

Date	O, I, P	Text
<i>Of submission to GCP</i>	<i>Organisation, Individual, Public Figure</i>	
18/07/2021		<p>I have tried to register my concern about a local walking and cycling route on your survey, but the format of the survey does not really allow for it.</p> <p>My concern is with the route that goes through from Warwick Road to Storey's Way. The problem with the survey is that it does not reveal the plans for the entrance and exit to the passageway that goes from Mayfield School in Warwick Road through to Windsor Road/Oxford Road. My assumption is that the mapping of these routes is intended to facilitate travel across the city, and thus may involve those wanting to go perhaps at greater speed than the purely local walking and cycling traffic.</p> <p>You will observe that the passage way is not wide. Bikes can pass one another, but the passage will also contain those who are cycling with small children, those who walk with small children, and older cyclists. The point of danger is where the passageway connects with Windsor Road/Oxford Road. Right of way is along Windsor Road, and traffic is currently required to give way at the end of Oxford Road, and then proceed carefully to navigate round the partial barrier into the passage way.</p> <p>My concern is that if any changes are made to that point, such as reducing or removing the barrier, the speed of through traffic is likely to increase, and be a source of irritation and danger to regular users of the passageway. As it is, cyclists frequently enter the passageway from Oxford Road without checking for traffic on Windsor Road, and also emerge from the passage way into Oxford Road without due care. At beginning and end of school hours, there are enough sources of distraction for those with small children without having any further problems presented which could result from 'easing' the entre into the passageway. I therefore urge you not to make it easier and faster to enter the passageway from that side.</p> <p>My postcode is [address]and I have been in [address] since {date}. [name]</p>

19/07/2021	P	<p>Hi {name}</p> <p>Is https://consultcambs.uk/engagementhq.com/cycling-plus GCP Tranche 2?</p> <p>I only realised it was happening through reading Camcycle notice. I am not aware of any engaging with local councillors on this? I am also interested in what has happened to Victoria Avenue bus gate.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>{name}</p>
20/07/2021	P	<p>Hi {name}</p> <p>The confusion then is that the County Council Tranche 2 consultation is called Active Travel https://consultcambs.uk/engagementhq.com/cats and this is also the Government terminology https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emergency-active-travel-fund-local-transport-authority-allocations and you are using Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge's Active Travel Network.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>{name}</p>
05/07/2021	O	<p>Dear GCP</p> <p>Your consultation does not take connectivity outside the GCP area into account. There are many opportunities to connect Cambridge with East Cambridgeshire, such as extensions to the Waterbeach and Swaffhams Greenway (yes, we note that some of the latter Greenway is in East Cambs!). There seems to be some compartmentalisation of imagination going on. We would have expected the LCWIP to have considered these routes but they also ignore them. How do we get the connectivity issue on your agenda?</p> <p>{name} for Ely Cycling Campaign http://elycycle.org.uk</p>

05/07/2021		<p>The survey asks questions about how I travel.</p> <p>I don't travel. Because covid.</p> <p>Did you mean to ask</p> <p>(1) how I used to travel before covid (2) how I think I might travel in future if and when it becomes safe to do so</p> <p>or did you really want me to answer the question as it is written and say that I don't travel?</p>
06/07/2021		<p>(name),</p> <p>So, as I don't travel currently, because of covid, there's no point in my trying to answer the questions.</p> <p>Shouldn't your consultation be useful beyond covid, as the facilities you're going to build will last beyond covid? Or are you working on the assumption that there isn't going to be any "beyond covid"?</p>
16/07/2021		<p>Hi</p> <p>It is rather irritating that you get half way through the survey, find that it is asking you questions about files that you haven't looked at, Back out to have a look at them, and find that once you are back at the discussion page, your answers are not actually saved or accessible again, despite having carefully clicked save and continue many times.</p> <p>The survey should open in a new page. Simple.</p> <p>OK, if I'd known you were going to throw it away, I could have copied the page to a new tab and worked with two tabs.</p> <p>But I shouldn't have to need to be clever.</p> <p>Also you should arguably have a "haven't looked at the proposals" answer or "don't have an opinion" for each question, as that is different from "neither for nor against". Or tell people that they needn't answer questions they don't have a view on. A lot of people will fill in the middle proposal because they think they have to respond when actually they know nothing about that proposal because they don't know the area and haven't looked at the proposal. That is quite different from a deliberate neutrality based on knowledge.</p>

	I cont.	<p>And whilst I am criticising the questionnaire, the first question is very leading. Who does not support active travel?</p> <p>However, some changes to make life easier for cyclists or pedestrians may have such a deleterious effect for those who need/prefer to travel by motorised transport, including buses, and those who live on affected routes, and those who have to spend more time on their journey (does travel time not register as a criterion with traffic planners these days) that overall more people are harmed than benefit.</p> <p>Is there a standard cost/benefit formula for extra journeys caused by modal filters or indeed any road scheme, taking into account extra CO2 and other pollution? Or do you do it all by putting a finger in the air? How much science has gone into these proposals?</p> <p>The main beneficiary of these proposals will, I suspect, be the e-scooter user. And I suspect that we shall soon see a huge increase in deaths and injuries in scooter riders. How will we decide the cost/benefit of that change?</p> <p>Oh, and you should have a comment section with *each* proposal, so that people can be more nuanced. "This bit ought to work well but that will be a disaster".</p> <p>Just trying to be helpful...</p> <p>Regards [name]</p>
26/07/2021	O	<p>CAUTION: This email originates outside of Cambridgeshire County Council's network. Do NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this email to be spam please follow these instructions to report it: https://camweb.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/spam/</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>Please can I request a copy of the survey questions so that we can tailor our response to those asked and a copy of the cycling Plus Map as the link on the website is not working.</p> <p>Many thanks and best wishes</p> <p>[name]</p> <p>[name] Travel, Transport & Sustainability Manager Tel: [telephone number] www.cuh.org.uk @ThinkGreen_CUH</p> <p>The Trust is: part of the National Institute for Health Research - Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre and a member of Cambridge University Health Partners</p> <p>This email is confidential, see www.cuh.org.uk/email_disclaimer.html</p>
28/07/2021	O	<p>Hi [name]</p> <p>I'm afraid the map is still not showing. If you say it's a large file type then this may be why the server may block it, is there any way to compress it so that we can review and submit a response?</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>[name]</p>

29/07/2021	O	<p>Hi {name}</p> <p>These are perfect – thank you for arranging!</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>{name}</p>
29/07/2021		<p>It is extremely difficult to understand what these diagrams mean if you have no prior knowledge of reading plans. I'd suggest that the average person will struggle with these so you have fallen at the first hurdle. I was unable to find any accompanying text to describe the rationale for the schemes, what they intend to achieve and how, and why these specific sites were selected. I really don't think this is the best way to run a consultation. It's a bit like 'but the plans were in the basement of the council offices' - Hitchikers Guide to the Galaxy reference.</p>
05/08/2021	I	<p>Hi {name},</p> <p>thanks for replying and for your quick reply,</p> <p>the link I had is this one:</p> <p>https://consultcambis.uk/engagementhq.com/cats</p> <p>and the GCP email is in the overall blurb that accompanies the drawings. I can see now that the two sets of plans are not the same, but do overlap in places. The link that you sent me is more informative! So thank you for that.</p> <p>kind regards,</p> <p>{name}</p>

03/08/2021		<p>Dear [name]</p> <p>I am writing because your name appears on the Cycling Plus consultation. I am far from sure that I have identified all the strands of policy-making relating to the encouragement of active travel in Cambridgeshire. Can you point me towards a single document that describes the strategic approach for the County, covering both County Council and GCP activity, and setting out its parameters – in particular quantification of what is to be achieved (eg in terms of numbers of active travel miles travelled), and what will be the measures of success, both at the global County level and for individual projects? I presume such a document must exist, otherwise there is no way of knowing whether the strategy is adequate or is working.</p> <p>I hope this isn't too much trouble, and look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>[name]</p> <p>[name] [address] [telephone number]</p> <p>Sent from Mail for Windows 10</p>
06/08/2021	P	<p>Dear Mr (name),</p> <p>Many thanks for copying this request to me.</p> <p>Very best,</p> <p>[name] County Councillor for Petersfield division Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p>Get Outlook for iOS</p>
30/07/2021		<p>To: contactus@greatercambridge.org.uk Subject: Priority - Standard - Greater Cambridge Partnership - Request a Service Details: Please find attached Request a Service: Customer details Title: Mr Full name: [name] Date of birth: 11/04/1945 00:00 Contact ID: CON-199467 Address: [address] Preferred contact method: Home phone Email: [email] Home phone [telephone number] Mobile: Work phone: Person to contact about this enquiry Title: Mr Full name: [name] Contact ID: CON-199467 Address: [address] Preferred contact method: Home phone Email: [email] Home phone: [telephone number] Mobile: Work phone: Request Service details Request type: Other GCP Project Details of enquiry: Please can you send out a paper version of the Cycling Plus Consultation as customer wants to retain a copy of what he has completed in the form.[name][address] Thank you Kind Regards [name] Customer Services Team</p>

