

Produced by the Cambridgeshire Research Group



Waterbeach Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings

V1

March 2019

'Cambridgeshire Research Group' is the brand name for Cambridgeshire County Council's Research function based within the Business Intelligence Service. As well as supporting the County Council we take on a range of work commissioned by other public sector bodies both within Cambridgeshire and beyond.

All the output of the team and that of our partners is published on our dedicated website

www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk

For more information about the team phone 01223 715300

Document Details	
Title:	Waterbeach Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings
Date Created:	07/03/19
Description:	
Produced by:	Cambridgeshire County Council Business Intelligence Service
On behalf of:	Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership
Geographic Coverage:	Cambridgeshire
Format:	PDF
Key Contact	Aaron.Rowinski@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Status:	V1
Usage Statement:	This product is the property of the Research and Performance Team, Cambridgeshire County Council. If you wish to reproduce this document either in whole, or in part, please acknowledge the source and the author(s).
Disclaimer:	Cambridgeshire County Council, while believing the information in this publication to be correct, does not guarantee its accuracy nor does the County Council accept any liability for any direct or indirect loss or damage or other consequences, however arising from the use of such information supplied.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Methodology Summary	6
Key findings.....	6
Support for the Greater Cambridge Greenways network	6
Individual elements of the proposed scheme	6
Other	8
Introduction	9
Background	9
Consultation and Analysis Methodology	10
Background	10
Consultation Strategy	10
Identification of the Audience	10
Design of Consultation Questions.....	11
Diversity and Protected Characteristics.....	11
Analysis	12
Quality Assurance	13
Data Integrity	13
Survey Findings	14
Respondent Profile	14
Respondent location	14
Respondent interest in project	15
Respondent usual mode of travel in the area	16
Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area	17
Respondent age range	18
Respondent employment status.....	19
Respondent disability status.....	20
Question 1: In general how far do you support the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network?	21
Question 2: How would you intend to primarily travel on the Greenway?	22
Question 3: How far do you agree with the following elements of the proposed Greenway Route?	23
Question 4: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?	25
Question 5: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options?	26

Summary of major themes	26
Question 6: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?.....	29
Summary of major themes	29
Question 7: Please comment if you feel any of these proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s.....	30
Summary of major themes	30
Stakeholders responses	31
Background	31
Summary of major themes	31
Email, social media and consultation event responses	34
Summary of major themes	34

Executive Summary

Between 15 October and 03 December 2018 the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) held an extensive consultation on a scheme to develop a Greenway route from Waterbeach to Cambridge.

The key findings of this piece of work are:

- Analysis of the geographical spread (see figure 1) and the breadth of responses for different groups shows that the Greater Cambridge Partnership has delivered an effective and robust consultation.
- The majority of respondents supported all elements of the proposed Greenway Route.
 - The majority of respondents supported all three Options for the 'Route into Waterbeach' element.
- The majority of respondents supported all four locations for the installation of solar studs.
- A great deal of detailed comments were received. From these it was clear that; there were concerns about the width of the paths; there were discussions about the lighting needed; there were discussions about the suitability of the path parallel to the existing railway; there was debate about the options for the route into Waterbeach.
- Responses were also received on behalf of a number of different groups or organisations. All of the responses from these groups have been made available to board members in full and will be published alongside the results of the public consultation survey.

Methodology Summary

The consultation adopted a multi-channel approach to promote and seek feedback including through traditional and online paid-for, owned and earned media, community engagement events in key or high footfall locations along the route and through the wide-spread distribution of around 8000 consultation leaflets.

2 drop-in events were held across the area to enable people to have their say in person and the opportunity to question project officers.

Quantitative data was recorded through a formal consultation questionnaire (online and hard-copy) with 423 complete responses in total recorded. A significant amount of qualitative feedback was gathered via the questionnaire, at events, via email and social media and at other meetings.

This report summarises the core 423 online and written responses to the consultation survey and the 16 additional written responses received.

