

## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (4th November 2021)

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No.	Question from:	Item	Question
1.	Charlotte de Blois	GCP City Access Strategy	<p>Can you confirm the standard and breadth of evidence which you will seek in this consultation? To elaborate will the data gathered from the community through door-knocking be included; will traders be interviewed personally and given the opportunity to demonstrate their trading concerns through reference to monthly figures; will displaced traffic be assessed by electronic monitoring; will ‘near misses’ be included using data from community reporting sites; will pollution levels be monitored using sensors; will growth in local population in specific areas be taken into account; will the width of pavements along the entire stretch of Mill Road be calculated and factored in; will data from local General Practitioners be sought to identify pollution related illness street by street; will there be a realistic assessment of speeding on the road and of course will reference be made to data on accidents? Mill Road is one of the most dangerous roads in the county.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The public consultation for Mill Road that the GCP is being asked to undertake next year will seek to engage with all elements of the Mill Road community and other communities in neighbouring areas. This engagement will help shape the future approach to Mill Road, and how it ties in with the wider City Access proposals.</p>
No.	Question from:	Item	Question:
2.	Elizabeth Walter	GCP City Access Strategy	<p>At your last meeting, 3 months ago, you promised a consultation on Mill Road bridge. So far, nothing has happened, despite consultations and implementation taking place in several other areas of Cambridge. In addition, we now know that the multiple submissions which invalidated the quantitative part of the previous consultation – nevertheless in favour of the bus gate – came overwhelmingly from pro-car activists. Can you now</p> <p>a. explain how implementation in 2023 at the earliest (as per the supporting document) is in any way reflective of the wishes of local residents and traders, all of whom desperately want to see this</p>

			<p>issue resolved?</p> <p>b. confirm that powers becoming available to you shortly will resolve the issue of blue badge access that was a major factor in your previous decision?</p> <p>c. give us firm assurances that in the meantime you will take urgent measures to tackle some of Mill Road's most pressing problems, such as frequent dangerous overtaking on the bridge and the increase in pavement parking, which is both dangerous and impedes wheelchair and buggy access?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The public consultation for Mill Road that the GCP is being asked to undertake next year will consider permanent measures to reduce traffic and improve the environment of the route in a city wide context to ensure that its implications are fully assessed and understood and that suitable mitigation measures are developed to manage issues arising from the displacement of any traffic to other streets/areas.</p> <p>At this stage it is anticipated that the full implementation of the solutions emerging from consultation would take place in 2023, although there may be opportunities for the earlier implementation of 'quick win' measures to address localised issues along the road.</p> <p>The powers to allow local authorities to enforce moving vehicle traffic offences that Government is expected to approve next year may create opportunities for a more flexible approach to any measures to control through traffic movements on Mill Road.</p>
	Chair		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
3	CamCycle	GCP City Access Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is it correct that under current proposals the second Mill Road consultation would not take place until June 2022, with no improvements due to be made until the following year?</li> <li>- When could the results of the recent consultation on phase two schemes for the Active Travel Fund be made public? Local communities are keen to see progress on schemes in their areas.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We note that a county member workshop is to be scheduled for non-Greater Cambridge ETROs in the coming months, but what about other schemes in addition to those proposed for St Neots and St Ives? Many more experimental schemes could be trialled across the county to improve active travel links in areas which are currently poorly served. Integration with the county's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) is important as well as with the GCP's City Access project.</li> </ul>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The GCP is being asked to undertake a further public consultation for Mill Road next year with an expectation of measures to reduce traffic on Mill Road being implemented in 2023 although there may be opportunities for the earlier implementation of 'quick win' measures to address localised issues along the road.</p> <p>Some 53 schemes with the potential to meet Government's requirements were identified in response to the invitation to apply for Active Travel funding from Tranche 2. Further work to develop the schemes has resulted in consultation on many schemes across the County. The responses are currently being analysed by the County Council's Business Intelligence group. It is expected that this will be completed, and a report compiled at the end of November. The results of the consultation will be published on the County Council's web site at this time.</p> <p>The workshop will consider all of the schemes that have been suggested and the consultation response to date. Work on further schemes that have proved more difficult to develop is continuing. The schemes are being considered alongside the County Councils LCWIP.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
4	Mr V Poole	GCP City Access Strategy	<p>Section 2.4 (Page 53) considers 'A second tranche of some 50+ Countywide Active Travel schemes' but says that 'a number of these schemes sit on the strategic road network'</p> <p>Could a list of roads on the strategic road network be published? Will the Committee also agree that:</p>