12/08/2021	O	<p>Dear Colleagues</p> <p>Please find attached the response to the Cycling Plus Consultation Survey on behalf of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.</p> <p>We would welcome further engagement with the project team as each of the proposed schemes develop.</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>[name] [telephone number] www.cuh.org.uk @ThinkGreen_CUH</p> <p>The Trust is: part of the National Institute for Health Research - Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre and a member of Cambridge University Health Partners</p> <p>This email is confidential, see www.cuh.org.uk/email_disclaimer.html</p> <p>12 August 2021 Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Cycling Plus Consultation Survey 2021 Dear Sir, Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge's Active Travel Network – July 2021</p> <p>Letter of support sent on behalf of the Cambridge University Hospitals. Cambridge University Hospitals (CUH) welcomes the plan to provide additional walking and cycling routes across Cambridgeshire's city and districts. I write on behalf of the Cambridge University Hospitals. About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge University Hospitals The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care. The site has grown considerably in recent years and the organisations on the site reflect the strength of healthcare and life sciences in Cambridge: Capital, Estates and Facilities</p>
	O cont.	<p>CUH NHS Foundation cont. Capital, Estates and Facilities Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare and the NHS: Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust • Education: The Deakin Centre and Cambridge Academy for Science and Technology • University & Research Institutes: University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine – housed in multiple buildings across the CBC and comprising twelve Academic Departments, four Research Institutes and five Medical Research Council (MRC) units, The Medical Research Council Laboratory of Molecular Biology (MRC LMB), Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute, Heart and Lung Research Institute and Addenbrooke's Centre for Clinical Investigation • Industry & Expansion: AstraZeneca Strategic R&D Centre, GlaxoSmithKline's (GSK) Experimental Medicine and Clinical Pharmacology Unit, Abcam PLC Headquarters and ideaSpace – a coworking community of start-ups <p>The campus will continue to grow (with work underway on the 2050 vision), creating jobs and bringing investment to Cambridge but we do this in collaboration with the city and its residents. Our achievements and success reflect the endeavour, persistence and brilliance of the people who live and work here. The campus has 21,000 researchers, industry and clinicians all working on one site. By 2031, it is estimated there will be 26,000 people working on the campus and up to 40,000 in the years following. Investment in the campus over the past five years has exceeded more than £750m. The CBC is the biggest employment site in Cambridge. Sustainable access to the CBC and CUH is a key factor alongside affordable housing to ensure the campus can attract and retain the best staff. With the further predicted growth in and around Cambridge as well as the predicted growth on the campus, increased walking and cycling routes, will become even more pressing.</p> <p>The proposals:</p> <p>Cycling is a very desirable travel option for a significant proportion of staff and visitors with over 12,000 daily cycle movements on campus in 2019. Growing congestion and pressures on parking, together with a strong focus on carbon emissions, mean that good cycling routes which improve access into and across the city are increasingly important. Over 7000 members of staff who access the campus come from the direction of the city centre or close vicinity, the majority via cycle, either directly from home, or from the railway station. To further support cycle users on the campus CUH and the CBC has plans to significantly increase cycling parking on site, not only to support the new developments but also the existing and increasing demand, which we expect to grow significantly beyond the current modal shift with the significant congestion regularly experienced on existing road infrastructure which is at capacity. It is clear that thorough thought and consideration has been given to each of the proposed corridors by how they link to existing routes and connect communities, focusing on commuter routes and desire lines. Our preferred options:</p>
	O cont.	<p>CUH NHS Foundation cont. We are supportive of all the routes proposed however, as the consultation asks for preferred, we would be particularly keen to see routes A, B and G come forward as soon as possible to support and facilitate key routes to the campus. With regard to route A (A1134 north – south: Fendon and Mowbray Road), CUH would welcome connections supporting the Cambridge Romsey Town and north of the city communities with the campus. Staff tell us that the lack of segregated spaces on this route do not make cycling appealing, and the development of this route would significantly improve the cycling experience.</p> <p>The second route supported is route B, which would improve cycle access along the A1134 east-west (Queen Edith's Way and Long Road), again, much improving access to the campus. The route would connect with and benefit from proposed works to improve cycle access and egress to and from Adrian Way/Long Road. The change to this junction is specifically noted in the actions (47 interventions) identified in the CBC Transport Needs Review. CUH would welcome this work being included within the GCP Cycling Plus Investment. The third route the Trust supports is route G Hills Road to Regent Street which would link the recently installed and highly utilised cycle lanes on Hills Road supporting direct access to the campus from the city.</p> <p>Each of the routes (A, B and G), and general improvements to cycling within Cambridge, would support bringing forward the works to improve access adjacent to CBC Car Park 6; works which the Cambridgeshire County Council agreed to fund in 2017 in exchange for the partial use of car park 6 as a compound for Skanska and the Hills Road cycle improvements. CUH would welcome those works proceeding at pace, following the recent planning and design development with the Council team.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing:</p> <p>The proposal to improve active travel will bring many benefits to the health and wellbeing of Cambridgeshire residents by supporting healthy lifestyles and getting out into the fresh air of their local neighbourhoods. Staff who work at the Trust often comment on the benefits of access to fresh air, green space and the ability to exercise – not just as part of a commute to and from work. CUH would welcome the benefits in this regard as a result of the planned investment proposed by the GCP.</p>

