

Greater Cambridge Greenways Barton Greenway You Said: We Did

February 2023

This document is a summary of the actions we have taken following outcomes from the public engagement undertaken for the Barton Greenway.

Introduction

Following the public engagement completed for the Barton Greenway design proposals held in the Autumn 2022; all of the data submitted from the public has now been analysed and compiled into a report outlining the overarching themes that emerged.

The full report from which the below information was based upon can be found on our website https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Active-Travel-Projects/Greater-Cambridge-Greenways/Barton-Greenway/Barton-Greenway-Summary-Engagement-Report-2022.pdf

The feedback we received forms an integral part in the subsequent stages of the project and, where possible, have been incorporated into this next phase of design.

The following information outlines what you said you wanted to improve or disagreed with, and how we plan to address this. It outlines where we have acted on your suggestions and made alterations to the design of the Barton Greenway design or provided justification on where we have not.

| YOU SAID | WE DID | |
|--|--|--|
| Section 1 – Barton Road to Cambridge | | |
| You expressed safety concerns relating to Grange Road and noted that there are often near misses in this location potentially due to poor visibility of the signals. | We will continue to work with the road safety experts to review the Grange Road junction design and investigate potential solutions to improve safety for vehicles exiting the Grange Road onto Barton Road. | |
| You raised concern that the proposed crossing improvements were not suitable and/or do not address safety concerns at specific locations such as Barton Road, the Driftway, Newnham Road and Grange Road. | The current Newnham Road junction improvements are being developed and delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). Engagement responses referring to the Newnham Junction improvements have been forwarded to CCC for their consideration and response. | |
| You provided positive feedback and welcomed the improvements to pedestrian, cyclist and motorist segregation. However, you also expressed concerns that widening the footway may result in removal of biodiversity and requested it was investigated to find a more favourable option. | Within the overall objectives of the entire Greenways Programme, there is a commitment to biodiversity net gain. As such, the Barton Greenway has been developed with environmental impacts in mind, whilst also aiming to meet the requirements of design guidance for sustainable transport and to consider the constraints of the route. The Barton Greenway has been designed to have minimal impact on existing green infrastructure, such as trees and verges. Therefore, the route, wherever possible, reuses existing infrastructure to achieve this aim. One tree located along Barton Road, is proposed to be removed to accommodate proposals east of Clarence Road. To mitigate this, the GCP will replant a tree on the verge. There are no further changes to trees proposed along Barton Road. | |

You suggested that the footway and cycle path should be widened on Barton Road to avoid pinch points along the existing cycleway and to meet LTN1/20 guidance. You suggested potentially incorporating an on-road cycle path option.

We appreciate the existence of several pinch points along the route, however the current design takes this in to account and balances the requirements of relevant design guidance for sustainable transport routes such as the Greenways, as well as considering the existing physical constraints along the route.

An on-road scheme was not an option previously consulted on and is currently not proposed to be taken forward. This is due to a number of factors including lack of carriageway space along Barton Road, potential impact on residential parking, and significant impact on construction duration and disruption.

You raised comments opposing to the proposed footway/cycleway along Barton Road as there is an existing shared-use path which does not require improvement. Some feedback was also received suggesting there could be potential loss of greenspace/trees if the footway was widened.

Within the overall objectives of the entire Greenways Programme, there is a commitment to biodiversity net gain. As such, the Barton Greenway has been developed with environmental impacts in mind, whilst also aiming to meet the requirements of design guidance for sustainable transport and considering the constraints of the route. The Barton Greenway has been designed to have minimal impact on existing green infrastructure, such as trees and verges. Therefore, the route, wherever possible, reuses existing infrastructure to achieve this aim.

One tree located along Barton Road, is proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposals east of Clarence Road. To mitigate this, the GCP will replant a tree on the verge. There are no further changes to trees proposed along Barton Road.

Concern was raised that the proposals in this section did not cater for equestrian users, with particular reference to the shared-use path along Barton Road. Another concern raised was the lack of provision to segregate horses from cyclists and motorists. You suggested widening and re-positioning the grass verge for horses on the side furthest from the carriageway.

We have noted these concerns and discussions will continue with equestrian users via the GCP Active Travel Forum. The requirements for equestrians will be considered based on the level of existing and forecast use. Evidence of this is reflected in the additional provision for equestrians in rural areas.

Section 2 - Barton Road

You raised concern regarding the inclusion of equestrian users along the shared use path suggested for this section of the greenway, and the use of non-slip surfaces to improve safety for equestrian users.