Key findings

Support for the Greater Cambridge Greenways network

Quantitative

- 417 respondents answered the question on how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network.
 - The majority of respondents supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network (94%)

Individual elements of the proposed scheme

Quantitative

- 418 respondents answered the question about how far they agreed with the individual elements of the proposed Greenway Route.
 - The majority of respondents supported all of the following elements of the proposed Greenway route:
 - Element 4: 'path parallel to existing railway track' (90%)
 - Element 2: 'improvements to Cambridge Road, Milton at the approach to Jane Coston Bridge' (86%)
 - Element 3: 'improvements to path through Milton Country Park' (83%)
 - Element 1: 'route through an underpass under the A14' (82%)
 - Element 5: 'development of a route around the perimeter of the Car Dyke Roman Canal site' (78%)

- Element 6: ‘traffic calming and junction changes on Car Dyke road’ (76%)
 - Element 7C: ‘route into Waterbeach Option C – towards new Waterbeach Station’ (73%)
 - Element 7B: ‘route into Waterbeach Option B – Car Dyke Roman Canal and Quiet Road’ (69%)
 - Element 7A: ‘route into Waterbeach Option A – Car Dyke Roman Canal and new shared use path along field edges’ (63%)
- 415 respondents answered the question about how far they supported the installation of solar studs in eight specific locations.
 - The majority of respondents supported all four solar stud locations:
 - ‘Along path parallel to the Railway’ (88%)
 - ‘Through the underpass under the A14’ (84%)
 - ‘Through Milton Country Park’ (80%)
 - ‘Around the perimeter of the Car Dyke Roman Canal site’ (79%)

Qualitative

- Question 5 asked respondents whether they had any additional comments on the proposed route options. 211 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
 - Debate about the width and environmental impact of element 4: ‘path parallel to the existing railway’
 - Debate about the safety and lighting of element 1: ‘route through an underpass under the A14’
 - Support for element 7C: ‘route into Waterbeach Option C – towards new Waterbeach Station’
 - General positive comments about the proposals
 - Discussions about the need for lighting along the route
 - Discussions about needing to include a route along the River Cam Towpath
 - Debate about width and accessibility element 7B: ‘route into Waterbeach Option B – Car Dyke Roman Canal and Quiet Road’
 - Concerns about the width of the paths
 - Discussions about expanding the proposals to include more of the A10 cycling provision
 - Debate about the accessibility of element 7A: ‘route into Waterbeach Option A – Car Dyke Roman Canal and new shared use path along field edges’
 - Debate about the accessibility of element 2: ‘Improvements to Cambridge Road, Milton at the approach to Jane Coston Bridge’
 - Discussion about further improvements for element 3: ‘Improvements to path through Milton Country Park’
- Question 6 asked respondents whether they had any comments about the suggested options for signage and wayfinding. 137 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
 - Concerns about confusion caused by the suggested abbreviations

- Debate about the amount of lighting needed along the route
- General positive comments about the signage and wayfinding proposals
- Discussion about the need for clear and consistent signage
- Discussion about whether signage was needed
- Discussion about the need for distance markers
- Discussion about the need for maps along the route

Other

Qualitative

- 69 respondents left comments about whether they felt the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any person/s or group/s that fall under the Equality Act 2010. The main themes were:
 - About the benefits the schemes would have for those with protected characteristics
 - About the negative impact the lack of space on shared use paths and lack of maintenance would have on older/younger users and/or those with disabilities

Introduction

Background

In 2016, the Greater Cambridge Partnership commissioned a consultant to review twelve Greenway routes that would enable cyclists, walkers and equestrians to travel safely and sustainably from villages around the city into Cambridge.

The consultant identified a number of missing links that could be provided, creating initial proposals for the villages below:

- Waterbeach Greenway
- Horningsea Greenway
- Swaffham Greenway
- Bottisham Greenway
- Fulbourn Greenway
- Linton Greenway
- Sawston Greenway
- Melbourn Greenway
- Haslingfield Greenway
- Barton Greenway
- Comberton Greenway
- St Ives Greenway

In April 2017, £480,000 of City Deal funding was allocated to the Greenways scheme to take the project through a public engagement and consultation phase.

Each Greenway then went through an initial public engagement phase. Residents and stakeholders attended events and discussed how the local area is meeting the transport needs of its users. This information was then fed into the designs for initial proposals for each route.

After taking on this feedback finalised designs were created, the Greater Cambridge Partnership then ran a public consultation between 15 October and 03 December 2018 to gather and record the public's views on the route. This consultation was promoted via online advertising, social media promotion, posters in key locations, emails, engagement events and consultation leaflets to over 5000 households.