	O cont.	<p>CUH NHS Foundation cont. Security and safety: Concerns are often raised by the staff at CUH, about personal safety when it comes to cycle paths which may connect communities and other public routes. The Trust advises that, the design of any new footpaths and cycle ways should be in open, well laid out spaces which will enable paths to be made safe. Adequate lighting; suitable CCTV coverage of off road routes and pro-active monitoring of those CCTV cameras, as well as good quality surfaces and on-going maintenance are essential to encourage users onto these routes. Staff indicate that they have reluctance to use some existing cycle routes, in the later evening or at night, when lit only by solar studs so the campus is keen to see street style lighting to support the safe use of the proposed corridors during late hours supporting shift staff and through the winter months. Whilst many of the proposed corridors align with the highway we note that some would not. There have been several crimes and assault related incidents reported on cycle routes closer to Cambridge – publicised via the local press. CUH would strongly advocate the installation of CCTV on these routes to support staff and indeed local residents using active travel routes to feel safe in their journeys. We feel that the inclusion of both good lighting and CCTV will be essential to the success of the proposed routes.</p> <p>Summary CUH welcomes the positive intentions of the Cycling Plus proposals and would strongly encourage routes A, B and G are brought forward as quickly as possible to support sustainable travel to the CBC and indeed across the city. CUH would advocate the consideration of the two additional schemes which would complement the Cycling Plus proposals (i.e. Adrian Way / Long Road Junction and Car Park 6 interchange works outstanding since the Hills Road cycle way improvements). The CUH Travel and Transport Group would welcome further engagement with the project team as each of the proposed schemes develop.</p> <p>The campus has responded to a number of consultation over recent months, strongly suggesting the need for improved lighting and actively managed CCTV along cycle routes, particularly where these are away from the main highway. We believe these ideas linked to the programme of schemes have the potential to make a significant improvement to encourage people onto their bicycles. We make these recommendations following feedback from a significant number of cycle users so would be disappointed to see this ideas not taken forward again.</p> <p>Yours faithfully [name] [job] University Hospitals</p>
12/08/2021	O	<p>Dear Colleagues</p> <p>Please find attached the response to the Cycling Plus Consultation Survey on behalf of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners.</p> <p>The CBC Travel and Transport Group would welcome further engagement with the project team as each of the proposed schemes develop.</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>[name]</p> <p>[name] [telephone number] www.cuh.org.uk @ThinkGreen_CUH</p> <p>The Trust is: part of the National Institute for Health Research - Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre and a member of Cambridge University Health Partners</p> <p>This email is confidential, see www.cuh.org.uk/email_disclaimer.html</p> <p>12 August 2021 [name] Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust [job] Management Offices [address] Direct Dial: [telephone number] [name] @addenbrookes.nhs.uk Dear Sir,</p>
	O cont.	<p>Cambridge Biomedical Campus cont. I write on behalf of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to first and foremost express our firm support for the proposals associated with the Greater Cambridge Partnerships Cycling Plus consultation survey. The campus is pleased to see these links being made and is excited by the opportunities the new routes will bring. About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care. The site has grown considerably in recent years and the organisations on the site reflect the strength of healthcare and life sciences in Cambridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare and the NHS: Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust • Education: The Deakin Centre and Cambridge Academy for Science and Technology • University & Research Institutes: University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine – housed in multiple buildings across the CBC and comprising twelve Academic Departments, four Research Institutes and five Medical Research Council (MRC) units, The Medical Research Council Laboratory of Molecular Biology (MRC LMB), Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute, Heart and Lung Research Institute and Addenbrooke's Centre for Clinical Investigation • Industry & Expansion: AstraZeneca Strategic R&D Centre, GlaxoSmithKline's (GSK) Experimental Medicine and Clinical Pharmacology Unit, Abcam PLC Headquarters and IdeaSpace – a co-working community of start-ups <p>The campus will continue to grow (with work underway on the 2050 vision), creating jobs and bringing investment to Cambridge but we do this in collaboration with the city and its residents. Our achievements and success reflect the endeavour, persistence and brilliance of the people who live and work here. The campus has 21,000 researchers, industry and clinicians all working on one site. By 2031, it is estimated there will be 26,000 people working on the campus and up to 40,000 in the years following. Investment in the campus over the past five years has exceeded more than £750m. The CBC is the biggest employment site in Cambridge. Sustainable access to CBC is a key factor alongside affordable housing to ensure the campus can attract and retain the best staff. With the further predicted growth in and around Cambridge as well as the predicted growth on the campus, increased walking and cycling routes, will become even more pressing. The proposals:</p> <p>Cycling is a very desirable travel option for a significant proportion of staff and visitors with over 12,000 daily cycle movements on campus in 2019. Growing congestion and pressures on parking, together with a strong focus on carbon emissions, mean that good cycling routes which improve access into and across the city are increasingly important. Over 7,000 members of staff who access the campus come from the direction of the city centre or close vicinity, the majority via cycle, either directly from home, or from the railway station.</p> <p>To further support cycle users on the campus CBC partners have plans to significantly increase cycling parking on site, not only to support the new developments but also to support the existing and increasing demand, which we expect to grow significantly beyond the current modal shift with the significant congestion regularly experienced on existing road infrastructure which is at capacity. It is clear that thorough thought and consideration has been given to each of the proposed corridors by how they link to existing routes and connect communities, focusing on commuter routes and desire lines.</p> <p>Our preferred options:</p>

