

Lancaster Way Consultation Outcome

To: Highways & Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 10 November 2020

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director: Place & Economy.

Electoral division(s): All in East Cambridgeshire

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable

Key decision: No

Outcome: To provide approval for the revisions to the Lancaster Way roundabout including the addition of a signalised pedestrian crossing of the A142.

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to:

- a) Note and comment on the outcome of the public consultation
- b) Approve the addition of a signalised crossing within the scope of the project and cover this with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority through a change request.

Officer contact:

Name: Chris Foyle
Post: Project Manager (Development)
Email: chris.foyle@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Member contacts:

Names: Cllr Ian Bates/Cllr Mark Howell
Post: Chairman/Vice-Chairman
Email: ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 Between 27 July and 18 September 2020, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) held a public consultation on a scheme to develop the A142/Lancaster Way roundabout in order to unlock further benefits of the measures from the A10/BP roundabout capacity improvements. The BP roundabout, funded by the Combined Authority, has recently been completed and is open for traffic. The project is a priority for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and East Cambridgeshire District Council who are funding the scheme.
- 1.2 This is a vital development to support economic growth within East Cambridgeshire and is expected to generate up to 2,500 jobs, 75% of which are expected to be from the local area. Cambridgeshire County Council agreed with the developer of the local Business Park, to carry out a feasibility study encompassing the A10, BP and Lancaster Way roundabouts to assess the current congestion issues limiting future growth which was completed in October 2018.
- 1.3 Improvements were designed to reduce congestion and improve capacity to support additional planned development. The design identified that by increasing the approach lanes from one to two lanes, the capacity on the roundabout itself could be increased and therefore see traffic move through the junction more efficiently. These changes include:
 - Widening of the road to accommodate two lane entries on the A142 Witchford Road arm of the roundabout.
 - On Lancaster Way, the two-lane approach is extended further into the business park.
 - Widening the road to accommodate two lane entries on the A142 Witchford Bypass approach.
- 1.4 The consultation was held to share the details with residents and receive feedback, with the public having the chance to offer comments for consideration on the proposed design.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The questionnaire used for the consultation is attached as Appendix A. This consultation was then advertised and respondents asked to comment via an online survey. Other forms of response, such as detailed written submissions, were also received and have been incorporated into the analysis of the feedback. The online survey included the opportunity for 'free text' responses and the analysis of these has been included within the report. Local public bodies and stakeholders also encouraged responses to the survey. Appendix A contains a breakdown of the consultation responses. In total, 200 individuals and 12 stakeholders responded.
- 2.2 A high level summary of the responses to the consultation is as follows for the individuals who responded:
 - Over half of respondents indicated they opposed the proposals (56%);
 - Over a quarter of respondents indicated they supported the proposals (28%);
 - 16% neither supported nor opposed the proposals;
 - At a local level, just under half of respondents who were located with the 'CB6' area

indicated they were opposed to the proposals (49%). Just over a third of these respondents supported the proposals (34%). 17% neither supported nor opposed the proposals.

2.3 Further to this, 12 Stakeholders also responded as follows:

- 7 (58%) indicated they either 'opposed' or 'strongly opposed' the proposals;
- 4 (33%) indicated they either 'supported' or 'strongly supported' the proposals;
- 1 (9%) indicated they 'neither supported nor opposed' the proposals

2.4 The final question asked in the consultation related to whether respondents would like to leave a comment on the proposals. 178 of the respondents and all of the stakeholders left comments regarding the proposals. These responses centred on the following themes;

- Impact on cycling and walking. Comments were made that the proposals would have a negative impact on cycling in the area. Some felt that improvements to cycling and walking would be of benefit to the business park. Some also felt that the design did not comply with the Department for Transport's LTN 1/20 guidance, East Cambridgeshire District Council's plans to improve cycling and walking or the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan. The introduction of additional lanes would make the uncontrolled crossing more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Most respondents felt that a signalised or grade separated crossing would solve this issue. Further to this, respondents also indicated they would support the proposals if a form of controlled crossing was included.
- Impact on equestrians. Comments were also received on the lack of equestrian crossing and access at the roundabout and that the extra lanes will decrease the safety for equestrians crossing the arms of the roundabout. Some of the respondents also felt that a Pegasus crossing was needed as part of the proposals.
- Proposals offered no improvements. Comments were received from respondents that felt the proposals were not going to address the congestion issues on the A142. There were also comments received that the impact of the proposals would discourage the use of the Active Travel route and increase the use of personal vehicle usage.
- Construction disruption. Comments were also received that the proposals would cause disruption to the travelling public. No details of how the construction would take place were provided in the consultation. However, the works to improve the A10 / A142 BP Roundabout were in place at the time.
- Historical roundabout design. Comments were also received that referred to an earlier configuration of the roundabout. The roundabout did previously have 2 lane entries, but the proposals consulted on are for a different arrangement to the previous one.
- That it was not needed. Respondents also commented that the proposals were no longer needed and that travel habits had changed, due to the pandemic, and that the costs were not necessary.

2.5 Of all the comments received, the theme of impacting on non-motorised users was the strongest. The comments stating that the proposals are not improving provision for other

users cannot be ignored, especially where the comments received indicate that the situation for non-motorised users would be made worse.

- 2.6 Therefore, it is suggested that the scheme include a signalised crossing of the A142 eastern arm of the roundabout. This is the existing un-controlled crossing currently in use. By including a signalised crossing within the proposals it is felt that those individuals who made objections on safety grounds would then support the proposals.
- 2.7 This cost is estimated to be in the region of £100k in addition to the existing budget of £760k. It is proposed that this could come from the savings made on the already delivered A10 / A142 BP Roundabout. This will be covered by a change request submitted to the CPCA.
- 2.8 In the previous paper presented to the Committee in July 2020, the works were scheduled to commence in January 2021 if the proposals remained as those consulted upon. Due to the inclusion of the signalled crossing the design will need to be revised and a delay of 2 months to the commencement is likely and this will be covered in the change request too.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

The proposal will improve the flow of traffic and increase the number of jobs in the area and thus improve people's life chances.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

By facilitating an additional 2,500 jobs, the scheme will increase economic development.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

The scheme will reduce congestion which is highly polluting. By including pedestrian and cycle facilities, it will also encourage these modes of travel.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are fully funding this scheme which will be delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

- 4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications
There are no significant implications within this category.
- 4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications
There are no significant implications within this category.
- 4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement
There are no significant implications within this category.
- 4.7 Public Health Implications
There are public health concerns regarding the possible reduction in the ability to safely walk and cycle following the improvement proposed, therefore we will work with the Public Health Department to address these concerns as part of the final scheme.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes
Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes
Name of Officer: Gus de Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? To be confirmed
Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact? To be confirmed
Name of Officer: Elsa Evans

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications? Yes
Name of Officer: Sarah Silk

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact? Yes
Name of Officer: Graham Hughes

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health? Yes
Name of Officer: Iain Green

5. Source documents

5.1 Source documents

Appendix A 142/Lancaster Way roundabout: Summary Report of Consultation Findings

Appendix B Lancaster Way Roundabout Consultation Plan. Ref (5020235-SKA-HCP-LW-DR-CH001 P03)

5.2 Location, Room 316, Shire Hall, Cambridge