

**19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Public Questions Listed by Agenda Item**

	Questioner	Question
1	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Firstly, regarding item 10.8, Camcycle would like to ask officers which four junctions in Cambridge have been selected for the Smart Signals trial? There are many areas of the city where those walking and cycling must undergo long waits or the need to press ‘beg buttons’ despite pedestrian and cycle flows being higher than motor traffic flows, or where non-motorised users have to navigate complicated two-stage crossings.</p> <p>We’d like to know the criteria on which junctions have been selected for this trial. We would recommend that improving safety for those walking, cycling or wheeling must be the first concern, followed by a need to prioritise sustainable transport by improving the directness and convenience of key walking and cycling routes.</p>
2	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>Our second question is regarding the timescales for delivery of new sections of the cycle network. In previous meetings we have stressed the need for accelerated delivery of the Greenways, and looking at table 11.1 we are concerned that the Eastern Access project is listed as due for completion in 2027. We hope that the aspects noted in the consultation as ‘short term actions that could be delivered by 2025’ such as new segregated cycle lanes on Newmarket Road could be rolled out much sooner than that and, in fact, follow on from experimental measures to reallocate roadspace planned for phase two of the county council’s Covid-19 walking and cycling schemes. This is particularly important as there has been a fatality at the Barnwell roundabout already this year.</p>
3	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Quarterly Progress Report</p> <p>We’d also like to ask about delays to the Chisholm Trail. Why has the opening of the jetty been moved to spring 2021 and is phase two still on schedule to complete in 2022 as listed? What are the designs for the route at the station end of phase two?</p>
4	Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy</p> <p><i>Active Travel</i></p> <p>Active Travel is defined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan as ‘walking, cycling and horse riding’. I very much appreciate the GCP’s use of this term in these meeting documents. However, the GCP definition of Active Travel on pg 175 is :</p>

		<p>‘any means of travelling that requires physical activity, such as cycling or walking’.</p> <p>Since the GCP’s projects need to comply with the LTP, the definition should be the same.</p> <p>The discrepancy between these two definitions is important because every reference to Active Travel improvements across Greater Cambridge calls for improvement of the ‘cycle network’. This Assembly has been informed on several occasions of the negative and dangerous impact on horse riders created by improvement to the cycle network which excludes provision for equestrians.</p> <p>The GCP sustainable transport programme acknowledges the need for equestrian provision:</p> <p>‘The GCP is creating safe and easy routes for more active travel journeys to accommodate Greater Cambridge’s growing number of cyclists, along with those walking and horse-riding.’</p> <p>Yet ...</p> <p>3. Options and Emerging Recommendations pg 71</p> <p>3.6. Firstly, recognising the opportunity to encourage active travel and build on the emergency measures and existing GCP spend commitments, it is proposed that an allocation is made to enable targeted investment in gaps in the cycling network. Planned investments through the GCP programme, as well as by partners, will significantly improve the cycling network across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>It is essential that any investment to resolve gaps or make improvements are to the Active Travel Network in Greater Cambridge to benefit and safety of all active travellers – this includes road space reallocation projects.</p> <p>Please will Board Members approve this hugely significant change?</p>
5	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 8 – GCP Future Investment Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle is pleased to see recognition of the important role cycling can play in addressing local issues and contributing to GCP goals in the Future Investment Strategy report. It’s clear that people want to cycle more, the government wants people to cycle more, businesses expect their employees to cycle more and public feedback from consultations and the Citizens’ Assembly recognise cycling’s role in tackling air pollution, congestion and climate change.</p> <p>We therefore strongly welcome the proposal for new investment to enable targeted investment in gaps in the cycling network and new criteria assessing whether transport schemes support the delivery of</p>