			<p>In the case of Arbury Road East which is very narrow, dangerous and does not even have B-road designation, it should not be considered a strategic road for motorised city access in the future</p> <p>Arbury Road should be a strategic road for active travel instead as it already carries high cycle volumes despite its perils. Wider roads with better infrastructure and protection for cyclists and pedestrians exist and these would seem more appropriate choices as strategic access roads for motorised transport in North Cambridge</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>There is currently no formal definition of roads forming the strategic road network outside of the national road classification system. In the context of managing traffic within the city, strategic routes are considered as those that are used by significant volumes of through traffic, where measures to control their use will have significant knock-on impacts. The review of the road network hierarchy aims to address this.</p> <p>The review of the road network hierarchy that the GCP has been asked to lead on will consider the future role and function of individual roads and streets, including Arbury Road, with a view to creating a new network where more road space is allocated to active travel and public transport trips.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
5.	Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridge shire British Horse Society	GCP City Access Strategy	<p>The impact of these schemes on the safety of equestrians must be factored into the proposals. The highway space allocated for equestrians must be identified.</p> <p>The current projects are all very urban areas but it is highly possible that at least some of the 50+ other projects will include semi urban and rural areas which will affect equestrians. Horses are entitled to use the whole of the highway network therefore they should be taken into account for all locations.</p> <p>The restrictive blue cycle only or shared cycle / pedestrian signed lanes are dangerous for horse riders forcing them into the traffic flow from the safety of the pavement edge allowing fast moving cycle traffic on their inside as well as vehicles on their outside. There is a three-way sign – pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders – which could be used but it would require policy change to accept that equestrians have the right to use these safe paths along with other vulnerable road users. Please will the Committee undertake that identification of the road space allocation for equestrians will be required in all these projects? This is not just for the safety of equestrians but all road users. Will</p>

			the Committee also undertake to consider the use of the three-way sign, or alternative, as a simple means of equal, safe provision for all vulnerable road users?
			<p><b>Response:</b> The focus of these schemes is to encourage walking and cycling as a mode of travel for significant numbers of people but the few schemes within a semi-urban or rural area will be designed to ensure that equestrians are not disadvantaged.</p> <p>The review of the road network hierarchy that the GCP has been asked to lead on will consider the future role and function of individual roads and streets and where appropriate will ensure inclusivity for all users.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
6.	Miss Katie Hawkes	GCP City Access Strategy	On behalf of Mill Road - a Street for People, I should like to ask a question about the timing of the proposed consultation on Mill Road, including its relationship with broader consultations.
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The GCP is being asked to undertake a further public consultation for Mill Road next year to consider permanent measures to reduce traffic and improve the environment of the route, with an expectation of measures to reduce traffic on Mill Road being implemented in 2023 although there may be opportunities for the earlier implementation of ‘quick win’ measures to address localised issues along the road.</p> <p>This work will be developed in a city wide context to ensure that its implications are fully assessed and understood and that suitable mitigation measures are developed to manage issues arising from the displacement of any traffic to other streets/areas.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
7.	Mr Andrew Kennedy	GCP City Access Strategy	My name is Andrew Kennedy and I’m a resident Romsey in Cambridge. I would like to seek clarity on the question of responsibility for ensuring the quality of both the consultation on and implementation of a Mill Road scheme. You are considering a recommendation to allow this work to be carried out by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. But can you confirm that it is this Committee that will be publicly accountable for its quality?