Public consultation is undertaken as part of wider stakeholder engagement in advance of any decisions on final options to consider and facilitate necessary input in the development of the scheme. The main stakeholders for this consultation were:

Individuals or organisations that are interested because they live in the community the scheme may affect, for example interested parties, potential users of the scheme, local businesses, bus operators, developers, landowners and local action groups. Government agencies and local authorities. For example district and parish councils, Environment Agency, Highways England and Natural England.

Consultation and Analysis Methodology

Background

The consultation strategy for this stage of the Waterbeach Greenway proposals was designed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership communications team with input from the County Council's Research Team. During the design process reference was made to the County Council's Consultation Guidelines, in particular taking into account the following points:

- The consultation is taking place at a time when proposals are at a formative stage (with a clear link between this consultation round and the previous consultation);
- Sufficient information and reasoning is provided to permit an intelligent response from the public to the proposals;
- Adequate time given for consideration and response given the significance of the decision being taken;
- Plans in place for a full analysis of the results and for these to be presented at a senior level to enable the consultation to be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals.

Consultation Strategy

Identification of the Audience

The consultation was open for anyone to contribute to. The key target audience were individuals or organisations that are interested because they live in the community the scheme may affect, for example interested parties, potential users of the scheme, local businesses, bus operators, developers, landowners and local action groups.

Government agencies and local authorities. For example district and parish councils, Environment Agency, Highways England and Natural England. This understanding of the audience was then used as a basis upon which to design the consultation materials, questions and communication strategy.

Design of Consultation Materials

It was identified that the audience for the consultation required a great deal of detailed information upon which to base their responses. So whilst the key consultation questions were relatively straight forward (people were asked to express how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network, how far they supported the 7 elements of the Waterbeach Greenway route, and how far they supported the installation of solar studs in 4 locations) a 2 page information document was produced and

supplemented with additional information available online and at key locations.

This document explained the Greater Cambridge Partnership's strategy and the time-scales to which it was working and discussed the reasons why a Greenway was being developed for Waterbeach. It also provided detailed maps, information and costings on each of the options to enable residents to compare the pros and cons for each element.

Design of Consultation Questions

The consultation questions themselves were designed to be neutral, clear to understand and were structured to enable people to comment on all the key areas of decision making. This was done in order to help people to understand and comment on both the Greater Cambridge Partnership's strategy and the local implications of this.

For the first half of the consultation survey there was a focus on questions relating to the options for the Waterbeach Greenway scheme. Questions then moved on to capture the detail of why respondents were choosing particular options. The second half of the survey focused on multiple choice questions relating to respondents' journeys and personal details, allowing measurement of the impact of the Waterbeach Greenway scheme on various groups.

The main tools for gathering comments were an online survey and a paper return survey attached to the consultation document. It was recognised that online engagement, whilst in theory available to all residents, could potentially exclude those without easy access to the internet. Therefore the paper copies of the questions were widely distributed with road-shows held to collect responses face to face. Other forms of response e.g. detailed written submissions were also received and have been incorporated into the analysis of the feedback.

The survey included the opportunity for 'free text' responses and the analysis approach taken has enabled an understanding of sentiment as well as the detailed points expressed.

Diversity and Protected Characteristics

A complete set of questions designed to monitor equality status (gender, ethnicity, sexuality) were not included within the direct questions on the survey. This was because previous feedback from the public has suggested that these questions were overly intrusive given the context of providing comments on the strategic aspects of a new transport route. Previous consultation has highlighted the importance of taking into account accessibility at the detailed scheme design stage.

It was decided therefore to only collect information on matters pertinent to travel, that is to say age, employment status and disability (although not the nature of disability). A free text option provided opportunity for respondents' to feedback on any issues they felt may impact on protected groups.