	O cont.	<p>Cambridge Biomedical Campus cont. We are supportive of all the routes proposed however, as the consultation asks for preferred, we would be particularly keen to see routes A, B and G come forward as soon as possible to support and facilitate key routes to the campus.</p> <p>With regard to route A (A1134 north – south: Fendon and Mowbray Road), the CBC would welcome connections supporting the Cambridge Romsey Town and north of the city communities with the campus. Staff tell us that the lack of segregated spaces on this route do not make cycling appealing, and the development of this route would significantly improve the cycling experience.</p> <p>The second route supported is route B, which would improve cycle access along the A1134 east-west (Queen Edith's Way and Long Road), again, much improving access to the campus. The route would connect with and benefit from proposed works to improve cycle access and egress to and from Adrian Way/Long Road. The change to this junction is specifically noted in the actions (47 interventions) identified in the CBC Transport Needs Review. CBC partners would welcome this work being included within the GCP Cycling Plus Investment.</p> <p>The third route the Trust supports is route G Hills Road to Regent Street which would link the recently installed and highly utilised cycle lanes on Hills Road supporting direct access to the campus from the city. Each of the routes (A, B and G), and general improvements to cycling within Cambridge, would support bringing forward the works to improve access adjacent to CBC Car Park 6; works which the Cambridgeshire County Council agreed to fund in 2017 in exchange for the partial use of car park 6 as a compound for Skanska and the Hills Road cycle improvements. CBC partners would welcome those works proceeding at pace, following the recent planning and design development with the Council team.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing:</p> <p>The proposal to improve active travel will bring many benefits to the health and wellbeing of Cambridgeshire residents by supporting healthy lifestyles and getting out into the fresh air of their local neighbourhoods. Staff who work on the CBC often comment on the benefits of access to fresh air, green space and the ability to exercise – not just as part of a commute to and from work. CBC partners would welcome the benefits in this regard as a result of the planned investment proposed by the GCP.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Cambridge Biomedical Campus cont. Security and safety:</p> <p>Concerns are often raised by the staff across the CBC, about personal safety when it comes to cycle paths which may connect communities and or other public routes. The Trust advises that, the design of any new footpaths and cycle ways should be in open, well laid out spaces which will enable paths to be made safe.</p> <p>Adequate lighting: suitable CCTV coverage of off road routes and pro-active monitoring of those CCTV cameras, as well as good quality surfaces and on-going maintenance are essential to encourage users onto these routes. Staff indicate that they have reluctance to use some existing cycle routes, in the later evening or at night, when lit only by solar studs so the campus is keen to see street style lighting to support the safe use of the proposed corridors during late hours supporting shift staff and through the winter months.</p> <p>Whilst many of the proposed corridors align with the highway we note that some would not. There have been several crimes and assault related incidents reported on cycle routes closer to Cambridge – publicised via the local press. CBC partners would strongly advocate the installation of CCTV on these routes to support staff and indeed local residents using active travel routes to feel safe in their journeys. We feel that the inclusion of both good lighting and CCTV will be essential to the success of the proposed routes.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>CBC partners welcome the positive intentions of the Cycling Plus proposals and would strongly encourage routes A, B and G are brought forward as quickly as possible to support sustainable travel to the CBC and indeed across the city. Partners would advocate the consideration of the two additional schemes which would complement the Cycling Plus proposals (i.e. Adrian Way / Long Road Junction and Car Park 6 interchange works outstanding since the Hills Road cycle way improvements). The CBC Travel and Transport Group would welcome further engagement with the project team as the schemes develop. The campus has responded to a number of consultation over recent months, strongly suggesting the need for improved lighting and actively managed CCTV along cycle routes particularly where these are away from the main highway. We believe these ideas linked to the programme of schemes proposed have the potential to make a significant improvement to encourage people onto their bicycles. We make these recommendations following feedback from a significant number of cycle users so would be disappointed to see this ideas not taken forward again.</p> <p>Yours faithfully [name] [address]</p>
13/08/2021	O	<p>Here is a considered response from Wilbrahams Environment Group to your survey request which we hope will be of interest</p> <p>[name]</p> <p>for Wilbrahams Environment Group</p> <p>Greater Cambridge Partnership – Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network - a response to the Consultation</p> <p>These comments are submitted by Wilbrahams Environment Group, a community body active in the Wilbrahams. We have studied the Active Travel Opportunities Consultation document, including the Study published in March 2021. Our interest is focused on our own locality, comprising the villages of Great and Little Wilbraham which are positioned less than six miles to the east of central Cambridge (to which many of our residents go daily or regularly for work, healthcare, education or leisure) yet in practice are almost cut off from "Active Travel" – meaning principally cycling or walking. Our response concentrates on cycling.</p> <p>GCP has asked for responses to 5 questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether and how often we use Active Travel to and around Cambridge What barriers discourage us from doing so What are our priorities for investment in Active Travel What are our preferences amongst the 13 corridors which GCP has identified Should GCP look at other possible routes for cycling <p>GCP's declared objective is to create a "joined up Active Travel Network". The March 2021 Study notes that in South Cambridgeshire cycle movements benefit from the existing Greenways routes but cycle routes "vary in quality, subsequently reducing connectivity and safety". The Study proposals focus on radial routes with high use which are poorly served by attractive and safe infrastructure.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Wilbrahams Environmental Group cont. The Study states that there is now a "unique opportunity to lock in a modal shift from car to Active Travel".</p> <p>The Wilbrahams are close to Cambridge. They are also even closer to two of the existing Greenways (at Fulbourn and Bottisham) on which GCP has spent large sums of money already, yet our communities do not enjoy safe access to either of them. We propose that GCP should facilitate greater use of those Greenways by providing us with the safe connectivity mentioned above. Dealing with each of the five questions posed to us:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only relatively few brave souls amongst our residents currently use Active Travel to and around Cambridge. 2. Residents are discouraged from using Active Travel because there is no safe cycle route at all out of our villages, either to Cambridge or to our local "hubs" at Fulbourn and Bottisham for shops, secondary schooling, GP services, library etc. 3. The roads within our villages are used by unusually large numbers of heavy goods vehicles, including car transporters, accessing commercial sites in Fulbourn or "cutting through" between the A14 and the A11. There is already a growing campaign here for action to improve road safety and in particular to reduce conflict between HGVs and cyclists and pedestrians in our villages, where some areas do not have roadside footpaths. 4. Beyond the boundaries of our villages we have no roadside footpaths at all, let alone dedicated cycle paths. The roads to Fulbourn, to Bottisham and to Quy are unusually busy with HGVs and other fast-moving traffic, so that cyclists tell us they very often feel exposed and unsafe. The traffic is a substantial disincentive to would-be cyclists here.
	O cont.	<p>Wilbrahams Environmental Group cont. 3. Our priority is for GCP and/or the County Council to invest locally in a "joined up Active Travel network" and achieve "a modal shift from car to Active Travel" by creating a safe cycle path between Fulbourn, the Wilbrahams and Bottisham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our residents could then use the two Greenways to access Cambridge by cycle for leisure and shopping. • Our villages are close enough for villagers to commute by cycle to Cambridge, to Addenbrooke's, to our Sixth Form Colleges, to the rail stations at Cambridge and Cambridge North and to major employment centres such as the Peterhouse Technology Park (currently being expanded and including Arm) at Cherry Hinton. • Our residents could cycle to our two local "hubs" – Bottisham and Fulbourn – for shops, secondary schooling, GP services, library etc or to connect to onwards public transport (of which there is almost none in the Wilbrahams). 4. We have no preferences amongst the 13 routes considered in the March 2021 Study, as our villages are remote from all of them. 5. Repeating our response to question 3, the GCP should look hard at creating the lateral cycle route through the Wilbrahams which we, the Parish Councils of our two villages and, we understand, our District and County councillors all support. <p>Existing assumptions by GCP and the County Council relating to cycle use are all based on the traditional bicycle, whereas today more and more people are investing in and using electric bicycles. Greater distances can be covered and cycles can be used by people who are older or less fit than has been the case in the past.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sale, rental and use of such cycles is booming. In the Netherlands, ebikes accounted for 50% of sales in 2020: GCP should be planning now for a similar trajectory here, to help to reduce our Carbon Footprint. We reproduce here an article from "Cycling Weekly" (August 2021) about the growth in the use of electric bikes in the UK: More than 25 million adults in the UK are now considering turning to two-wheeled e-mobility for the first time, as commuting and leisure habits evolve in the post-pandemic world. According to a study by Bosch eBike Systems, 55 per cent of British people are considering purchasing an e-bike following last year's lockdown, while 32 per cent say they would use their car less in favour of electric pedal power. Critically, 66 per cent would consider buying an e-bike if the government committed to proposed subsidy schemes. • Bosch's study polled over 2,000 people across the UK - including non-cyclists and those who already own an e-bike - on their perceptions of e-mobility and how these have changed since the start of the pandemic. The research aimed to understand the UK public's appetite for electric bikes, their willingness to swap the car for a two-wheeled commute, and the transformative role the pandemic has played in changing sustainable travel habits. • The UK e-bike market has grown rapidly over the last few years, with the pandemic accelerating this growth. In 2020 it grew by 68 per cent compared to 2019, with Bosch's research suggesting that the UK public's appetite for electric bicycles is only set to increase.
	O cont.	<p>Wilbrahams Environmental Group cont. • In the Wilbrahams we are investigating a scheme in partnership with a commercial provider to introduce a hire scheme for electric cycles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the past it has been assumed that people will not be prepared to commute to work or for other purposes by cycle beyond a fairly short distance. Traveling for 7 or 8 miles by cycle, eg from the Wilbrahams to central Cambridge, is becoming more acceptable/viable with the advent of ebikes – and that trend can accelerate if safe routes are provided for cyclists. • It has been proposed in the past to create a safe cycle route to Bottisham (to whose Village College our children go) by adapting the existing road across the old airfield. • A roadside cycle path could be created from Great Wilbraham to the outskirts of Fulbourn • There is a possible route from Little Wilbraham to Quy Waters, on the Newmarket Road (and thence to Cambridge) using Short Drove and building a connection across County Council land near to Quy Waters. <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCP's plans for a "joined up Active Travel Network should – must – include the Wilbrahams • BCP should acknowledge the certainty of increased use of ebikes and the consequent lengthening of viable journeys by bicycle • The Wilbrahams are six miles (as the crow flies) from Central Cambridge yet are isolated without car use (we have only one bus per day into Cambridge) • There are at least three potential cycle routes here which would readily connect our community to the existing cycle network • Cycle routes, when provided, would <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve access to employment, education retail and other services - Promote Health - Reduce our Carbon Footprint - If you supply the routes, cyclists will come. <p>Wilbrahams Environment Group, August 2021 Contact details: [name] [telephone number] or [email]</p>

