

**1st October 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board – Public Questions
Listed by Agenda Item**

No.	Questioner	Question(s)
1	Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 8: Greenway Schemes</p> <p>Reference in the meeting documents is made to the ‘cycle path’ through the Wing Development - this is to be an NMU route available to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. The same applies to the Quay to Lode well used ‘cycle path’. These are NMU route not cycle paths.</p> <p>Prior to approval of the Greenways proposals today, will the GCP please confirm that ‘shared use’ is as defined in all the Greenway consultation documents – available to all three vulnerable road users – pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and ensure that the routes are delivered as such? This applies to all the routes being considered at this meeting.</p> <p>Will the Board ensure that equestrians are not excluded from any sections unless a genuine safe alternative route is available to them (defaulting to the legally available option of the busy highway, already identified as unsafe for cyclists, does not count as ‘safe’)?</p> <p>Where Pedestrian / Cycle Only routes are to be created / improved, will the Board please require that the Safety Audit must assess the impact on the safety of equestrians created by the schemes?</p>
2.	Paul Bearpark	<p>Agenda Item 9: Better Public Transport - Waterbeach to North East Cambridge</p> <p>I live on Cambridge Road, Waterbeach, close to 3 of the 4 route proposals through Waterbeach village. I am the founder of Waterbeach Cycling Campaign and I led the development of the transport policies for Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan. I strongly support improved active travel and public transport provision. However, I am concerned that the narrow range of options, through Waterbeach, with 3 of the 4 options taking the same alignment through the Cambridge Rd/Glebe Rd pinchpoint, and insufficient weight given to the difficulties of delivering a route through here, will lead to difficulties delivering the entire route.</p> <p>These difficulties are only mentioned in Appendix E pg 142 of the board paper which states” <i>Space is constrained here so any transitway alignment may either <u>require housing demolition</u> or would encroach on allotments. Passes close to houses and may face opposition from residents.”</i></p> <p>The Project Manager has told me that no demolition is intended but it is difficult to see how a route through this pinchpoint is possible without demolition or significant impact on residents.</p> <p>Q1 Can the GCP provide a route through Waterbeach village that will not involve demolition of property or result in significant opposition from residents?</p> <p>Q2 Why are there not more route options through Waterbeach village? For example, a route along Waterbeach High St was rejected very early in the process. Concerns about reliability could be addressed through consideration of parking controls and modal filters at suitable points. This would have the additional benefit of making the centre of the village more attractive for walking and cycling and better serve the east of the village and new town.</p> <p>Q3 Will a detailed map showing houses at risk of demolition or significantly affected be available during the consultation?</p>