We will endeavour to include the triple mode signage denoting pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian usage in the Preliminary Designs for this section. However, this will be subject to the Road Safety Audit process and findings.

| | We will consider surface materials and treatments further, in coordination with CCC, in the subsequent design phases and a surface materials and treatment strategy will be developed and adopted across the Greenways network. |
|--|--|
| You suggested maintaining and/or planting | Within the overall objectives of the entire |
| vegetation along section 2 of Barton Road. | Greenways Programme, there is a |
| | commitment to biodiversity net gain. As |
| | such, the Barton Greenway has been |
| | developed with environmental impact in |
| | mind, whilst also aiming to meet the |
| | requirements of design guidance for |
| | sustainable transport and considering the constraints of the route. The Barton |
| | |
| | Greenway has been designed to have minimal impact on existing green |
| | infrastructure, such as trees and verges. |
| | Therefore, the route, wherever possible, |
| | reuses existing infrastructure to achieve this |
| | aim. |
| | Opportunities for additional planting will be |
| | assessed in the next design stage. |
| You proposed creating segregation | The greenways designs are being guided |
| between pedestrians and cyclists by using | by current LTN1/20 standards, the |
| trees, grass verges or shrubs to preserve | constraints along this section and the |
| the landscape whilst also improving the safety of Greenway users. | forecast level of use. However, in terms of protecting the landscape, opportunities for |
| Salety of Greenway users. | additional planting will be assessed in the |
| | next design stage. |
| You raised concerns regarding the width | The design has been developed to balance |
| and segregation of the existing path and | the requirements of relevant design |
| space between the path and the | guidance (LTN1/20) for sustainable |
| carriageway along Barton Road and the | transport routes such as the Greenways, as |
| proposed shared-use path. | well as to consider the existing physical |
| | constraints of the route and forecast use. |
| Section 3 – Barton Road, Coton Road and | |
| You indicated your concern regarding the two-stage signalised crossing proposed at | We will consider the design of this crossing further in the Preliminary Design stage. |
| the roundabout and suggested it should be | We will consider a single staged crossing |
| a single stage crossing to improve user | and advance signal controls and will |
| experience and reduce waiting times for | continue to seek input from our CCC |
| cyclists. | highways colleagues and traffic signals |
| You also suggested that the crossing | specialists to identify the most appropriate |
| should be automated to prevent cyclists | design. |
| needing to dismount and press the button | |
| to activate the crossing. | |
| Section 4 – The M11 Bridge | M/s will look to sonduct survive of the |
| You indicated your support agreeing that the proposals would improve safety. You | We will look to conduct surveys of the existing bridge structure and approaches to |
| TING MONOCULE WOUND IMPROVE COTATO VALL | A A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF T |

¹ An underpass at this location was not engaged upon as the option for an at grade crossing minimises costs, land take required and environmental impacts, including potential flooding. In addition, a high-pressure gas main was identified along the eastern side of the Grantchester Road arm of this junction. Relocating this would have resulted in extensive and very costly groundworks.

| Tallan visiba mand than and 12 12 12 | Lintaine the decima and Little (d) |
|--|---|
| also welcomed the extension of the parapet's heights and widening of the shared-use path in this section. | inform the design and height of the new parapets and the facilities crossing the bridge. |
| You noted that the surfacing on the M11 bridge is poorly maintained, specifically referring to the existing bumps and cracks on the surface that is formed by subsidence on the ramp leading up to the bridge. | We will pass on reports of subsidence causing surfacing issues to the structures design team as well as National Highways. |
| You expressed concerns regarding the inclusion of equestrians within the proposals for this section. This included the need to provide suitable crossings on the approach to the roundabout, such as Pegasus crossings, and increasing the parapet heights to comply with equestrian guidance. | We will continue to consider equestrian requirements based on the levels of existing and forecast use. This has been reflected in additional provision for equestrians that has been provided elsewhere on this route. We will conduct surveys of the existing bridge structure and approaches to inform the design and height of the new parapets and the facilities crossing the bridge. This will seek to include specific consideration for equestrian users including measures such as mounting blocks if deemed appropriate. |
| You expressed your desire for a wider pathway provision for cyclists and pedestrians and suggested the dual carriageway is reduced to a single carriageway over the bridge, to allow cyclists to pass each other safely. | We will investigate the potential for, and the impacts of, reducing the carriageway to a single lane in the next design stage. The outcome of this will be subject to transport modelling results. |
| Section 5 - Roundabout leading to M11N | Slip Road ² |
| You expressed concern that the location of the crossing would be dangerous and may increase queuing on the M11 and increase congestion for those travelling towards Cambridge. | We will further consider the design of the crossing in the upcoming Preliminary Design stage and will seek input from CCC highways and signals colleagues. The final design will reflect the outputs of highway modelling, the road safety audit and the physical constraints at this location. |
| You noted the potential use of automatic sensors to detect approaching cyclists therefore reducing the waiting times at the crossing and limiting the need for cyclists to dismount. You suggested installing advanced warning signed to warn evaluate it is a material. | We will investigate the potential use of advance signal controls at the next stage of design. We will seek advice from CCC highways colleagues and traffic signals specialists. We will propose signage and road markings in agreement with CCC and in line with the |
| signage to warn cyclists it is a motorway slip road. | in agreement with CCC and in line with the lasted guidance and recommendations from the Road Safety Audit. |
| You expressed concern regarding the inclusion of equestrians at the crossing, making specific reference to the close proximity of the Polo Club located nearby. | We will continue to consider the design of the crossing as we progress through the preliminary design stage and further input will be sought from the CCC highways and |