Analysis

The strategy for analysis of the consultation was as follows:

- An initial quality assurance review of the data was conducted and a review with the engagement team carried out to identify any issues or changes that occurred during the consultation process.
- A set of frequencies were then produced and checks made against the total number of respondents for each question and the consultation overall. A basic sense check of the data was made at this point with issues such as checking for duplicate entries, data entry errors and other quality assurance activities taking place.
 - **Duplicate Entries.** Measures were in place to avoid analysing duplicated entries. The online survey software collects the timestamp of entries so patterns of deliberate duplicate entries can be spotted and countered.
 - **Partial Entries.** The system records all partial entries as well as those that went through to completion (respondent hit submit). These are reviewed separately and in a few cases, where a substantial response has been made (as opposed to someone just clicking through) then these are added to the final set for analysis.
 - Within the analysis a search for any unusual patterns within the responses was carried out, such as duplicate or 'cut and paste' views being expressed on proposals.
- Closed questions (tick box) are then analysed using quantitative methods which are then presented in the final report through charts, tables and descriptions of key numerical information.
- Data was also cross-tabulated where appropriate, for example, to explore how respondents in particular areas or with different statuses answered questions. Characteristic data was then used to provide a general over-view of the 'reach' of the consultation in terms of input from people of different socio-economic status and background.
- Free text questions were analysed using qualitative methods, namely through thematic analysis. Key themes are identified using specialist software and then responses tagged with these themes (multiple tags can be given to the same response). At this stage totals of tagged themes are created and sample quotes chosen for the final report that typify particular tagged themes. Comment themes are listed in order of the number of comments received, from most to least. In the reporting of themes 'most' represents where over 50% of respondents' comments were applicable, 'some' represents 25%-49%, and 'few' represents less than 25% of comments.

- The 'Places' tool on Consult Cambs allowed respondents to place a 'pin' on to a map of the route and leave a comment. No comments were left on the map for these proposals.
- The final report is then written to provide an objective view of the results of the consultation.

Quality Assurance

Data Integrity

- A visual check of the raw data show no unusual patterns. There were no large blocks of identical answers submitted at a similar time.
- Date / time stamp of submissions showed no unusual patterns.
- Text analysis showed no submissions of duplicate text.

Survey Findings

Respondent Profile

In total, 423 residents responded to the consultation survey.

Respondent location

Respondents were asked for their postcodes during the survey, but were not forced to enter a response. 341 respondents entered recognisable postcodes, while nearly a fifth did not (82 respondents).

Based on the postcode data provided most respondents resided in:

- Waterbeach (46%)
- Milton (22%)


These postcodes were also used to group respondents by parish (or ward in the case of Cambridge) and then into one of two categories;

- 'Waterbeach and further North' (covering 49% of respondents);
- 'South of Waterbeach' (covering 31% of respondents)

A full breakdown of respondent locations can be found in Appendix 1.

The following map shows the rate of response by parish/ward:


Figure 1: Map to show areas of response



Respondents were asked a series of questions about their personal circumstances and the results can be seen below. Please note that respondents did not have to enter information on these questions.

Respondent interest in project

413 respondents answered the question on their interest in the project. Respondents could select multiple answers for this question.




- The majority of respondents indicated they
 - Were a 'resident in South Cambridgeshire' (78%)
 - 'Regularly travel in the area' (57%)
- Nearly half indicated they 'work in the area' (44%)
- Just under a fifth indicated they were a 'resident in Cambridge' (19%)
- Few respondents indicated they:
 - Were a 'local business owner/employer' (4%)
 - 'Occasionally travel in the area' (4%)
 - Were a 'resident elsewhere' (4%)
 - 'Study in the area' (3%) or had an 'other' interest (3%)

Respondent usual mode of travel in the area

415 respondents answered the question on how they usually travel in the area. Respondents could select multiple answers for this question.

Figure 3: Usual mode of travel




- The majority of respondents indicated:
 - They usually travelled by 'bicycle' (80%)
 - They were a 'car driver' (69%)
- Just over half of respondents indicated they usually travelled 'on foot' (52%)
- Over a quarter of respondents indicated they were a 'car passenger' (27%)
- A fifth indicated they were a 'bus user' (20%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual mode of travel was:
 - 'Other' (12%)
 - As a 'horse rider' (3%)
 - A 'powered two-wheeler' (1%)
 - 'Not applicable' (1%).
 - As a 'van or lorry driver' (<1%)

Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area

207 respondents answered the question on their usual workplace destination if they commuted in the area.

