



GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP

Swaffhams
greenway

Swaffhams Greenway project: you said, we did

Summary of actions we have taken from the public engagement

June 2023

Introduction

Following the public engagement exercise on the Swaffhams Greenway proposals held in Winter 2023; all of the data submitted has now been analysed and compiled into a report outlining the overarching themes that emerged.

The full report of which the below information was based upon will be uploaded to the GCP website.

The feedback we received, forms an integral part of the next phase of this project. Where we have been able to, we have incorporated comments and suggestions into the next round of design.

The following information outlines what you said you wanted to improve or disagreed with, and how we plan to act upon this. It outlines where we have acted on your suggestions and made changes to the design of the Greenway or where we have not made changes and the reasons for this.

The table below is broken down into sections 1 – 7 representing the 7 sections of the scheme as outlined in the main report.

YOU SAID	WE DID
Wayfinding and signage (General)	
You expressed the need for provision of clear signage along the route to maximise safety of all users.	We are developing a wayfinding strategy across all 12 Greenways to ensure that all active travel users can safely navigate along each route.
Lighting (General)	
You expressed the need for improved lighting along the route to maximise safety of all users. The comments ranged from the provision of streetlamps to the installation of solar studs in the shared use path.	We are developing a street lighting strategy across all 12 Greenways to ensure that all active travel users can safely navigate along each route.
Section 1 - Quay Hotel Access Road to Orchard Street	
You outlined your support for improvements for active travel users at Quay Hotel Access Road to Orchard Street with your comments welcoming the improvements which will provide safer conditions for cyclist that the existing route, expressing their existing issues with visibility, road surfacing, road surfacing and speeding vehicles.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.
You indicated your concerns on existing road surfacing and expressed the desire for improving the road surfacing as you suggested it is not suitable for cyclists or drivers in its current state.	We have noted this comment and will review the condition of the surface course of the road conditions in the next stage of design.
You raised your concerns around the inclusion of equestrian users and thought that the proposals were slightly confusing as to whether equestrians are included in the shared-use-path.	GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to adherence to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results.
Section 2 – Orchard Street	
You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at Orchard Street with your comments supporting the scheme and that it will be a great improvement.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.

You expressed your concerns around the traffic calming measures at Orchard Street.	We are designing all Greenways highway designs using national standards or guidance such as DMRB, Manual for streets, LTN1/20, Cambridge County Council Active Travel Guide and GCP Greenways design guide.
You expressed opposition to using speed humps as traffic calming measures as they present an obstacle for some cyclists. You requested sinusoidal speed humps which would provide a smoother ride for cyclists.	We will review with the design team the specific concerns on the traffic calming measures in the detailed design stage. However, our proposal is to use sinusoidal speed humps.
You expressed your concern regarding equestrian users along the Orchard Street section. You commented the importance of equestrians being treated equally to other road users, with others mentioning that the on-street cycle symbols exclude equestrian road users.	GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results.
Section 3 – Stow Road	
You raised your concerns on safety using the uncontrolled crossing on Stow Road, as you felt the traffic flow is inappropriate for this type of crossing. Some respondents said that they would be in favour of a signalised crossing.	The design team will review the crossing points in the preliminary design stage using the Active Travel England toolkit. CCC can monitor the proposed uncontrolled crossing and make changes if the requirement arises.
You commented that the uncontrolled crossing it is not wide enough to facilitate safe crossing of cyclists with trailers.	The width of the proposed crossing is 3.0m and should accommodate bikes with trailers (2.8m) and tandems as defined in LTN 1-20.
You expressed concerns about road space on Stow Road for an effective shared-use path alongside the carriageway. Three responses add the road is currently too narrow, around the Wheatsheaf pub.	The design team will undertake a review of the space outside the Wheatsheaf pub on a site visit which will form part of the Preliminary design stage.
You raised your concerns around equestrian users in this section of the route, raising concerns that horse riders are being excluded in the proposals for the shared use path.	GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to adherence to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results.
You outlined your opposition at Lode Road, noting that the proposals are not appropriate for the existing road usage and width	All highway designs are designed using national standards or guidance such as DMRB, Manual for streets, and LTN1/20. Also, Cambridge County Council has an Active Travel Guide and GCP have developed a Greenways design guide. All designs are subject to a Road Safety Audit.
You recommended conducting a traffic count to assess the vehicle flows	We have undertaken traffic counts as part of the Feasibility design process
You expressed concerns around equestrian users in this section of the route, raising concerns that horse riders are being excluded in the proposals for the shared use path.	GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results
SECTION 4 – Main Street and Quay Court	
You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at Main Street and Quay Court, with your comments in favour of the scheme and commented that this section has been well designed and that a quiet street environment will be an improvement from the existing road conditions.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.
You suggested traffic calming measures or changes to the proposed traffic calming measures, such as, a raised table	The GCP design team will review the Traffic Calming and crossing suggestions during the Preliminary design stage.

