

**17th February 2022 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

Question	
<p>Cllr Mike Harrison (Chairman General Purposes and Highways. Royston Town Council)</p>	<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>Paul Bearpark District Councillor for Milton and Waterbeach</p>	<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 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><i>What progress has been made by Atkins on the design?</i></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><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>

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 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?
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 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</p>

	<p>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>
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>
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 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 to bring them to the LTN 1/20 standard for all ages and abilities cycling?
<p>Jim Chisholm</p>	<p>Agenda item 7: Chisholm Trail: Phase 2</p> <p>All those years ago, and in the last century, after putting my 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>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>Andrew Milbourn Chair Hurst Park Residents Association</p>	<p>Agenda Item 9 - Milton Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 Road based, on pre-covid statistics, and how will the construction plan cope with these safely.
<p>Owen Scarrott</p>	<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</p>

	<p>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 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 two road deaths 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 priority cycle route, yet it's marked separately as 'area access' in the draft hierarchy. The draft categorises Arbury Road together with <i>wider roads</i>, many with space for cycle lanes and verges.</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 recommendations 2. Cambridge Citizens Assembly 3. Hierarchy review principles (<i>objective h Encouraging the use of the most appropriate routes for general traffic</i>)

	<p>4. The tranche 2 EATF consultation?</p> <p>5. Milton Road redevelopment effects on Arbury Road and junction with Milton Road.</p> <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 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>
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 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?</p>
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 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?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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?
Sue Purseglove Milton Road resident	<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>
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape design and planting plan for the Elizabeth Way/Milton Rd roundabout. 2. 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. 3. 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>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>
Andrew Milbourn Chair Hurst Park Residents Association	<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 when crossing the road if there is still fast traffic.</p>

<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>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>
<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="426 1471 901 1830" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Bus shelter on Histon Road the new bus stop will be sited.</p> <div data-bbox="963 1456 1244 1830" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Number 194 Milton Road where</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>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 more, it is getting far too much.</p>
<p>Camcycle</p>	<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 recommendations to provide temporary solutions for better junction management?- 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.- 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. |
|--|--|