			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The GCP is being asked to undertake a further public consultation for Mill Road. As a partner authority of the GCP, the County Council will have an opportunity to influence the format and content of the public consultation. GCP and County officers will liaise as the consultation plan is developed.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Mr Afzal Aslam	GCP City Access Strategy	Road closures affecting the taxi trade
			<b>Response:</b> All user groups will be taken into account and consulted in the development of active travel schemes.
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>9.</b>	Mrs Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridge shire British Horse Society	Business Planning – Capital Programme	<p><i>Longstanton Bridleway 10 upgrade</i>  <i>The NMU route is proposed alongside the access roads into Northstowe, so improvements to the bridleway would also facilitate <b>a new circular route using the A14 NMU route and the new access road NMU routes</b>. The length of the section of the bridleway to be resurfaced is circa 750 metres in length and has a width of 3.5 metres.</i></p> <p>NMU means pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. A shared route is pedestrians and cyclists only. The removal of the grass surface, hard topping and reduction of the usable width (from 6-7m to 3m) of ca. 750 metres of the bridleway to facilitate the new NMU circular route has been carried out against the loudly voiced wishes of the horse riders, other soft surface users (pedestrians, runners, dog walkers) and those concerned for the environment. The Southern Access Road West (SARW) into Northstowe NMU route has been delivered as a shared pedestrian / cycle route only.</p> <p>Equestrian amenity has been compromised while the promised access on the path alongside the SARW to ‘provide a circular route’ has not been delivered. This is inequitable and inexcusable. Will the Committee undertake that the promised NMU access path alongside the SARW will be delivered and advise when this will happen?</p> <p>Equestrians must also be included on the new path which links the southern end of the new bridge to the SARW NMU path to provide circular access. Will the Committee confirm that is the intention?</p>

			All off road paths which link communities, the rights of way network as well as in semi urban areas, must be available to all vulnerable road users – pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Will the Committee undertake that this should be included as policy?																																												
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The new surface is not hard as it is granite dust finish with some give. The Asset Information Manager has confirmed that there is no definitive width established for this bridleway. The comment about useable width is not accurate. Users are not prevented from moving along the gentle side slopes although these areas have been seeded with a grass and wild flower mix to aid biodiversity. Users are more likely to use the 3m wide dust surface.</p> <p>The Southern Access Road West (SARW) has been delivered by Homes England and was subject to the Planning process which decided the nature of the facility provided. The decision regarding this was not made by CCC.</p> <p>The new path is being implemented as part of the Planning process relating to an adjacent development. The Highways Development Management team are assisting through the development planning process.</p>																																												
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>																																												
10.	Mrs Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridge shire British Horse Society	Business Planning – Capital Programme	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>B/C.1.020</td> <td>Bar Hill to Northstowe cycle route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- Committed</td> <td>982</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.021</td> <td>Girton to Oakington Cycle Route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- Committed</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.022</td> <td>Busway to Science Park cycle route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- Committed</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.023</td> <td>Boxworth to A14 Cycle Route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- 2022-23</td> <td>550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.024</td> <td>Dry Drayton to NMU link cycle route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- Committed</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.026</td> <td>Hilton to Fenstanton Cycle Route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- 2022-23</td> <td>500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B/C.1.027</td> <td>Buckden to Hinchingsbrooke cycle route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- 2022-23</td> <td>780</td> </tr> </table>	B/C.1.020	Bar Hill to Northstowe cycle route			- Committed	982	B/C.1.021	Girton to Oakington Cycle Route			- Committed	1,000	B/C.1.022	Busway to Science Park cycle route			- Committed	150	B/C.1.023	Boxworth to A14 Cycle Route			- 2022-23	550	B/C.1.024	Dry Drayton to NMU link cycle route			- Committed	300	B/C.1.026	Hilton to Fenstanton Cycle Route			- 2022-23	500	B/C.1.027	Buckden to Hinchingsbrooke cycle route			- 2022-23	780	<p>Why are these community linking safe off road access projects ‘Highways England Non-Motorised User (NMU) Routes’ being delivered as cycle routes and not as NMU routes? Item 2 of that 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021 report and Table 1 clearly state ‘NMU’ throughout.</p> <p>Why has no consultation taken place with the British Horse Society about these projects when they clearly could impact positively on safety? Why has the Local Access Forum not been advised of these projects? How will equestrians be included as policy in these projects and any others going forward?</p>	
B/C.1.020	Bar Hill to Northstowe cycle route			- Committed	982																																										
B/C.1.021	Girton to Oakington Cycle Route			- Committed	1,000																																										
B/C.1.022	Busway to Science Park cycle route			- Committed	150																																										
B/C.1.023	Boxworth to A14 Cycle Route			- 2022-23	550																																										
B/C.1.024	Dry Drayton to NMU link cycle route			- Committed	300																																										
B/C.1.026	Hilton to Fenstanton Cycle Route			- 2022-23	500																																										
B/C.1.027	Buckden to Hinchingsbrooke cycle route			- 2022-23	780																																										