Figure 4: Usual workplace destination




- Over a quarter of respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was:
 - 'Cambridge City Centre' (30%)
 - 'Other' (28%)
- Over a fifth indicated it was 'Milton Road Science Park or Business Park' (22%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was:
 - 'University of Cambridge' (9%)
 - 'Addenbrooke's/Biomedical Campus' (7%)
 - 'Cambridge Research Park' (6%)

26 respondents who indicated their usual workplace destination was 'other' left information indicating their destination. These locations included: Whittlesford, Newmarket, London, Cambridge Airport, Swavesey, Bury Saint Edmunds, St Ives, Teversham, Shepreth, Grantchester, Great Abington, Histon, Hinxtton, Cambridge city, Cambourne, Fulbourn, Melbourn, and Girton.

Respondent age range

412 respondents answered the question on their age range.




- Average working ages from '25-34' to '55-64' were well represented
- Working ages from '15-24' were slightly under represented

Respondent employment status

414 respondents answered the question on their employment status. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.


Figure 6: Employment status



- Just under three quarters of respondents indicated they were 'employed' (72%)
- Few respondents indicated:
 - They were 'retired' (13%)
 - They were 'self-employed' (8%)
 - They were in 'education' (3%)
 - They were 'a home-based worker' (2%)
 - They were 'a stay at home parent, carer or similar' (2%)
 - They were 'other' (1%)
 - That they would 'prefer not to say' (1%) or were 'unemployed' (1%).

Respondent disability status

423 respondents answered the question on whether they had a disability that influences the way they travel.




- 4% of respondents indicating that they did.

Question 1: In general how far do you support the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network?

417 respondents answered the question on how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network.

Figure 8: Support for the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network




- The majority of respondents supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network (94%)

Question 2: How would you intend to primarily travel on the Greenway?

423 respondents answered the question on how they intended to primarily travel on the Greenway. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.

Figure 9: Mode of travel on the Greenway




- The majority of respondents indicated they would be 'cycling' on the Greenway (86%)
- Under two fifths indicated they would be 'walking' on the Greenway (35%)
- Few respondents indicated they would be 'running' (13%), 'horse riding' (3%) or using 'other' means to travel on the Greenway (1%)
 - Respondents who indicated they used 'other' means to travel on the Greenway were asked to specify. These included using mobility aids, skating, and issues with crossing the A10 to use the Greenway.
- Few respondents indicated they 'did not intend to travel on the Greenway' (5%)

Question 3: How far do you agree with the following elements of the proposed Greenway Route?

418 respondents answered the question about how far they agreed with the individual elements of the proposed Greenway Route.

Figure 10: Support for elements of the proposed Greenway Route




The majority of respondents supported all of the following elements of the proposed Greenway route:

- Element 4: 'path parallel to existing railway track' (90%)
- Element 2: 'improvements to Cambridge Road, Milton at the approach to Jane Coston Bridge' (86%)
- Element 3: 'improvements to path through Milton Country Park' (83%)
- Element 1: 'route through an underpass under the A14' (82%)
- Element 5: 'development of a route around the perimeter of the Car Dyke Roman Canal site' (78%)
- Element 6: 'traffic calming and junction changes on Car Dyke road' (76%)

One element had multiple options available.

Figure 11: Support for element 7: ‘Route into Waterbeach’ Options




For the element 7: ‘Route into Waterbeach’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported all three options:
 - ‘Option C – towards new Waterbeach Station’ (73%)
 - ‘Option B – Car Dyke Roman Canal and Quiet Road’ (69%)
 - ‘Option A – Car Dyke Roman Canal and new shared use path along field edges’ (63%)
- Respondents were nearly equally opposed to all three options:
 - ‘Option A’ (9%)
 - ‘Option C’ (8%)
 - ‘Option B (7%)

Question 4: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?

415 respondents answered the question about how far they supported the installation of solar studs in several locations.

Figure 12: Support for the installation of solar studs



The majority of respondents supported all four solar stud locations:

- 'Along path parallel to the Railway' (88%)
- 'Through the underpass under the A14' (84%)
- 'Through Milton Country Park' (80%)
- 'Around the perimeter of the Car Dyke Roman Canal site' (79%)

Question 5: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options?

211 respondents left comments on question 5, which asked if they had any additional comments on the proposed route options.