 $^{^2}$ An underpass at this location was not engaged upon as the option for an at grade crossing minimises costs, land take required and environmental impacts, including potential flooding.

| | signals colleagues. However, the final design will reflect the output of the highway modelling, safety audit and the physical constraints at this section. |
|---|--|
| Section 6 - Cambridge Road to New Road | Junction |
| You indicated concerns regarding the consideration of equestrian users within this section, which provides a link to an existing bridleway. You suggested accommodating equestrians by using a Pegasus crossing at this junction. | We will consider equestrians in the redesign of the A603 crossing. This will include the consideration of a Pegasus crossing or crossing where mounting and dismounting is provided for on either side of the A603. This will be heavily influenced by the signals design, the existing constraints in this location and the results of the Road Safety audit. |
| You suggested altering the crossing to be a continental roundabout and to review the signal timings to ensure that there is minimal impact on traffic. | We will liaise with signals design engineers and CCC highways to discuss the proposals and modelling outputs to minimise the impact of this junction on traffic. |
| You indicated that the existing junction is busy with abundant signage that can be considered overbearing and/or confusing for drivers. You suggested reviewing and de-cluttering the existing street signage. | We will consider the decluttering of the junction wherever possible and the signage and road markings proposed will be in agreement with CCC and in line with the latest guidance. |
| You also highlighted the required need for good access for larger vehicles into the Orchard site to be maintained. | We will consider the requirements at the Orchard site at the next design stage, with key consideration given to hatching at this location. |
| Section 7 – Barton Village | Trace and the second se |
| You expressed interest in extending the route alignment to tie in with the existing shard use path within Barton village on Comberton Road, raising concerns for cyclists' safety when travelling west out of the village to join the existing shared-use path. | We will be extending the route to tie in with the existing shared use path within the village along Comberton Road to provide better connectivity between Barton and Comberton. We will consider the safety concerns raised and this will feed into the updated design to include signage and potentially road markings to inform drivers of cyclists making this manoeuvre. It is worth noting that designs will also be subject to Road Safety Audits. |
| You opposed the proposals within the village, raising concerns relating to safety. Suggested improvements included providing greater traffic calming measures and a new crossing location. | To address these safety concerns, we will look to reduce the speed limit through the village and the opportunity to implement traffic calming measures which should create a safer environment for all users and make any required crossing easier. |
| You made comments relating to equestrian users, referring to the traffic calming measures and suitability of speed humps for equestrian users. Furthermore, you raised concerns that equestrian users have not been considered in the proposals for Barton Village. | We have proposed slower speed limits in Barton to create a safer environment for all users, including equestrians. We propose that the majority of the Greenway is oncarriageway through the Village, and it is therefore expected that equestrian users would also be on-carriageway at this location. It should be noted that designs are |

You expressed concern regarding the widening of the path adjacent to the pond and the proposed speed limits and how they will be enforced/adhered to through the village.

subject to further road safety audits which will consider suitability and safety for all users.

We would like to reassure you that there are currently no plans to widen the path around the pond at this stage, as the area is too constrained and due to the low level of feedback received on this issue. In terms of reducing the speed limit through the village, the designs include both physical measures to help slow speeds, along with signage. Please note that designs are also subject to further road safety audits which will consider this issue.

You indicated concern regarding crossing points, as it was noted that being required to cross the road twice was considered unsafe particularly for children and elderly pedestrians.

We are proposing to reduce speed limits and introduce traffic calming measures in Barton to create a slower speed and safer environment for all users. This should make any required crossing easier for all. In addition, there will be no change to the pedestrian route, with pedestrians able to use the existing alignment of the footway.

Section 8 – Barton to Grantchester

You expressed your dislike of red thermoplastic surfacing as it was considered to be out of place in the rural context of the village and suggested that normal asphalt would be preferred.

You expressed support of installing a sealed surface however you also raised concern regarding the increased risk of flooding this may cause. This included the potential flooding risk along the existing bridleway.

The bridleway is constrained as it is narrow, and you suggested leaving the surface materials as they are. The surface proposed may encourage cyclists to travel at a higher speed and increasing the risk of conflicts between Greenway users.

You raised concern regarding the removal of the bridleway to create a cycle path and the issues regarding hard surfaces for horses. You suggested potentially positioning a new cycle path alongside the bridleway to avoid removing it.