13/08/2021	O	<p>Dear [name],</p> <p>I'm sorry to bring this to you at the end of a Friday. I am asking for an extension to the Cycling Plus consultation.</p> <p>I have only just been able to find time to consider the consultation properly. I gather from Camcycle that they too have not been able to find time amongst their volunteers to respond. Only CambridgePPF has a draft response in the works.</p> <p>There is a fundamental difficulty with responding to this consultation. It has to sit within the City Access Strategy, as it's about how highway space is allocated to walking, cycling, buses and private transport. Key issues in the city have to be resolved holistically, and can't be addressed one mode at a time e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Barrett Hostel Lane – Senate House Passage – Market St: highly conflicted between pedestrians and cycles •Emmanuel St, Parker St, Hobson St, Silver St, Bridge St, Magdalene St, et al: dangerously conflicted between buses, cycles and pedestrians •Bus station (such as it is): operating at capacity, with no room to accommodate planned growth in bus patronage. •East from Barton Rd: narrow routes across Lamas Land and Sheep's Green, and along The Fen Causeway are conflicted and unsuited to heavy use. •Embroke/Downing St: choked with traffic to/from the Grand Arcade car park. <p>There is an implied strategy in the Active Travel Opportunities brochure, to divert cyclists around the inner ring road. That is controversial to say the least, and probably not even viable, given the constraints of the very busy junctions.</p> <p>My suggestion therefore is to extend the consultation by at least week (perhaps to 24 August when the confusingly similar Active Travel Schemes consultation ends) to allow considered responses to the consultation from ourselves, Camcycle and other groups. Ideally though, I would prefer it if we could respond to this consultation in the context of the City Access Strategy being prepared for the GCP Assembly in September. Would it be possible to extend the consultation deadline to one week after that report is published?</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>(name) Smarter Cambridge Transport https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=www.smartertransport.uk&umid=9f45155a-04b8-417d-b24d-1bc496c6fe0c&auth=df9d20fa411d87c1803ee3b11535af83ce4c7acf-99d2f7b8c0859b92dafaac2ccad463585b305a95 [email] / [telephone number]</p>
14/08/2021	O	<p>From The Well-brahams' Mental Health and Well-being Group 14 August 2021</p> <p>To consultations@greatercambridge.org.uk</p> <p>Dear Madam/Sir,</p> <p>please find below, and attached as a word document, a response to the Greater Cambridge Partnership Cycling Plus: Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network Consultation</p> <p>Greater Cambridge Partnership Cycling Plus: Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network Consultation</p> <p>Improving mental and physical well-being and reducing environmental impact by the provision of safe cycle and walkways as leisure opportunities for all is the nub of our submission.</p> <p>Additional Route Proposal: We request that provision is made for a safe cycle way from Bottisham through the Wilbrahams to Fulbourn thereby connecting the "greenways" proposed from Cambridge to Bottisham and from Cambridge to Fulbourn.</p> <p>To the East and South East of the Local Plan growth site that includes the new Marshalls "mini town" and Anglian Water's relocated WWTP, lie Teversham, Bottisham, Fulbourn and the Wilbrahams including Six Mile Bottom. This area is badly provided for compared to all other sections, or arcs, of the map in respect of access by any safe cycling route.</p> <p>The provision of a circular cycle route connecting these rural villages to one another and to Cambridge City has fivefold rewards: -</p> <p>A. those living in Cambridge City and its outskirts could cycle at leisure to more rural settings in Bottisham, the Wilbrahams, Fulbourn and Teversham accessing fens and SSSIs and return home as a circular route;</p> <p>B. those in villages could cycle to and from Cambridge City, either directly or more leisurely;</p>
	O cont.	<p>Welbraham's cont. C. the bus service to and from the Wilbrahams is minimal. Given access to "greenways" and other active travel routes walking and cycling would become part of an everyday journey to work, school, leisure activities and shopping in Cambridge;</p> <p>D. Safer cycling and walking routes between the Wilbrahams, Bottisham and Fulbourn would also provide better access to village shops, medical practices and schools, including leisure facilities, for instance at Bottisham Village College, as well as better access to other safe routes for leisure;</p> <p>E. the option to cycle to work and home.</p> <p>We believe that the Wilbrahams are positioned ideally, geographically, between Fulbourn and Bottisham, to be included in any plans and schemes to improve the active and safe cycling and walking network to the East and South East of Cambridge City.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>(names redacted)</p> <p>The Well-brahams' Mental Health and Well-being Group</p> <p>Contact: (email redacted).</p> <p>Greater Cambridge Partnership Cycling Plus: Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network Consultation</p> <p>Improving mental and physical well-being and reducing environmental impact by the provision of safe cycle and walkways as leisure opportunities for all is the nub of our submission.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Welbraham's cont. Additional Route Proposal: We request that provision is made for a safe cycle way from Bottisham through the Wilbrahams to Fulbourn thereby connecting the "greenways" proposed from Cambridge to Bottisham and from Cambridge to Fulbourn.</p> <p>To the East and South East of the Local Plan growth site that includes the new Marshalls "mini town" and Anglian Water's relocated WWTP, lie Teversham, Bottisham, Fulbourn and the Wilbrahams including Six Mile Bottom. This area is badly provided for compared to all other sections, or arcs, of the map in respect of access by any safe cycling route.</p> <p>The provision of a circular cycle route connecting these rural villages to one another and to Cambridge City has fivefold rewards: -</p> <p>A. those living in Cambridge City and its outskirts could cycle at leisure to more rural settings in Bottisham, the Wilbrahams, Fulbourn and Teversham accessing fens and SSSIs and return home as a circular route;</p> <p>B. those in villages could cycle to and from Cambridge City, either directly or more leisurely;</p> <p>C. the bus service to and from the Wilbrahams is minimal. Given access to "greenways" and other active travel routes walking and cycling would become part of an everyday journey to work, school, leisure activities and shopping in Cambridge;</p>
	O cont.	<p>Welbraham's cont.D. Safer cycling and walking routes between the Wilbrahams, Bottisham and Fulbourn would also provide better access to village shops, medical practices and schools, including leisure facilities, for instance at Bottisham Village College, as well as better access to other safe routes for leisure;</p> <p>E. the option to cycle to work and home.</p> <p>We believe that the Wilbrahams are positioned ideally, geographically, between Fulbourn and Bottisham, to be included in any plans and schemes to improve the active and safe cycling and walking network to the East and South East of Cambridge City.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>[names]</p> <p>The Well-brahams' Mental Health and Well-being Group 14 August 2021 Contact: [email] consultations@greatercambridge.org.uk</p>
14/08/2021		<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am responding to your "Cycling Plus" consultation. I have completed the survey, but have an additional suggestion.</p> <p>The eastern end of Humberstone Rd is blocked to traffic, but is clearly a pathway of desire for cyclists, who come east along Humberstone Rd, and either turn south on the pavement (heading for the underpass under Elizabeth Way, or north (towards the pedestrian crossing across Elizabeth Way). But there is no proper way for bikes to get onto the pavement there, space is cramped, and there is no signage. You could say "don't do that" but it would be much better (and cheap) simply to improve the junction for bikes, since they are going to do it anyway.</p> <p>Some part of the City Council is already considering changes to the street furniture and planting in the blocking patch at the end of Humberstone Rd (blocking the path to Elizabeth Way). There was a consultation about this a few months ago. As part of that change, and/or your work, could you</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Stop cars parking closer than a couple of metres to the end •Provide on-ramps for bikes to get up the kerb •Offer signage to help bikes and pedestrians negotiate the short length of shared-use pavement that ensues <p>Simple, cheap, effective. You could regard it as linked to your Chesterton Rd corridor.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>[name]</p>

14/08/2021		<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am responding to your "Cycling Plus" consultation. I have completed the survey, but have an additional suggestion.</p> <p>In your consultation questionnaire you make no mention of children. In my experience, it is largely safety considerations for their children that take families off their bikes and into cars. If you can get kids cycling when they are ten, they will cycle when they are adults.</p> <p>So cycle routes, junction changes, lanes etc should all be designed with children in mind. I'm sure you have this in your head, but it just wasn't apparent in your survey.</p> <p>(name)</p>
15/08/2021		<p>It is good to see the thirteen proposed cycle routes in the Cycling Plus consultation. There are many benefits of making cycling part of everyday transportation which are clearly recognised by the GCP. Each and every Cycling Plus route is needed for getting people cycling and realising those benefits. So it is hugely disappointing that there is only budget allocated for two or three of these routes. It is appalling that this consultation pitches communities against one another to gain the benefit of these cycle routes. Especially when £20 million is a paltry sum compared to the sums spent on the road network. Please consider allocating a larger budget to these projects so more of them can be tackled.</p> <p>I live close to two of these so will give detailed responses to those. Impington to Milton Following the proposal roughly from left to right. New Road (South) Proposal: resurface route. The surface is currently poor so resurfacing is welcome. I'd like to see the footpath included in the resurfacing, perhaps widened too, as it is poor for walking along at the moment. New Road/Bridge Road Junction. Proposal remove crash barriers and improve visual appeal of existing modal filter. Welcome improvements to make an urban looking part of Impington more appealing. I think the flared junction should be squared off, this would give the Toucan crossing more space to separate cycling and walking. This would tie in well with the next proposal along New Road.</p>
	I cont.	<p>New Road (North) Proposal: shared use footway on eastern side, using grass verge to widen it to an acceptable width. Tighten side road junction radii. Replace speed cushions with cyclist-friendly traffic calming. Where physical constraints mean that an acceptably wide shared footway is not possible, implement horizontal traffic calming (give way to oncoming vehicles) with bypasses for cyclists. Risks: shared use footways provide a lower level of service for cyclists and there may be additional risks associated with horizontal traffic calming measures proposed.</p> <p>Improvement for cycling is very welcome here as many pupils who arrive to IVC by cycle on this road. There is a lot of conflict between drivers and cyclists on the road and between pedestrians and cyclists on the pavement. A wide shared use route could be a good solution here. However, it does need to be 3m wide to work properly as a shared path. This must involve narrowing the main carriageway where required so that the shared use is not compromised just to keep the status quo for motor vehicles. Perhaps sections of single track; as this would keep the road passable in each direction, provide traffic calming and allow decent space for the shared use path. Tightening the side junctions is welcome. Please include continuous pavement over the side junctions, making active modes the priority. Having the shared use on the east side of New Road ties in well with the crossing of Bridge Street as this arrives to the east side also.</p> <p>Impington Lane / Clay Cl Lane / Burgoynes Road / New Road junction. Proposal: tighten geometry and add raised table to lower traffic speeds and make a safer junction for cyclists to cross.</p> <p>Excellent suggestions as this is a busy junction with many movements for IVC. Tightening the junction lowers turning speed and gives space for the shared use path. I'd like to see the junction moved west to allow the shared path on New Road opportunity to cross Burgoynes Road directly into Clay Close Lane, separated from the motor vehicle junction, for an excellent active travel connection away from Burgoynes Road. This crossing should have priority – either with giveaway markings or a toucan crossing. Make the active route continuous and convenient as specified in LTN 1/20.</p>