Summary of major themes

Comment Theme	Respondent comments
Element 4: Path parallel to the existing railway track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported this element, as they felt it improved the connectivity between Waterbeach and Cambridge with a safe route that avoids main roads • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the path needed to be made wider to accommodate different types of users without risking their safety • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the path's development impact on the environment • A few respondents indicated that maintenance needed to be included within the costs to ensure the route remains safe and accessible
Element 1: Route through an underpass under the A14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element. These respondents felt that, although costly, the underpass offered connectivity to other routes in the area • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that lighting in the underpass would need to be sufficient to make it safe at night and felt that solar light studs would not achieve this • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they opposed this element <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that underpasses were unsafe, particularly at night ○ Some of these respondents felt that the cost was too high ○ A few of these respondents felt that the bridge and towpath towards Fen Road in Milton offered a cheaper and more accessible alternative
Element 7C: Route into Waterbeach Option C - towards new Waterbeach Station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element as they felt this route gave the best access to all areas of Waterbeach, including the new developments and the new railway station, while avoiding the busier main roads

<p>Positive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the proposals •
<p>Lighting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt the whole route needed lighting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents discussed the lighting for element 1: A14 underpass, feeling that overhead lighting would be needed to ensure access is always visible and to improve feelings of safety, which they felt solar light studs were not enough to achieve along ○ Some of these respondents felt that overhead lighting may be needed at more dangerous areas of the route, such as along the railway tracks and where close to the river ○ A few of these respondents felt that the whole route needed some form of lighting
<p>Route along the River Cam Towpath</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the route needed to link up to or use the existing towpath along the River Cam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt the towpath needed maintaining to make it more accessible ○ A few of these respondents felt that use of the towpath could save development elsewhere along the route, particularly element 4: Railway – between Milton Country Park and Car Dyke Roman Canal, and so save on development costs
<p>Element 7B: Route into Waterbeach Option B - Car Dyke Roman Canal and Quiet Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this element as they felt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was not enough space to accommodate cyclists and that it would be dangerous ○ That this route was not accessible to enough of Waterbeach • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this route would provide good access for Waterbeach residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that element 7C: route to New Waterbeach Station, would also need to be built to provide access to the new station and developments ○ Some of these respondents felt that traffic calming measures, such as speed reduction, would be needed to ensure this route is safe

<p>Width of path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the paths needed to be wider in order to provide enough space for cyclists to pass each other and give pedestrians ample room to avoid conflict
<p>A10 cycle route</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the cycling provision along the A10 also needed to be improved, as this route provided access to employment centres and is heavily used • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the Greenway proposals offered a safer alternative to the A10 cycle route
<p>Element 7A: Route into Waterbeach Option A – Car Dyke Roman Canal and shared use path along field edges</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this route would not offer suitable accessibility to Waterbeach or its residents • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this route would be needed alongside element 7B and 7C as they would provide overall accessibility to Waterbeach and ensure futureproofing with the planned expansions in the area
<p>Element 2: Improvements to Cambridge Road, Milton at the approach to Jane Coston Bridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this proposal was needed to improve safety • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this element was too much of a detour to be of use
<p>Element 3: Improvements to path through Milton Country Park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this element as they felt it would impose on the users of the park, particularly due to the proximity of the route to children’s play areas • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this route but felt that further improvements were needed, such as segregation of the routes and potential rerouting to avoid children’s play areas, to ensure the route was safe

Question 6: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?

137 respondents left comments about suggested options for signage and wayfinding.

Summary of major themes

Abbreviations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the abbreviations of place names could be confusing for those not familiar to the area or confused for other locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of these respondents felt that full places names would be more suitable
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for the solar light studs, feeling they would help with safe passage of the routes at night and during poor weather <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents felt that overhead lighting would be needed at junctions and underpasses to ensure visibility • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that lighting needed to be minimised due to the impact on the environment
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the signage
Clear signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the signage needed to be as clear and consistent along the route as possible to help users of the Greenway
Not needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the signage was not needed, feeling that the existing signs and individual access to maps via phones was adequate
Distance markers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that distance markers would be useful for Greenway users
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that maps would be useful to show how the route connects with other routes in the area

Question 7: Please comment if you feel any of these proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s

69 respondents left comments about whether they felt the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any person/s or group/s that fall under the Equality Act 2010.

Summary of major themes

Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would have a positive impact on person/s or group/s with protected characteristics as they improved access to the surrounding areas
Disability and age (negative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that without adequate space on shared paths and maintenance of the routes they may not be accessible to younger/older users and/or those with disabilities

Stakeholders responses

Background

11 responses were received on behalf of a number of different groups or organisations.

