

24th February 2021 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item

Questioner	Question
<p>Matthew Danish on behalf of Camcycle</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,550 members that works for more, better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities in the Greater Cambridge region. We have the following comments and questions for the Joint Assembly, stemming from agenda item 6 'Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy':</p> <p>We welcome the introduction of new proposals to deal with cycling 'missing links' in the Greater Cambridge region. In general, we believe that the GCP will gain excellent value for its money by building a network of high-quality cycle routes suitable for all ages and abilities. There is much need for improvement throughout the region, and while the routes identified are relevant, we have questions about how they were prioritised in the Active Travel Study document that accompanies the agenda.</p> <p>We ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Why at this stage were certain 'key cycle connections' left out of the evaluation, and will they be added as the project moves forward? For example, Arbury Road (east) is one of the most important cycle links in the area without any infrastructure; it has been identified by the LCWIP, it is marked as a 'key cycle connection', but otherwise it has been left out of the Active Travel Study. Likewise for Barnwell Road and Brooklands Avenue. (2) Will the GCP commit to using LTN 1/20 as the basis for designing high-quality cycling infrastructure? We are concerned that some of the specific 'gap analysis' sections in the Active Travel Study make low-quality suggestions that would be worse than nothing, such as shared-use pavements or narrow advisory cycle lanes. (3) What were the criteria for the ranking of Cycling Missing Links in Table 1 of agenda item 6 and what were the specific numbers for each item?
<p>Rosalind Lund, Chair Arbury Road East Residents Association (ARERA)</p>	<p>Agenda Item 6: Public Transport Improvements and City Access Strategy</p> <p>Why is Arbury Road South absent from the prioritised list of missing links for the GCP's Future Investment Strategy? Agenda Item 6, para 5.8 on the draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) provides an initial prioritised list of missing links (table 1 p31). But table1 (p135) shows the Arbury Road "corridor" as complete. It is not. Arbury Road from North Cambridge Academy to Milton Road has no cycle provision. It is a narrow road with parking on pavements. It and Union Lane are a missing link in the corridor to the cycle bridge across to Newmarket Road or to Cambridge North station.</p> <p>When SQW evaluated this 'corridor' in 2019, it only considered Phases 1 and 2 of the GCP's improvements and judged that was 'complete'. Mike Davies, then</p>

	<p>Director of Cycling for GCP/CCC, disagreed. He offered to hold a workshop on how to improve cycling and pedestrian provision on the remainder of Arbury Road in October 2019. After his departure, the Cycling Team (January 2020) refused to hold this workshop because of imminent improvement works on Histon Road.</p> <p>CCC's LCWIP indicates that Arbury Road South (same section as above) and Union Lane should be treated as a "prioritised cycling route" implemented in the "short term" and recommends "consider making this section of Arbury Road one way in order to provide on-road cycle lanes or put in modal filter". The CCC's Highways Committee has already agreed that such a modal filter should be in the second tranche of government supported measures to combat COVID and reduce pollution. This should be shown high on the GCP's list of priorities.</p>
<p>Michael Page on behalf of the Hurst Park Estate and Milton Road Residents' Associations and County Councillor Jocelyne Scutt Chair of Milton Road LLF</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7: Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>In reference to pages 123 and 129 of Agenda item 7; it is stated in 12.8 that in order to manage network capacity, construction of Milton Road was delayed to coincide with the completion of the Histon Road works - and in 12.9 it states that the Histon Road works remain on schedule for completion by the summer of this year.</p> <p>However, in 15.9 there is an assumption that construction on Milton Road will not begin until April 2022 – approx. 10 months later.</p> <p>You may remember that public consultation on the Milton Rd project started in December 2015 and was followed by years of hotly debated but productive work between the project team and stakeholders including residents' associations and the Local Liaison Forum. This resulted in a Final Concept design and Strategic Outline Business Case approved by the Board in the summer of 2018. A Final Design including landscaping was approved by the Board in March 2019 and a frozen 2D design was released in June 2020 with further engineering design details completed by the end of last year.</p> <p>Question 1 to officers: What is the reason for a further 10 month delay to the start of construction? Is it really necessary after all the time that has been available to prepare during the Histon Rd works?</p> <p>Question 2 to Assembly members: Are you content to allow another year to pass by without challenge before construction starts on what should be a shovel-ready, oven-ready project, while sections of Milton Road continue to crumble and disintegrate?</p>