			<p>In particular, we would like details of the 'Bar Hill to Northstowe' project – does this impact on Wilsons Road Bridleway northern section as it was mentioned in a social media post by a Local Councillor? If so, we hereby give notice of our objection to changes to the surface of this beautiful, grassy, rural bridleway.</p> <p>Equestrians are entitled to use the whole of the highway which includes the verges. The right of equestrians to use the verge can only be extinguished through a legal event. We challenge any project to create a shared cycle / pedestrian path using the verge without identification of the legal event being used to expel equestrians from the safety of the verge. There is no requirement under HA80 cycle path creation to exclude equestrians.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The NMU Programme 2 routes should where possible be fully inclusive to all NMU's. There has been no consultation regarding scheme details with anyone as yet because the schemes are still at concept stage and have not been developed.</p> <p>The Bar Hill to Northstowe scheme connects to the existing NMU provision between School Lane and the B1050 and will therefore not impact the Wilsons Road Bridleway.</p> <p>The improved section of Wilsons Road with funding from Highways England is correctly described in the article as a new surface for all users.</p> <p>The verge is part of the highway. As such the rights of all highway users can only be removed by a legal event. The use of all parts of the highway are managed by the highway authority within its duties and powers.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
11.	Mrs Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer –	Business Planning – Capital Programme	<p>This Committee posted an ill-informed, unacceptable announcement:  <a href="https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/news/work-to-improve-local-paths-as-part-of-councils-commitment-to-greener-transport-links?utm_source=Facebook&amp;utm_medium=social&amp;utm_campaign=Orlo&amp;fbclid=IwAR3xUTdY2LsQEY1eYDKqImu71g3GTZXZ00h17pSW5dGvN7RbJGNH10M-Xpc">https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/news/work-to-improve-local-paths-as-part-of-councils-commitment-to-greener-transport-links?utm_source=Facebook&amp;utm_medium=social&amp;utm_campaign=Orlo&amp;fbclid=IwAR3xUTdY2LsQEY1eYDKqImu71g3GTZXZ00h17pSW5dGvN7RbJGNH10M-Xpc</a>  The Committee appears unaware of the impact of its decisions and what work has been carried out.</p>



<p>Cambridge shire British Horse Society</p>		<p>Reynolds Drove was surfaced, without consultation, in January 2020 with motorway tarmac known for over 20 years to be unsuitable and dangerously slippery. Its damaging concussive properties has reduced the amenity for runners, walkers, dogs as well as horses. The proposed work is to reduce the Council’s potential for liability of a user slipping into the adjacent waterfilled ditch not to ‘upgrade’ the amenity. The BHS was not consulted about the original work nor the proposed work. We object to both and ask to be consulted before any proposed work is agreed.</p> <p>Wilson’s Road Bridleway useable width, safety and amenity has been severely reduced with exposed wooden shuttering and dangerous stakes along the edge of the 3m new surface within the bridleway. The promised mitigation (re seeding) was abandoned without consultation with the soft surface users to be negatively impacted.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire bridleway network is recognised as ‘fragmented, inadequate and in need of improvement’ by the ROWIP. The Court of Appeal in the case of Cowen -v- Secretary of State for the Department of Environment Transport and the Regions (1999) 3PLR108 concluded that if the construction of a hard surface changes the character of a way it goes beyond ‘improvement’. Roadification of bridleways is known to negatively impact on the environment and the amenity of all soft surface users, particularly the user group access restricted to just the bridleway network – equestrians. Please will this Committee undertake to withdraw these inequitable proposals? Will the Committee undertake not to use the bridleway network to create hard top / cycle paths but protect these much-needed green corridors into the countryside?</p>
		<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The proposals to address the issues around horses slipping on Reynolds Drove were discussed and agreed earlier this year with the British Horse Society, but in the light of these new comments a review of the proposal will be undertaken with GCP.</p> <p>Wilson’s Road – As noted in the response to an earlier question there is no definitive width established. The “exposed wooden shuttering” is not correct. These are timber edgings retained by timber stakes. The timber stakes are fully buried so are not exposed. The timber edgings are mainly buried. The top surface of the edging is exposed to indicate the edge of the dust surface and ensure that the edging is obvious to users. The exposed top surface is flush with the dust surface of the bridleway. A trial of the top soil surface indicated that it would not meet the objectives of the scheme to improve access for all users of the bridleway. The necessary delay in allowing a swad to develop</p>