	I cont.	<p>Clay Cl Lane Proposal: improve surfacing and lighting on this section to provide a more suitable route for cyclists.</p> <p>This seems a very simple, low risk improvement to make this the obvious active travel connection. It will keep riders and walkers away from the part of Burgoynes Road without footpaths.</p> <p>Milton Road / Clay Cl Lane / Burgoynes Road junction Proposal: change priority such that Burgoynes Road is the minor arm of this junction</p> <p>This is great as it prioritises active modes. Please consider a mode filter on Clay Close Lane here to reinforce Clay Close as access only for motor vehicles via the previously discussed junction.</p> <p>Milton Road / Butt Lane. Proposal: add modal filter to the west of the junction with the Recycling Centre to reduce traffic on this road and create a safer environment for cycling. Consider lowering speed limit and additional traffic calming measures. Risk: the importance of this link when there are traffic problems on the A10/A14 may mean that a modal filter here wouldn't be possible, or would need to be removable under certain circumstances.</p> <p>This is a tough one. With Butt Lane running parallel to the A14 I agree there is a strong case that it shouldn't be taking regional traffic. However, concerns to keep access to the recycling centre, P&R and soon the Police Station from both ends is justified. Therefore, a complete modal filter is not the best solution in my view.</p> <p>I would rather see the existing cycle route significantly widened and maintained. It's currently so narrow and often so overgrown that cycles cannot pass each other. This forces some to take to the road where they face aggression from drivers expecting them to be on the cycle path. To get this extra width space must be taken from</p>
	I cont.	<p>elsewhere. Please consider adding culverts to the ditches around the fields to place the cycle lane on top (like the GCP cycle route between Oakington and Girtton). Where that isn't possible the space must come from the main carriageway. Traffic calming restrictions where needed for the cycle lane would be a reasonable trade off to keep full through motor-vehicle access.</p> <p>The bridge over the A10 is a big issue for this corridor as currently the steep ramps, narrow deck and sharp corners make it unsuitable for cycling. I'd like this dramatically improved – I assume its omission from this consultation is due to inclusion instead with the A10 upgrade? Nonetheless, it would ideally have the active route remaining at grade, with the A10 raised over the top. This gives cyclists the easiest gradient to traverse and reduces the overall height. Otherwise, any replacement bridge needs to have shallow approach gradients, gentle curves, higher parapets and a wider deck.</p> <p>Histon to Histon Road</p> <p>Following the proposal roughly top to bottom.</p> <p>Water Lane (north) Proposal: wide advisory lanes in both directions, removal of centre line and narrowing the carriageway where necessary to reduce speeds Risks: advisory cycle lanes are a lower level of service for cyclists which may not be suitable for the level of traffic in central Histon.</p> <p>I agree this area is a very constrained space so wider advisory lanes may be the only physical separation possible. However, this is against the latest government guidance (LTN 1/20) and is highly unlikely to provide sufficient improvement. Separation of modes can also come from light timing. An all-ways green cycle scramble would work well here. This would formalise the behaviour already seen at peak times where riders from all arms use the pedestrian phase to cross through the junction, negotiating a path between each other within the road space. Creating a specific phase for this would reduce the conflict between riders and pedestrians as they currently use the crossing space in different directions.</p>
	I cont.	<p>Water Lane (central) Proposal: convert mandatory cycle lanes into Cambridge kerb segregated cycle lanes, reallocating space from hatching, right turn pockets, grass verges, central reservations as needed. Risks: potential utilities clashes, high cost.</p> <p>Cambridge kerb separation would be a big improvement over the current narrow paint only lanes.</p> <p>Chequers Road / Water Lane junction Proposal: tighten junction radii, provide bypass feature for southbound cyclists staying on Water Lane, remove left hook risk for northbound cyclists. Could consider cycle gates. Risks: potential utilities clashes.</p> <p>I think this is an excellent suggestion. Tightening the junction here will complement efforts to refocus Station Road on local trips only. From this perspective no proposed changes to the war memorial junction is a stark omission. Please consider adding similar changes here, with a view to making the whole of Station Road unattractive as a short cut for motorists on the main B1049.</p> <p>Water Lane (south) Proposal: convert mandatory cycle lanes into Cambridge kerb segregated cycle lanes, reallocating space from hatching, right turn pockets, grass verges, central reservations as needed. Risks: potential utilities clashes, high cost.</p> <p>Cambridge kerb separation would be a big improvement over the current narrow paint only lanes.</p>

	I cont.	<p>New Road / Bridge Road junction Proposal: see Impington to Milton route Discussed earlier.</p> <p>Station Road Proposal: add modal filter is possible, to create a parallel quiet alternative route Risks: modal filter may require extensive stakeholder consultation to avoid opposition</p> <p>I think this is interesting as it is further south than the filter proposed by the County Council. Both could complement each other well in keeping though traffic onto the main B1049, which has greater potential for segregating cyclists from motorists. For a single filter I think this is a better location since it allows the City 8 bus to continue to visit the Baptist church, doctors and dentist.</p> <p>I am very pleased to see this as a potential alternative route, not a potential alternative scheme. This is in line with the DfT guidance and the practice in the Netherlands where the whole road network should be looked at with a critical eye for active travel.</p> <p>Bridge Road Proposal: convert mandatory cycle lanes into Cambridge kerb segregated cycle lanes, reallocating space from hatching, right turn pockets, grass verges, central reservations as needed. Risks: potential utilities clashes, high cost.</p> <p>With the available space here I think this is unambitious. There should not be a one size fits all approach. With more space available a greater level of separation should be considered. For example, the verge separated lanes like those on Hills Road could be used here. Please provide more space to the uphill sides of the overpass so riders of different speeds have space to pass each other.</p>
	I cont.	<p>Bridge Road / Cambridge Road junction. Proposal: tighten junction radii, rework junction to accommodate segregated cycle facilities on the northern arm. Risks: junction has been reworked in the recent past and so improvements may be harder to justify financially.</p> <p>The southbound path east of this junction is a narrow shared used path that undulates over many different surfaces. Improving this corridor without addressing this section would be a great shame. The northbound cycle lane jumps up and down from shared use pavement to painted cycle lane in several locations. Neatening this up with a clear segregated cycle lane would be very welcome.</p> <p>Roundabout over A14. Proposal: improvements to shared use footway and crossings for cyclists. Risks: shared use footways provide a lower level of service for cyclists.</p> <p>During the A14 improvements the poor quality of the cycle provision at junction 32 was raised many times. Sharp turns to come from the crossing onto the shared use paths. Poles for the lights placed right into the cycling desire line. Insufficient space to accommodate bikes waiting to cross. None of these concerns were listened to by Highways England, and so the new facilities continue to be complained about. One of the four crossing has seen a later improvement – moving the pole and extending the dropped kerb – an expense that should have been avoided by getting it right the first time. A fresh evaluation with respect to the latest LNT 1/20 guidance is absolutely required.</p>
	I cont.	<p>I am very disappointed that no discussion is given to the link south of the A14. The junction with Kings Hedges Road is very poor for active modes and is a barrier for connecting with the GCP improvements on Histon Road. Multiple crossing stages add delay to walking and cycling alike. Staggered, fenced in pens on the islands are difficult to navigate by cycle. The outline permission for Darwin Green adds more of the same for northbound trips. The whole area needs a rethink to prevent it being the weakest link in this cycle corridor. The new Histon Road junction with Gilbert Road gives a good template for this; a clear set of cycle lanes around the junction, with signals to cross the road arms and pedestrian crossings over both the cycle lanes and main carriageway.</p> <p>It is also disappointing that the proposal does not head north along Glebe Way from Rose and Crown towards Cottenham, especially with the concerns on traffic around the new Park Primary School. Like the Water Lane sections I think carriageway narrowing and removal of the central hatching would provide a wider Cambridge kurbed lane to replace the paint only northbound cycle lane. Alternately, combine the pavement, painted lane and hatching for a new shared use pavement on the west to match the existing one on the east of Glebe Way.</p> <p>I think both schemes offer a great improvement to the villages of Histon and Impington. I hope you will be able to take these forward to detailed design and implementation.</p> <p>Kind regards, (name and address)</p>

