

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (7th December 2021)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No .	Question from:	Item	Question
1.	Councillor Richard Robertson		<p>Will the council have a study carried out into the possibilities for widening the path and providing a fence for the whole of the bus-way from Hills Rd bridge to the turnoff to the hospital?</p> <p>In view of the danger which currently exists and has contributed to the death of two people, will the council require the speed of the buses travelling next to the pedestrians and cyclists to be reduced to 15mph with immediate effect for the full length of this stretch?</p>
			Response:
			<i>The County Council has committed to undertake a full and detailed safety review of the busway from independent experts following the latest traffic incident. However, prior to completion of that review, The speed limit on the busway between Long Road Bridge and the railway station, in both directions, has been reduced to 15mph given ongoing concerns over safety, including from the Health and Safety Executive.</i>
No .	Question from:	Item	Question:
2.	David Stoughton (Cambridge Living Streets)	Future Transport Priorities	<p>Under the banner of Active Travel, it has become customary to refer to walking and cycling jointly and to see them as being addressed as one. There are joint strategies for walking and cycling and plans become conflated. So much so that Greater Cambridge Partnership proposals very often seem to assume that providing for cycling solves the problems of pedestrians simultaneously. We believe that this approach makes their distinct needs harder to identify and gives a very wrong impression to the public.</p> <p>Whilst provision for cycling requires its own, often new and costly, infrastructure, encouraging walking at least in the urban environment is often about removing the barriers that inhibit many otherwise able pedestrians. These barriers consist amongst others of footways that are often too narrow and in a poor state of repair, misplaced streets furniture and A boards, infrequent pedestrian crossings, often far from the desire line, and increasingly since Covid of vehicles parking on the pavement and obstructing progress. In other words much of it is about maintenance and</p>

			<p>improvement of existing infrastructure, better connectivity and enforcement. So unlike cycling the majority of the cost is assigned to operational rather than capital budgets which makes it harder to address.</p> <p>On top of this the constant conflation of walking and cycling may lead to some unintended outcomes. There are an increasing number of shared use schemes which, while not in themselves a problem providing there is clear demarcation, if taken in conjunction with older instances of shared use where the markings have faded is partially responsible for encouraging increasingly dangerous behaviours. This seems to us to have been further amplified by the constant references to walking and cycling together. Too many cyclists amongst others seem to have taken shared usage and the conflation of modes of travel as signals permitting cycling on all footways and, in their wake, private eScooter riders, motorised delivery drivers and other wheeled vehicles have taken to using them extensively. This is extremely distressing for the elderly and parents with prams or buggies and dangerous for the disabled and especially the blind.</p> <p>I am sure that nobody intended for this to happen, and clearly part of the issue is the lack of any enforcement but referring to walking and cycling in, so to speak, a single breath is clearly not helping.</p> <p>Will this committee please distinguish more clearly between the two forms of active travel in the future and encourage others to do so.</p>
			Response:
			<i>Following Central Governments first Cycling and Walking Investment strategy in 2017 local authorities were recommended to develop their own Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) to enable cases to be made for future funding. Cambridgeshire's LCWIP will form part of a long term vision to improve the County's walking and cycling networks in order to increase the number of residents travelling on foot and by cycle and thereby improving health and well-being of all those living and working in the county. The LCWIP differentiates and prioritises walking and cycling separately. The Active Travel Strategy will similarly differentiate between these modes of transport.</i>
No	Question from:	Item	Question:

3	David Stoughton (Cambridge Living Streets)	Active Travel Schemes	<p>Living Streets Cambridge thanks the officers of this committee for ensuring that we are included in the user focus groups for consultation and suggests that the RNIB and Camsight are added to the list as representatives of the blind and partially sighted community.</p> <p>We note that, while the majority of this item refers to future planning and work, there is already work being done to improve the condition of footways in Cambridge funded from the £20 million budget allocated in February 2021. At the same time Living Streets is continuing to identify areas that we would propose are considered for improvement. We would like to be able to input suggestion to the maintenance team while being aware that there is limited budget and capacity in any period. To that end we would seek to forge a closer working relationship in which future targets for improvement can be suggested for review and prioritisation in the light of available budgets and the proposed schedule of work.</p> <p>A potential vehicle for this was created following publication of the results of our survey ‘From risky streets to Living Streets’ earlier this year. A joint working group consisting of councillors from both City and County Councils was established but there has been no indication that it has ever met. Repeated requests for a meeting with that group have received no response, yet it seems an ideal forum through which we could collaborate on current priorities for maintenance and provide evidence to support future planning for walking provision. Wide participation across the city will help to mitigate a suspicion amongst residents that only those who are able to attract sufficient attention or have connections are able to secure funding for improvement.</p> <p>Will this committee ensure that the joint working group or some other similar group is established and is able to work directly with officers in establishing and prioritising needs. And will it request that that group work with Living Streets Cambridge to establish the evidence base that our members can assemble.</p>
			<p>Response:</p> <p><i>Camsight have been offered the opportunity to engage, and will be offered further opportunity to do so as the strategy is developed, as will the RNIB.</i></p> <p><i>The annual capital highway maintenance programme, including footways, is determined by the highway asset management team, who consider network condition data, route hierarchy and usage to form maintenance programmes. Elected Members also feed into this process via the Local Highways Officers, who also receive</i></p>