<p>over Albert Road to help reduce traffic speed at the junction. You also suggested the turn radii at Albert Street/Main Street junction is tightened to further reduce speed and some requested that cyclist have priority over Albert Road.</p>	
<p>Section 5 – Abbey Lane, Lode, Longmeadow, White Droveaway Junction</p>	
<p>You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at Abbey Lane, Lode, Longmeadow and White Droveaway junction. You were in favour of the new 40mph speed limit as this would significantly safety but would like it to be enforced with the use of a speed camera. Some also were strongly in favour of the priority being given to cyclists.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.</p>
<p>You commented on the proposed refuge island not being wide enough to accommodate cycles and some made comments on the visibility of the crossings</p>	<p>The design team will review the crossing points in the preliminary design stage using the Active Travel England toolkit. CCC can monitor the proposed uncontrolled crossing and make changes if the requirement arises. The width of the proposed crossing is 3.0m and should accommodate bikes with trailers (2.8m) and tandems as defined in LTN 1/20.</p>
<p>You raised concerns around equestrian users and their inclusion within the proposal. You stated that the shared path is labelled as such it doesn't allow horse riders and said that it would cause issues with cyclists passing equestrian users on their left-hand side, which could potentially cause issues</p>	<p>GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to adherence to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results.</p>
<p>You suggested that alterations to the route, some suggested to reroute the greenway to the other side of the Denny, whereas others suggest rerouting the greenway to follow White Fen Droveaway and to later connect to the proposed route</p>	<p>The GCP design team will review the alternative route suggestions by holding a site visit during the Preliminary design stage.</p>
<p>You asked when the decision to change the route was taken (F.O.I 2079884)</p>	<p>Officers took a decision not to recommend the route on the date set out in the correspondence. That decision is yet to be ratified by members and a process exists where this will be set out in the Executive Board paper that the public can ask questions on</p>
<p>Section 6 - Swaffhams Road</p>	
<p>Despite concerns you outlined you were generally in favour of the proposals for improvements for active travel users at Swaffham Road. You commented that you approved of the reduction of the speed limit but would like to see it enforced. You also raised your concerns that the 3m width may not be able to be maintained throughout and there would be some pinch points.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.</p>
<p>You raised safety concerns and commented on the existing road layout. Some comments note the poor visibility of the route and the width of the shared use path.</p>	<p>We will review the alternative route suggestions by holding a site visit during the Preliminary design stage</p>
<p>You raised your concerns around the inclusion of equestrian users within the section of the greenway. Concerns</p>	<p>GCP will accommodate equestrians where possible. Subject to DMRB standards and Road Safety Audit results</p>

<p>around how safe the route will be for horse riders to use is also questioned.</p>	
<p>SECTION 6 – High Street, Swaffham Prior</p>	
<p>You outlined you were generally in favour of the proposals for improvements for active travel users at Swaffham Prior.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in June.</p>
<p>You stated your opposition to the use of red surfacing feeling that it was unnecessary, while others were in favour of the red surfacing and believed it should be extended</p>	<p>The use of red asphalt will be determined during the Preliminary design stage</p>
<p>You suggested further extension of the route beyond Station Road. You also raised your concerns related to buses and questioned if there would be any issues operating once the scheme is implemented.</p>	<p>The design team will review the end point of the 20MPH zone within the village. However, is not included in the current scope and may be addressed in any subsequent Greenway schemes.</p>
<p>You also raised your concerns related to buses and questioned if there would be any issues operating once the scheme is implemented.</p>	<p>The design team have carried out a swept path analysis to ensure there is sufficient space for all required users.</p>
<p>You made comments related to the proposed traffic calming measures within this section of the proposal. Some respondents were against the addition of the speed humps, while others suggested reducing the amount of speed humps or removing entirely.</p>	<p>Further traffic calming reviews will be carried out over the Preliminary design phase of works. Any specific issues raised in the Road Safety Audit will be addressed by the Design team. However, the proposal is to use sinusoidal speed humps</p>
<p>You suggested changes to be made to the speed limits, while most were in favour of the reduction in the speed limit, others believed that it should be extended further to before cyclists end up joining the road.</p>	<p>We will explore the extension of the speed limit area in the Preliminary design stage. However, this not included in the current scope and may be addressed in any subsequent Greenway schemes</p>