Histon Road residents with Thundering Trucks, and night time works both before and during the CGP roadworks, that Histon Road would never be used as a diversion route during the Milton Road works.</p> <p>I now hear that Histon Road will indeed be used as a diversion route and AT NIGHT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Can you confirm that it was promised that Histon Road would <i>not</i> be used as a diversion route? b) Is this true that Histon Road will be used as a night time diversion route, and if so the starting and stopping times during the night? c) How long will this continue? d) Will Histon Road ever be used as a daytime diversion route? e) Can you let me know whether the Milton Road diversion will be one way, or both ways f) What is the estimated level of traffic to be diverted onto Histon Road, in terms of HGVs as well as smaller road vehicles? <p>Local residents have had two years of A14 diversion 2 years of work on Histon Road and there are objections to</p>	<p>It is planned to undertake construction of Milton Road whilst retaining two way flow.</p> <p>This will minimise the need for diversions which will only be required at critical stages e.g. when final resurfacing takes place toward the later stages of the project.</p> <p>These full closures are planned to happen over night time hours in which case it is proposed to divert traffic towards Histon Road.</p> <p>As was the case when Histon Road was closed over night it is anticipated that traffic levels will be low at these times.</p>

		more, it is getting far too much.	
21	Camcycle	<p>Agenda item 9: Milton Road</p> <p>Milton Road is a long awaited project with many good things about it. The project team worked well with the community to design a tree-lined avenue with protected cycleways and (mostly) dedicated footways. They nearly achieved LTN 1/20-compliance before it was even published, except for one really bad section.</p> <p>The other problems come during the construction period, which will be a painful two-year period no matter what, but could still be improved.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed cycling provision during construction is almost nothing. It will not be suitable for the numerous families who send their children to the schools on Milton Road. People walking and cycling will be forced onto a small overcrowded pavement. What additional steps can the GCP take to provide safe cycle routes during the construction period? - Junctions such as that with Arbury Road are going to be nightmarishly congested and unsafe for the next two years if they are stuck with their current level of motor traffic, holding up buses and endangering people walking and cycling. Will the Joint Assembly step up and support convening a working group of residents and stakeholders, using their 	<p>The contractor, Milestone, will ensure that construction works are well segregated from local residents and travelling public.</p> <p>There will be clearly defined zones for cyclists and pedestrians to travel along which will be kept clear from construction risks and activities.</p> <p>Milestone will look to moving plant/ site vehicles away from sensitive areas at sensitive times of the day, e.g. at School drop off/ pick up times</p> <p>All modes of transport will be accommodated for during the construction works for e.g. the length of the works will be regulated so shared lengths are not excessive and once the area is passed there is an opening up of the area to allow safe overtaking by vehicles.</p> <p>Additionally, the contractor will seek to ensure that cyclists will be accommodated in their own travel lane as far as practicable (could be shared with pedestrians).</p> <p>The traffic management plan will be a live document that will be updated appropriately</p> <p>The project team will manage the Arbury Road junction in line with the Construction Management plan.</p>

		<p>recommendations to provide temporary solutions for better junction management?</p> <p>- Please also list any additional construction mitigation measures the GCP will implement to significantly reduce motor traffic passing through Arbury Road junction and along Milton Road.</p> <p>- The final design proposes a tiny 1.3m-wide footway and 1.2m-wide cycleway in front of Seeley's Court (next to 383 Milton Road). After the scandal of the narrow Histon Road footways, will the GCP learn from that mistake and ensure that footways and cycleways at least meet the minimum requirements? This may mean forgoing a proposed short extension of an existing bus lane, but the safety of people walking and cycling must be a higher priority.</p>	<p>As with all areas of the site, the Arbury Road junction will be regularly assessed and if necessary, changes made to the traffic management layout and operation, following the successful approach recently taken on Histon Road.</p> <p>The Milton Road project team will not introduce a modal filter on Arbury Road – future ETROs will be considered under the Network Hierarchy paper on the agenda.</p> <p>In terms of the crossing at Seeley's Court, the designers will look to adjust the kerb line in this area to reduce the narrowing of the footway and cycleway through this pinch point.</p> <p>The project team do not intend to shorten this stretch of bus lane.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------