			<p>was not consistent with being able to return the bridleway to use as soon as possible after construction.</p> <p>It is reasonable to improve the surface of bridleways for all users as this has many benefits as described in the article.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
12.	Sir Brian Heap / Mr Stephen Pratt	Active Travel Schemes	<p>We, as group of Fendon Road residents ask both CCC and GCP why, in the light of the points set out below and what we believe to be a lack of complete, adequate and robust evidence, it would be justifiable and defensible to make the traffic closure on Nightingale Avenue permanent when:</p> <p>a. Residents in Fendon Road have consistently maintained a complaint, for well over one year, that the temporary closure of Nightingale Avenue has caused increased volumes in vehicular traffic on Fendon Road which is a danger to cyclists and pedestrians crossing the road. It has also caused increased congestion with time costs to all users and delays to the ambulance as well as other emergency services on this main thoroughfare to Addenbrookes Hospital.</p> <p>b. On 7th October 2021 a young female cyclist employed at Addenbrookes Hospital was killed in a collision with a tanker on the Fendon Road A1307 roundabout during the morning rush hour and such risks are ever present when traffic volumes increase.</p> <p>c. The volume of traffic has caused an increase in air pollution on Fendon Road which is a risk to the health and wellbeing of pedestrians, cyclists and residents. Long queues of stationary or slow moving traffic now occur regularly, particularly at rush hour. Neither CCC nor GCP have put forward any evidence to the contrary.</p> <p>d. CCC and/or GCP have already considered mitigation measures in respect of safety and the environment this temporary road closure has caused on Queen Edith's Way, whereas Fendon Road, a key feeder road into the hospital, has been ignored.</p> <p>If the temporary closure of Nightingale Avenue is not removed we submit that CCC and/or GCP should carry out a methodical investigation to properly address these complaints together with a comprehensive transport cost- benefit analysis, taking account of all costs including increased journey times now that the COVID pandemic has abated and before any decision is made to make the</p>

			temporary closure on Nightingale Avenue permanent.
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Some level of vehicle displacement is inevitable with schemes of this type which may result in more congestion and delay in other roads and streets. Studies of similar schemes across the UK suggest that issues associated with vehicle displacement may diminish over time. These issues need to be weighed against the benefits achieved for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The emergency services have been consulted as part of the ETRO process but no concerns over increased delays have been raised with the GCP.</p> <p>Nitrogen dioxide levels in Fendon Road fell during the pandemic but can be expected to return to pre-pandemic levels as traffic levels return to normal. Pre-pandemic monitoring in Fendon Road (2019) recorded an annual average of 21 microgrammes per cubic metre (the national air quality objective is 40 microgrammes).</p> <p>The recent fatal accident at the Addenbrooke's roundabout has heightened concerns over road safety. As stated in the reports to the GCP Joint Assembly and Executive Board, it would not be appropriate at this time to draw any firm conclusions on the effect of the Nightingale Avenue closure on accident levels in the local area.</p> <p>Fendon Road forms part of the main road network in the city and, as such, measures to reduce its traffic levels need to be viewed in a city wide context. The broader City Access agenda aims to tackle congestion, reduce delays and lower traffic levels through investment in active travel infrastructure, enhanced public transport and effective demand management measures such as a congestion or pollution charging mechanism.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
13.	Ms Katherine Love	Active Travel Schemes	Why not simply put up a no-right-turn sign at the Nightingale junction with Hills Rd, instead of the MF? This would have the desired effect of preventing those using Nightingale as a rat-run to Addenbrookes, but would allow local residents to access the lovely Cambridge countryside without contributing to unnecessary pollution?
			<b>Response:</b>