British Horse Society
 Cambridge Football Club
 Cambridge Past, Present and Future
 Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust
 Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum
 Camcycle

South Cambridgeshire District Councillor
 St Johns College
 Waterbeach and District Bridleways
 Community Group
 Waterbeach Cycling Campaign
 Wong International

All of the responses from these groups have been made available to board members in full and will be published alongside the results of the public consultation survey. The following is a brief summary of the common themes expressed through this correspondence; it should be noted that stakeholder responses can contradict each other therefore we've made no reference to the relative merit or otherwise of the information received.

Summary of major themes

<p>Element 5: Development of a route around the perimeter of the Car Dyke Roman Canal site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this route <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these stakeholders felt that the path needed to be wider to accommodate the increased usage and all types of Greenway user ○ Some of these stakeholders felt that the paths surface needed be carefully developed and managed, particularly for equestrians • Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that there were alternative routes this element could take to mitigate the impact on the environment
<p>Shared use of paths</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that measures should be put in place to ensure accessibility and safety of all Greenway users, including segregating the paths and including grass strips along entire route

<p>Element 2: Improvements to Cambridge Road, Milton at the approach to Jane Coston Bridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, feeling that it was important for access to nearby employment sites. These stakeholders also felt that the improvements needed to expand onto Cowley Road, either treatment A (Quiet Road) or treatment C (Protected Path) • A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme were concerned that Jane Coston Bridge was not accessible to equestrians
<p>Element 1: Route through an underpass under the A14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, as it would be a more direct route than Jane Coston Bridge for many users. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these stakeholders felt that the path needed to be wider to accommodate the increased usage and all types of Greenway user • A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme were concerned about equestrian access to the underpass, feeling it needed mounting blocks. These stakeholders also discussed the possibility of the Greenway using a nearby underpass
<p>Element 4: Path parallel to the existing railway track</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that some form of screening, preferably natural, was needed along this part of the route to mitigate the risks from high winds and the railway line • Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, feeling it was integral to the proposals. These stakeholders felt that the path needed to be wider to accommodate the increased usage and all types of Greenway user
<p>Element 6: Traffic calming and junction changes on Car Dyke Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, feeling it would increase safety in the area
<p>Element 7A: Route into Waterbeach Option A – Car Dyke Roman Canal and shared use path along field edges</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that this route was the most indirect of the three Options, with the exception of a nearby employment site, and that users would likely prefer the other Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that this Option should be included if the budget allows it along with the other two Options • A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme were concerned about equestrian access

<p>Element 7B: Route into Waterbeach Option B - Car Dyke Roman Canal and Quiet Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these stakeholders felt that this Option would be the primary route for residents of the existing village ○ Some of these stakeholders felt the traffic calming measures would be of benefit to users
<p>Element 7C: Route into Waterbeach Option C - towards new Waterbeach Station</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, feeling it would offer the best access to the new developments and nearby bridleways
<p>Width of path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that the widths of the paths along the Greenway needed to be extended to allow safe passage for users
<p>Element 3: Improvements to path through Milton Country Park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated that this was an area of high pedestrian usage and so would require segregated paths to ensure their safety • A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme felt this route would be of benefit to equestrian users but were concerned about whether development had considered these users

Email, social media and consultation event responses

16 responses were received regarding the consultation through email and social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter. Following a thematic analysis of these responses the following themes have been noted.

Summary of major themes

A10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the A10 was dangerous to cycle along <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt the proposals offered a safe alternative ○ Some of these respondents felt that the proposals needed extending along the A10, particularly towards Cambridge Research Park
Equestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt the proposals did not offer enough provision for equestrians, particularly around element 4 (Path parallel to the existing railway track), and that the proposals should make use of the towpath along the River Cam • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt the proposals had accommodated equestrians
Links to other cycle routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals should have more links to other Greenways, the St Ives guided busway cycle path, and other parts of the national cycle network
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the scheme, feeling it improved safety and accessibility in the area for all non-motorised users
Shared use paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that paths should offer more segregation of users in order to avoid conflict and improve safety
Element 4 (Path parallel to the existing railway track)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this element was problematic due to the proximity to the railway • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, particularly as it was away from roads