		<p>net-zero carbon objectives across Greater Cambridge.</p> <p>We'd like confirmation that this investment will be led by the forthcoming Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan and ask when the plan will be published? Also, will investment in routes be spread across links within the city and out in the wider region so that rural communities share the benefit of improvement to active travel links?</p>
6	Camcycle	<p>Agenda Item 9 – Public Transport Improvements And City Access Strategy</p> <p>Camcycle welcomes more detail on the city access strategy and supports the short-term measures being implemented to encourage more people to walk and cycle. More secure cycle parking at workplaces and in the city centre is very important to address issues of cycle theft, particularly when seeking to increase uptake in the use of e-bikes. We also strongly support the city centre freight pilot with increased use of cycle logistics.</p> <p>Questions on short-term measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the start date for the e-cargo bike loan scheme? 2) When are tranche 2 roadspace reallocation schemes likely to be implemented? 3) Has any support for those with disabilities who would like to cycle been investigated? Currently, there are significant financial barriers to those seeking access to adapted cycles such as handcycles or tricycles. <p>Camcycle also supports a more widescale programme of roadspace reallocation to create safe and attractive active travel routes and agree that if this is coordinated with a review of car parking and the city road network hierarchy, and communicated well as a whole scheme, it is more likely to achieve high levels of modal shift and public support. However, we believe that the recommendations underestimate the impact that could be had by fast, ambitious action. For example, Leicester's pop-up cycle network (11 miles in 10 weeks) has already increased cycling by 45% and school street schemes in London have had a huge impact on modal shift.</p> <p>Questions on long-term schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Why were cities which have achieved significant modal shift to cycling in a short time not included in the Lessons from Elsewhere report? E.g. Seville, Paris, Ghent? 2) What timescales are envisaged for packages 3a, b and c? Are these dependent on the existence of the GCP's new Busway and Greenway schemes?

7	<p>Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 11 – Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p><i>Proposed Form of Greenway</i></p> <p>As this Assembly has previously been informed, whilst supporting the creation of multi user Greenways, the BHS needs to ensure that the existing amenity for horse riders is protected. To manage expectations and inform Assembly members before the £8m outline budget is approved, please could Peter Blake confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haslingfield to Hauxton : the existing Bridleway will be kept in its original state and the new path is in addition to the Bridleway? • Haslingfield to Cantelupe Farm: ‘improvements’ will be suitable for equestrians? • M11 Bridge: will be suitable for horse riders through upgrade or by use of mounting blocks? • Cantelupe Farm to M11 Bridge: this long, straight, grassy bridleway track that is open and safe for a canter will be retained and the new path is in addition to the Bridleway? • Upgrade of an existing footpath to link to the M11 Bridge: will be a Bridleway? • A link northwards to the Barton Greenway and follow Bridle Way and The Baulk path: will be in addition to the Bridleway? • Path from the M11 bridge to the Bridleway : will be upgraded to a Bridleway? • M11 Bridge to Burnt Close Grantchester: will be upgraded to a Bridleway? • Broadway to The Baulk path (north east end): will be upgraded to Bridleway with safe access for equestrians? • Cambridge Rugby Club to Barton Road and The Baulk: will be upgraded to Bridleway with a safe crossing of Grantchester Road for all users?
8	<p>Lynda Warth on behalf of the British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 11 – Greenways - Haslingfield</p> <p><i>Haslingfield to Hauxton</i></p> <p>Equestrian Access Groups were persuaded not to oppose the creation of a shared pedestrian / cycle path through Harston, despite having strong evidence of historic equestrian usage, on the grounds that a safe off road link would be provided for equestrians from Trumpington Meadows Country park to the Harston bridleway network.</p> <p>We feel very strongly that the decision not to create a new bridge to allow off road access to Trumpington Meadows Country Park is a missed opportunity for both the Melbourn and Haslingfield Greenways. This would create a much safer option for all users than having to use a path alongside the busy A10. The Hauxton P&R development with increased traffic will only exacerbate the existing danger at this point.</p>

		Given the serious potential safety impact, please could this decision be revisited with a view to finding a suitable solution to allow this connection to be made which would be acceptable to the Wildlife Trust?
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

19th November 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Question from Member of a Partner Council

	Questioner	Question
1	County Councillor Susan van de Ven	<p>Agenda Item 8 – GCP Future Investment Strategy</p> <p><i>Greenway Maintenance Plan</i></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Highways has severely limited resources to carry out its statutory obligations. Over the past few years, verge cuts along multi-use paths have been reduced to twice per year, and surface water drains are no longer subject to regular scheduled maintenance. This situation is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Valuable learning on path maintenance has taken place along the A10 corridor between Hauxton and Melbourn, where the GCP put its first spade into the ground, and which forms the basis for the forthcoming Melbourn Greenway.</p> <p>The ambitious Greenway scheme is extremely welcome and stands to transform the opportunity for safe cycling in the Greater Cambridge area. Of particular note is the synergy between Greenway schemes and the inclination to create networks rather than standalone routes. How will the GCP ensure that the Greenway scheme, once built, will be properly looked after, in order to stand as a truly strategic asset for a future multi-modal transport network?</p>