			<i>resident and customer requests. To influence the choice of schemes included going forward, it recommended this done through the Local Highways Officers, who each cover a specific area of the county. Once the annual programme is prepared, it is approval annually by this committee.</i>
4.	Question from	Item	Question
	Mark Rison	GCP Programe for the Review of Mill Road	<p>Coldham's Lane in Romsey (Cambridge) is a family orientated, community centred residential road that suffers from excessive motor traffic and has no traffic management. Given the volumes of traffic, dangerous speeding, and static jams, it is in as dire need of motor traffic reduction and promotion of active travel as neighbouring Mill Road is.</p> <p>Can the H&TC confirm that in consideration of any traffic reduction measures, Coldham's Lane in Romsey will be treated no less favourably (both in terms of timing and scope of measures) than Mill Road?</p>
			<p>Resonse:</p> <p><i>Coldham's Lane is one of the 15 Active Travel schemes being considered by GCP, aligned with their City Access Strategy</i></p>

Petitions

No .	Petition from:	Item	Petition
1.	CamCycle		<p>Please take rapid action now on dangerous junctions across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Immediately address all locations that have seen recent collisions and remove safety issues for people walking, cycling and using other active travel modes at junctions across the county.</p> <p>It's time to deliver on the vision for zero deaths and serious injuries in our region. It's time that no more lives were lost or families left suffering.</p> <p>We call on Cambridgeshire County Council to:</p> <p>1. Commission an immediate review of the Addenbrooke's roundabout, considering both</p>

		<p>the short-term safety considerations of the current roadworks occurring in this area and longer-term plans to make the whole junction safer, designing out conflicts between motor vehicles and vulnerable road users and giving priority to buses and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>2. Work together with other local transport authorities on an audit of junctions across the county to identify urgent improvements to make active travel safe. This audit should be based on the latest government standards on inclusive cycle infrastructure design, LTN 1/20. These standards, developed by active travel experts, should be adopted immediately by all local transport and planning authorities.</p> <p>3. Ensure that the safety of active travel users is prioritised in every junction improvement and transport scheme. All those choosing to walk, cycle and use other active modes of travel should feel safe on the region's roads and when traversing junctions.</p>
		<p>Response:</p>
		<p><i>When there is a fatal accident on the network, police forensic investigation is started immediately and is used for the relevant court process, usually either coroner's or crown court proceedings.</i></p> <p><i>The Council, under its duties in S39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, undertakes to investigate the causes of collisions on roads it is responsible for. In the case of fatal collisions, the immediate elements of the Council's investigation will focus on the highway environment and any defects or factors that may require immediate attention. Previous collision history of the site is also reviewed, and a report is compiled. The process allows us to understand the causes of the accident in more detail and consider any necessary remedial action.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The above process is underway for Addenbrookes. The Greater Cambridge Partnership is seeking to explore active travel improvements for the A1134 North-South (Perne Road, Mowbray Road and Fendon Road), including considering how a scheme could improve provision for cyclists at the Addenbrooke's roundabout.</i> <i>2. The Active Travel Strategy (separate item on December Agenda) will consider safety for NMUs in the County</i> <i>3. Safety is and will remain a vital consideration of junction design. LTN 120 provides key guidance in terms of safe design.</i>

No .	Petition from:	Item	Petition:
2.	CamCycle		<p>We, the undersigned, petition the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Highways and Transport committee to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stop the currently proposed scheme for the junction of Windsor Road, Oxford Road and the active travel route from Warwick Road, on the grounds that it would force pedestrians and cyclists into conflict on a very narrow pavement with sharp 90-degree turns, and make the cycle route inaccessible to many people using tricycles, cargo cycles, tandem cycles, mobility scooters, disability-adapted cycles or those who are towing trailers. 2. Ensure that the currently proposed scheme is replaced by one that is in full compliance with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 and therefore is fully accessible to people of all ages and abilities. <p>We have become aware that the most recent design proposal (dated 1 November) for the junction of Windsor Road, Oxford Road and the active travel route from Warwick Road includes the removal of the existing dropped kerb for access into the active travel route, and instead replaces it with a long stretch of wooden fencing. That would force people cycling onto the pavement until they reach a narrow pedestrian crossing of Windsor Road, which is unsuitable for cycling. The sharp turns and narrow spaces would render this route effectively unusable for many people who currently use it, especially for parents who take their kids on cycles to the Mayfield School and Under Fives Roundabout Pre-school.</p> <p>The government has published a cycling design manual called LTN 1/20. This manual sets out how to design cycle infrastructure that is inclusive, accessible and therefore safe. For example, in paragraph 5.6.3 it states: <i>'Deliberately restricting space, introducing staggered barriers or blind bends to slow cyclists is likely to increase the potential for user conflict and may prevent access for larger cycles and disabled people and so should not be used.'</i></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council have policies which stipulate that changes to streets or footways must improve both for walking and cycling. This scheme does neither. Therefore we ask the committee to step in and ensure that the scheme is replaced by an LTN 1/20 compliant scheme in accordance with best practice.</p>

			This petition is supported by Camcycle. Please see our website for more information: www.camcycle.org.uk/windsor-road
			Response:
			<i>The scheme is currently being safety audited, and the proposed design is being reviewed by officers before proceeding further. Any design changes will be shared with CamCycle, and also the locally elected member for comment and review before starting construction on site.</i>