			Whilst banning the right turn from Nightingale Avenue into Hills Road would provide more flexibility for car based trips by local residents it would not achieve the same level of traffic reduction as the ETRO modal filter as through traffic movements would still be possible from Queen Edith's Way to Babraham Road to avoid delays at Addenbrooke's roundabout for outbound trips .
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
14.	Cllr John Morris (HDC)	Active Travel Schemes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How committed is the new administration to delivering active travel schemes in Huntingdonshire and indeed across Cambridgeshire?</li> <li>2. How soon can we expect Cambridgeshire County Council to commence consultation with local communities with a view delivering some of the published active travel schemes in Huntingdonshire?</li> </ol>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The administration is committed to delivering Active Travel Schemes in Huntingdonshire and across the whole County.</li> <li>2. The development of some schemes, including some in Huntingdonshire, has proven difficult within the conditions for funding set by government. These are undergoing development and consultations are expected to commence in in the next 3-4 weeks.</li> </ol>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
15.	Mrs Kirsty Howarth	Active Travel Schemes	<p>Firstly, we urge the committee to support the recommendation to make all the ETRO schemes permanent as per the proposal as they have clearly achieved the objectives set out when they were put in place. Not to keep the schemes would, amongst other things, make the roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians and not seize the opportunity of promoting alternative modes of transport that Cambridge most desperately needs adopted?</p> <p>The officers report stated the Luard Road scheme on its own had been 'successful in improving walking and cycling and making the area safer' - with this view based on 700 cycle trips per day. However, a recent survey carried out by residents showed the daily number of cycle trips on the road had increased by 74% to 1,218 and pedestrians' numbers recorded at 2,198, measured between</p>

			<p>8am-6pm.</p> <p>This data surely supports the view that residential roads are simply not suitable nor safe to allow cars, vans and HGV's to use these roads as 'cut throughs'. Furthermore, could it not be surmised that all six ETRO schemes have indeed encouraged more pedestrians and cyclists to use the routes as they feel safer in doing so now there are no motor vehicles.</p> <p>Subsequently, my question is that on the back of the clear success of the existing ETRO schemes will new schemes be implemented in the city to achieve the same benefits?</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The review of the road network hierarchy in Cambridge that the GCP has been asked to lead on will consider the future role and function of individual roads and streets with the intention of creating a new network where more road space is allocated to active travel and public transport trips. As part of this work an action plan will be developed to prioritise the delivery of these new network roles and functions which is expected to include schemes similar to the ETRO schemes.</p>
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question From:</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Question:</b>
16.	Mr Richard Thorold	Traffic Management Update	<p>As a trustee of the Louis Thorold Foundation we are keen to save lives by seeking to reduce the speed limits where pedestrians and our little ones are vulnerable to road vehicles. I will be speaking on behalf of those forgotten ones, the victims and families of road crashes who do not really have a say in these matters. They just have to carry the life sentence that goes with it.</p> <p>As CCC has signed up to Vision zero it now has the chance to really make a difference to peoples safety by turning the speed limit policy on its head by mandating 20mph as the default limit in all Urban areas and where people are vulnerable.</p> <p>I will be presenting evidence that lower speed limits save lives and challenging the need for evidence gathering and data collection around average speeds.</p> <p>As a reminder Vision zero clearly states "No human being should be killed or seriously injured as the result of a road crash" Lets be like Oslo and reduce deaths to ZERO.</p>
			<p><b>Response:</b></p>

			<p>The evidence that successful 20mph schemes improve safety is clear, and particularly important for vulnerable road users. The key is to ensure appropriate investment in infrastructure and community engagement in order to significantly change the speeds people drive in built-up areas so we can realise the safety and health benefits, otherwise the good policy is at risk of being undermined.</p>
--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------