

**10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public
Questions Listed by Subject**

	Questioner	Question
1	Sue Rogers Cycling Representative, Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum Secretary, Swavesey & District Bridleways Association	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: St Ives Greenway</p> <p>Why have local equestrians and local bridleway groups and British Horse Society County Access officers not being consulted with ahead of GCP Greenway proposals being drawn up for the St Ives Greenway? The documentation indicates that consultation has taken place.</p> <p>There has been no communication to date with the local equestrian sector in the St Ives Greenway area. As a result, the GCP proposals shown are less than ideal in some cases and may seriously disadvantage equestrians.</p> <p>For example, raising the section of busway embankment alongside the stretch of guided bus Public Bridleway which floods between Swavesey and Fen Drayton to provide a 2m path for walkers and cyclists. Equestrians are legal and frequent (daily) users of this section which can flood to a depth of 1-2m. Any flood mitigation to this route must include all legal users of this Public Bridleway and that includes equestrians. Equestrians should not be disadvantaged by design or designed out of existence.</p>
2	Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: General</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge the importance of encouraging active travel commuting, Greenways must be planned with equal importance given to both leisure use by all non-motorised users (NMUs)(walkers, cyclists, equestrians, disabled people, and commuter-cycling use).</p> <p>The UK's obesity crisis and Covid-19's disproportionate effect on obese people needs good policy to improve the nation's health, wellbeing and fitness. Providing welcoming, encouraging, pleasant and safe to use 'gold standard' Greenways for all NMU groups is an important step towards this policy's delivery.</p> <p>The appropriation of Public Rights of Way to function as high-speed commuter cycling corridors is only acceptable where mitigation is in place to ensure that leisure use of such routes by other non-motorised user groups is not disadvantaged in any way. For example, if a right of way is hard-surfaced to provide a velodrome-like environment for the commuting cyclist who will then attain high speeds, a regularly-topped, parallel grass verge of equal width must be available and maintained to provide comfortable conditions for walkers, runners, dogwalkers and horse riders. Appropriate signage to remind cyclists of the need always to slow down and give way to walkers, equestrians and slower-moving cyclists (eg families with young children on bikes) would reduce the opportunity for conflict.</p> <p>Will the GCP undertake as a matter of principle, not to diminish the amenity benefit of existing rights of way for other users in the rush to provide for commuting cyclists on all the Greenway schemes?</p>

**10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public
Questions Listed by Subject**

3	<p align="center">Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways: Barton Greenway</p> <p>Traffic calming schemes in Barton Village must include provision for horse riders. The quick win path on the Comberton Road where Barton PC has recorded speed in excess of 90 mph, did not include horse riders. Horse riders are not being safe guarded in the same way as other users but are being put at increased risk by cyclists speeding past on their inside as well as traffic on their outside. Traffic accidents have been reported by equestrians on this road which links two PRowWs.</p> <p>Approval of the New Road junction crossing linking to the bridleway must include horse riders. At Haggis Farm Stables alone there are 60 horses who need safe access to the bridleway.</p> <p>Approval of the Underpasses must include access for horse riders. The horses from Haggis Farm, Barton, Coton and Grantchester all need safe places to cross the M11N slip road and Grantchester Road. The recent NMU fatality on the slip road must not be repeated.</p> <p>Approval of the Bridge route over M11 must include horse riders. Local horse riders already use this path and need a safer route across the M11 bridge.</p> <p>Approval of the Barton Road route must include horse riders.</p> <p>The principles of equestrian inclusion set out above for the Barton Greenway, should be replicated on all the other Greenway schemes. To date, no useable equestrian access has been delivered on any of the Greenways or Quick Wins although these schemes are proposing to utilise part of the existing, inadequate and fragmented bridleway network for the creation of commuter cycling routes to the detriment of existing legal users.</p> <p>Will the Assembly approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Greenway scheme only if all these changes to include equestrian access are accepted? • Other Greenway routes only if the principles of equestrian inclusion are embedded in the schemes?
---	---	--

**10th September 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public
Questions Listed by Subject**

4	Jim Chisholm	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Greenways</p> <p>“Over my dead body...”</p> <p>Not mine I hope.</p> <p>I must start by saying that there is lots of good stuff proposed.</p> <p>In 1995 I first became involved with the development of possible cycleways in Cambridgeshire through Sustrans and the sterling work of Nigel Brigham. I’ve some of those papers here (wave papers). Nigel rolled up the basic planning, land negotiations, and initial design in one project. Other similar consultants are available.</p> <p>Some sections of those proposed routes were never delivered.</p> <p>This was because unlike road improvements, there was no commitment to use Compulsory Purchase Orders. Negotiations with Trusts on the other side of the Pond, farmers, and for small parcels of land with development potential stalled. On the Appendices to these documents I see, to my limited knowledge, at least two such sections that were never delivered.</p> <p>One became known as ‘over the farmer’s dead body’, and later ‘over the farmer’s son’s dead body’.</p> <p>It is paramount that this Assembly, and then the Board, give at this stage, a commitment, where required, to use CPO for these so valuable projects.</p> <p>I see no such commitment.</p> <p>For the Sawston Greenway some linked to Cambridge South station must wait, and 2kms has been vastly improved under the “Quick Wins” program. But an extremely substandard section within Stapleford, with an effective width of under a metre, carried on Monday morning over 250 bikes in little over an hour, with 150 being to Sawston Village College! A Sustrans agreement still exists for part for the proposed 2km improved route, and under 500m remains where commitments now, to use CPO would accelerate progress. Under current plans, all those I counted would have left school, before this route would open!</p> <p>Let us commit to using CPO, and to delivering what is possible now, don’t say ‘Four more years’.</p>
---	-----------------	--