15/08/2021	O	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council regarding the Cycling Plus Survey recently published by GCP (https://consultcambs.uk/engagementhq/cycling-plus).</p> <p>I enclose our response which I hope you will give serious consideration to. Providing safe and viable cycling routes between Little Wilbraham and Great Wilbraham (The Wilbrahams) to neighbouring villages and the cycle network as well as connecting Six Mile Bottom is essential in enabling our communities to travel for essential amenities and leisure for those that do not have access to a car or want to use a sustainable form of transport.</p> <p>I have investigating several very viable alternative cycle routes as well as connected with many villagers who are frustrated with the lack of consideration we receive in respect of transport connectivity. I would be happy to be contacted and to discuss further if I can be of assistance.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>(name). [name] [job] [email]</p>
	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. Greater Cambridge Partnership – Investing in Cambridge’s Active Travel Network - a response to the Consultation</p> <p>These comments are submitted on behalf of Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom Parish Council. We have studied the Active Travel Opportunities Consultation document, including the Study published in March 2021. Our interest is focused on our own locality, comprising the villages of Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom which are positioned around six and eight miles to the east of central Cambridge respectively (to which many of our residents go daily or regularly for work, healthcare, education and leisure) yet in practice are almost cut off from “Active Travel” – meaning principally cycling or walking. Our response concentrates on cycling.</p> <p>GCP has asked for responses to 5 questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether and how often we use Active Travel to and around Cambridge 2. What barriers discourage us from doing so 3. What are our priorities for investment in Active Travel 4. What are our preferences amongst the 13 corridors which GCP has identified 5. Should GCP look at other possible routes for cycling <p>GCP’s declared objective is to create a “joined up Active Travel Network”. The March 2021 Study notes that in South Cambridgeshire cycle movements benefit from the existing Greenways routes but cycle routes “vary in quality, subsequently reducing connectivity and safety”. The Study proposals focus on radial routes with high use which are poorly served by attractive and safe infrastructure.</p> <p>The Study states that there is now a “unique opportunity to lock in a modal shift from car to Active Travel”.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom are close to Cambridge. They are also even closer to two of the existing Greenways (at Fulbourn and Bottisham) on which GCP has spent large sums of money already, yet our communities do not enjoy safe access to either of them. We propose that GCP should facilitate greater use of those Greenways by providing us with the safe connectivity mentioned above.</p> <p>Dealing with each of the five questions posed to us:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only relatively few brave souls amongst our residents currently use Active Travel to and around Cambridge. 2. Residents are discouraged from using Active Travel because there is no safe cycle route at all out of our villages, either to Cambridge or to our local “hubs” at Fulbourn and Bottisham for shops, secondary schooling, GP services, library, leisure facilities etc. • The roads within our villages are used by unusually large numbers of heavy goods vehicles accessing commercial sites in Fulbourn or “cutting through” between the A14 and the A11. There is already a growing campaign here for action to improve road safety and in particular to reduce conflict between HGVs and cyclists and pedestrians in our villages, where some areas do not have roadside footpaths.

	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. •Beyond the boundaries of our villages we have no roadside footpaths at all, let alone dedicated cycle paths. The roads to Fulbourn, to Bottisham and to Quy are unusually busy with HGVs and other fast-moving traffic as well as being narrow and unlit, so that cyclists tell us they very often feel exposed and unsafe. The traffic is a substantial disincentive to would-be cyclists here. Sadly, there have been serious accidents and fatalities involving cyclists which has discouraged many from cycling.</p> <p>3. Our priority is for GCP and/or the County Council to invest locally in a "joined up Active Travel network" and achieve "a modal shift from car to Active Travel" by creating a safe cycle path between Fulbourn, the Wilbrahams and Bottisham. Also to consider connecting Six Mile Bottom to Little Wilbraham or to Fulbourn with a safe cycle route.</p> <p>• Our residents could then use the two Greenways to access Cambridge by cycle for leisure and shopping.</p> <p>• Our villages are close enough for villagers to commute by cycle to Cambridge, to Addenbrooke's, to our Sixth Form Colleges, to the rail stations at Cambridge and Cambridge North and to major employment centres such as the Peterhouse Technology Park (currently being expanded and including Arm) at Cherry Hinton.</p> <p>• Our residents could cycle to our two local "hubs" – Bottisham and Fulbourn – for shops, secondary schooling, GP services, library etc or to connect to onwards public transport (of which there is almost none in the Wilbrahams or Six Mile Bottom).</p>
	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. 4. We have no preferences amongst the 13 routes considered in the March 2021 Study, as our villages are remote from all of them.</p> <p>5. Repeating our response to question 3, the GCP should look hard at creating the lateral cycle route through the Wilbrahams which we, the Parish Councils of our two villages and, we understand, our District and County councillors all support.</p> <p>6. Ideally, we would then also like to see Six Mile Bottom be connected to this cycle network.</p> <p>Existing assumptions by GCP and the County Council relating to cycle use are all based on the traditional bicycle, whereas today more and more people are investing in and using electric bicycles. Greater distances can be covered and cycles can be used by people who are older or less fit than has been the case in the past.</p> <p>• The sale, rental and use of such cycles is booming. In the Netherlands, ebikes accounted for 50% of sales in 2020: GCP should be planning now for a similar trajectory here, to help to reduce our Carbon Footprint. We reproduce here an article from "Cycling Weekly" (August 2021) about the growth in the use of electric bikes in the UK:</p> <p>More than 25 million adults in the UK are now considering turning to two-wheeled e-mobility for the first time, as commuting and leisure habits evolve in the post-pandemic world.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. According to a study by Bosch eBike Systems, 55 per cent of British people are considering purchasing an e-bike following last year's lockdown, while 32 per cent say they would use their car less in favour of electric pedal power. Critically, 66 per cent would consider buying an e-bike if the government committed to proposed subsidy schemes.</p> <p>Bosch's study polled over 2,000 people across the UK - including non-cyclists and those who already own an e-bike - on their perceptions of e-mobility and how these have changed since the start of the pandemic. The research aimed to understand the UK public's appetite for electric bikes, their willingness to swap the car for a two-wheeled commute, and the transformative role the pandemic has played in changing sustainable travel habits.</p> <p>The UK e-bike market has grown rapidly over the last few years, with the pandemic accelerating this growth. In 2020 it grew by 68 per cent compared to 2019, with Bosch's research suggesting that the UK public's appetite for electric bicycles is only set to increase.</p> <p>• In the Wilbrahams we are investigating a scheme in partnership with a commercial provider to introduce a hire scheme for electric cycles.</p> <p>• In the past it has been assumed that people will not be prepared to commute to work or for other purposes by cycle beyond a fairly short distance. Traveling for 7 or 8 miles by cycle, eg from Little Wilbraham to central Cambridge, is perfectly within range for many but becoming even more acceptable/viable with the advent of ebikes – and that trend can accelerate if safe routes are provided for cyclists.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom cont. It has been proposed in the past to create a safe cycle route to Bottisham (to whose Village College our children go) by adapting the existing road across the old airfield.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A roadside cycle path could be created from Great Wilbraham to the outskirts of Fulbourn There is a possible route from Little Wilbraham to Quy Waters, on the Newmarket Road (and thence to Cambridge) using Short Drove and building a connection across County Council land near to Quy Waters. Short Drove is an existing bridleway and has recently been made surfaced – this could be extended a short distance to meet Newmarket Road. There are also possible routes from Six Mile Bottom to Fulbourn (following the railway line) or to Little Wilbraham (alongside Wilbraham Road). <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSCP's plans for a "joined up Active Travel Network should – must – include the Wilbrahams and then Six Mile Bottom. BSCP should acknowledge the certainty of increased use of ebikes and the consequent lengthening of viable journeys by bicycle The Wilbrahams are six miles (as the crow flies) from Central Cambridge yet are isolated without car use (we have only one bus per day in to Cambridge) There are at least three potential cycle routes here which would readily connect our community to the existing cycle network Cycle routes, when provided, would <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve access to employment, education retail and other services Promote Health Reduce our Carbon Footprint If you supply the routes, cyclists will come. <p>Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom Parish Council, August 2021 Contact details: [email]</p>
14/08/2021		<p>I would like to see a cycle path in Hinton Way, Great Shelford. It is one of three parallel road going east to west.</p> <p>Granhams Road, the first, is not suitable for cycling as it is narrow and has a national speed limit.</p> <p>Haverhill Road (Stapleford), the third, is not suitable as it has a national speed limit and goes up a steep hill and then down again.</p> <p>Hinton Way is really the only road cyclists use. However, it is relatively narrow, bad visibility in places, and above all, despite the 30 mph speed limit, the default speed seems to be 40 - 55 mph (no action is ever taken to remedy this).</p> <p>I often go by car now (1 1/2 miles down into the village) as I consider it much safer.</p> <p>[name] [address]</p>
16/08/2021	O	<p>Dear Greater Cambridge Partnership</p> <p>Cambridge Past Present & Future has reviewed the consultation material and responds as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> We are pleased to see additional investment into active travel and welcome this initiative. We also welcome the consultation exercise to ask the community how they feel it should be invested – we hope that this will be genuine and the GCP will consider the feedback, rather than just pressing ahead with its own ideas. Our main response to the proposed corridors is that there is a complete lack of transparency about the strategy for cycling in the city centre and how the proposed corridors relate to that strategy. If there is no strategy then one is needed before any investment in these corridors is made, and if there is one then this must be made clear to the public as a priority. It is clear from the Future Investments Strategy that there is a cycling void in the city centre, see for example: (map) <p>Or (different map)</p>