We will further consider the use of red surfacing in this location during the next stage of design and if it is found to not have an impact unduly on design proposals, safety requirements etc., this will potentially be removed.

Surface materials and treatments is an ongoing discussion across the greenways network, and a strategy will be developed across the greenways network. We will consider issues with drainage, durability and maintenance when considering materials and surface treatments as part of the next stage of design.

We will continue to investigate the use of hard and soft surface treatment and will seek input from key stakeholders.

As a general design principle and where possible, we are retaining existing bridleways as they are with a shared-use path built alongside. However, where this is not feasible, due to width or other constraints, we will consider appropriate surfacing for all users in these locations. We will investigate potential surface treatments, materials, drainage, durability and maintenance in more detail during the next design stages. We will develop a strategy to be adopted across the Greenways network which also considers

| | the rural setting of particular route sections, environmental impacts and user experience. This will include both hard-surface and soft-surface options and we will seek input from key stakeholders. |
|--|---|
| You commented on the proposed width of the pathway in terms of the width required to safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. It was raised that the width suggested would not be enough to include both a hard and soft surface. | In terms of width, we are designing the Greenways to balance the requirements of relevant design guidance for sustainable transport routes whilst considering the existing physical constraints of the route. Moreover, the designs are being guided by the current LTN1/20 standards and forecast level of use. In regard to surfacing materials, please refer to above. |
| Section 9: The Baulk Path | |
| You suggested the installation of solar studs to light the route. | We will investigate lighting options further, considering the contextual setting of particular route sections, environmental impacts and user safety. Included within this, we will consider the use of solar studs. |
| You indicated your concern regarding the section interlinking with Grantchester Road in relation to user safety. | We have considered safety of junctions in the current designs; however, we will investigate this further in the next stage of design and following the outcome of road safety audits. |
| You suggested incorporating a cycle friendly roundabout at the interchange with Coton Road. | We are not currently proposing to change designs in favour of a roundabout at this location. However, we will investigate this option further in the next stage of design. |
| You raised general concerns that the proposals along the Baulk Path would have a negative impact on the environment. | We are developing proposals, including lighting, to be considerate of the different settings along the route, including rural sections such as the Baulk Path. Within the overall objectives of the entire Greenways Programme, there is a commitment to biodiversity net gain. As such the Barton Greenway has been developed with environmental impacts in mind, whilst also aiming to meet the requirements of design guidance for sustainable transport and considering the constraints of the route. The Barton Greenway has been designed to have minimal impact on existing green infrastructure, such as trees and verges, and significant environmental work is being undertaken to minimise any impacts on wildlife. |
| You welcomed the proposals of a grass verge as long as it was sufficiently maintained and of adequate width for equestrian users. You also stated that the current surface is suitable for equestrian | We will consider surface treatments and materials in greater detail, including drainage, durability and maintenance, during the next design stages, and a |

| users and therefore no resurfacing | strategy will be developed across the |
|---|---|
| improvements are required. | Greenways network. |
| You commented on the general lack of | The Baulk Path remains part of the |
| need for the inclusion of the Baulk Path as | proposed Barton Greenway at this stage. |
| part of the Barton Greenway route, stating | However, we will continue to consider the |
| that the proposal would be detrimental to | rural setting of the Baulk Path and will seek |
| the environment, especially as there are | to minimise the impact on existing green |
| alternative walking and cycling routes that | infrastructure such as trees and vegetation |
| are safer. | as well as wildlife. |
| You raised comments relating to surface | We will consider surface treatments and |
| materials, specifically stating that you were | materials in greater detail, including |
| in favour of the grass verge however felt the | drainage, durability and maintenance, |
| hard surfacing was not appropriate for the | during the next design stages, and a |
| Baulk Path. | strategy will be developed across the |
| | Greenways network. Options for hard- |
| | surface treatments and soft-surface |
| | treatments will be considered alongside |
| | input from key stakeholders and any |
| | proposals will consider the rural setting, |
| | environmental impacts and user |
| | experience. |
| General Comments (not section specific) | |
| In general, you were in favour of lighting | We will further consider the lighting options |
| along the route to improve safety and | at the construction design stage and a |
| suggested the use of solar studs due to the | lighting strategy will be developed across |
| lack of street lighting and the lessened | the greenways. Options for solar stud |
| environmental impact. | lighting, overhead lighting, or both will be |
| | considered alongside input from key |
| | stakeholders and will be informed by the |
| | setting of particular route sections, |
| | environmental impacts and user safety. |
| You proposed improving signage and | We will continue to develop a wayfinding |
| wayfinding to provide clear indication of the | strategy to ensure a coherent approach is |
| Greenway. | adopted across the Greenways network |
| | and that all users are considered. Signage |
| | and road markings will be proposed in |
| | agreement with CCC and in line with the |
| | latest guidance. |