	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. As we know, the population of our area is growing rapidly and set to grow much more yet. One of the strategies being pursued to cope with moving more people around is to enable and encourage more journeys by cycle. CambridgePPF supports this approach. However, there is a significant problem with this strategy. Most of the cycle routes (such as the Greenways Programme) will funnel cyclists to the city centre without any ability for cyclists to get across the centre other than through the medieval part of the city (including the likes of Garret Hostel Bridge, Senate Passage, Trinity Lane, St John's Street, Trinity Street, Sidney Street, St Mary's Street, Market Street and King's Parade). These routes are not suited to commuter cycling because they are largely pedestrian. This is already creating conflicts with the increasing numbers of pedestrians. Due to population increase this situation will not be tenable by 2030 and the city centre is likely to be increasingly pedestrianised (as identified in the City Council's Making Space for People report).</p> <p>The GCP's busways schemes and other efforts by GCP and the Combined Authority to promote travel by bus will lead to a significant increase in the number of buses on roads that are not pedestrianised (such as Pembroke/Downing Street, Magdalene/Bridge Street, Silver Street, St Andrew's Street and Hobson Street). This will make those routes less safe and attractive for people walking or cycling.</p> <p>CambridgePPF has previously raised this problem with [name] when he was the County Cycling Officer, and with Camcycle. Both accept that there is a problem, but no easy solution. This has all the hallmarks of another Cambridge transport planning failure.</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. Looking at the 13 corridors proposed in this consultation, there are none through the centre. Two references in the report hint, on pages 15 and 18, at a strategy to promote more cycling around the inner ring road: "... helping to contribute to an outer ring road of better quality cycle provision around the City Centre, thus potentially avoiding the need for cyclist [sic] to travel through the City Centre."</p> <p>If that is the strategy, then this should be made clear and evidence provided that it would work. Will the strategy also extend to pedestrianizing the city centre? If so, how would this be enforced, given that, for many trips, it will be the shorter and more attractive route for people cycling? Where will the additional cycle parking be provided on the edge of pedestrianised areas? Has there been a study conducted on what impact this would have on buses and general traffic, in particular in junctions are altered to include cycle and/or pedestrian priority? Given the very high costs involved in converting busy junctions to be safe and attractive for people of all ages and abilities to cycle and walk, where will the funding come from? Without a clear, tested and agreed strategy, plus substantial funding, the inner ring road will continue to be unattractive and relatively unsafe for people to cycle.</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. If that is not the strategy, either because it has not been agreed with the GCP board, or because there is insufficient funding to realise it, then one is needed urgently. Developing and delivering that strategy should be the top priority for investing the £20m because, without it, the active travel component of the Future Investment Strategy, and indeed the wider transport strategy, is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>3. Many of the proposals put forward involve using grass verges. In most locations this will have a negative visual impact on the street scene and neighbourhood. There seems to be no recognition of this in the Future Investments Strategy report, nor of the role of verges in absorbing rainwater and reducing the heat-island effect of roads and buildings. If taking grass verges is deemed necessary, we would expect the GCP to compensate for that impact by improving the landscaping on those streets that are affected (for example through tree planting, flower verges, better street furniture, etc).</p>

	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. 4. The Queen's Road corridor passes along the Backs, one of Cambridge's most sensitive historic environments. Loss of verges, use of coloured surfaces, installation of additional signage or lighting, etc have the potential to damage this important area. Again, this is not identified in the Future Investments Strategy Report. Any infrastructure on this route corridor will need to follow guidelines set out by Historic England. This would also apply to any other routes that traverse historic areas.</p> <p>5. Many of the proposals put forward include either using pavements as shared paths or reducing pavement widths. These would be to the detriment of pedestrians, who include people with a range of disabilities, users of wheelchairs and mobility scooters, and people conveying children in a pram or pushchair. The report is subtitle, "Active Travel Options", yet this form of active travel appears to be subordinated to cycling, when provision for both should be enhanced. Furthermore, it is walking that sits at the top of the transport hierarchy, and therefore should not, except in exceptional circumstances, be compromised for better cycling provision. We would like to see a clearer indication that all solutions that involve reallocating roadspace from motor traffic, even where that reduces capacity, have been thoroughly examined before any suggestion is made to take space from pedestrians.</p> <p>I trust that you will take our comments into consideration. A formal response is attached.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[name] - [job] [email] Tel/direct link to my mobile - [telephone number] www.cambridgeppf.org Cambridge Past, Present & Future - Wandlebury Country Park, Gog Magog Hills, Cambridge CB22 3AE</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Charity No 204121. Greater Cambridge Partnership By email to: consultations@greatercambridge.org.uk 15/08/2021 Dear Greater Cambridge Partnership Response to Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge's Active Travel Network Cambridge Past, Present & Future is Cambridge's largest civic society. We are a charity run by local people who are passionate about where they live. We operate in the greater Cambridge area and working with our members, supporters and volunteers we: • Are dedicated to protecting and enhancing the green setting of Cambridge for people and nature. • Care about Cambridge and are an independent voice for quality of life in the strategic planning of Greater Cambridge. • Are working to protect, celebrate and improve the important built heritage of the Cambridge area. • Own and care for green spaces and historic buildings in and around the city for people and nature, including Wandlebury Country Park, Coton Countryside Reserve, Cambridge Leper Chapel & Barnwell Meadows, Bourn Windmill and Hinnton Watermill. CambridgePPF has reviewed the consultation material and responds as follows:</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. 1. We are pleased to see additional investment into active travel and welcome this initiative. We also welcome the consultation exercise to ask the community how they feel it should be invested – we hope that this will be genuine and the GCP will consider the feedback, rather than just pressing ahead with its own ideas. 2. Our main response to the proposed corridors is that there is a complete lack of transparency about the strategy for cycling in the city centre and how the proposed corridors relate to that strategy. If there is no strategy then one is needed before any investment in these corridors is made, and if there is one then this must be made clear to the public as a priority. It is clear from the Future Investments Strategy that there is a cycling void in the city centre, see for example: Cambridge Past, Present & Future Wandlebury Country Park Cambridge [address] Phone [telephone number] www.cambridgeppf.org Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Charity No 204121.</p>

	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. Or</p> <p>As we know, the population of our area is growing rapidly and set to grow much more yet. One of the strategies being pursued to cope with moving more people around is to enable and encourage more journeys by cycle. CambridgePPF supports this approach. However, there is a significant problem with this strategy. Most of the cycle routes (such as the Greenways Programme) will funnel cyclists to the city centre without any ability for cyclists to get across the centre other than through the medieval part of the city (including the likes of Garret Hostel Bridge, Senate Passage, Trinity Lane, St John's Street, Trinity Street, Sidney Street, St Mary's Street, Market Street and King's Parade). These routes are not suited to commuter cycling because they are largely pedestrian. This is already creating conflicts with the increasing numbers of pedestrians. Due to population increase this situation will not be tenable by 2030 and the city centre is likely to be increasingly pedestrianised (as identified in the City Council's Making Space for People report).</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. The GCP's busways schemes and other efforts by GCP and the Combined Authority to promote travel by bus will lead to a significant increase in the number of buses on roads that are not pedestrianised (such as Pembroke/Downing Street, Magdalene/Bridge Street, Silver Street, St Andrew's Street and Hobson Street). This will make those routes less safe and attractive for people walking or cycling.</p> <p>CambridgePPF has previously raised this problem with (name) when he was the County Cycling Officer, and with Camcycle. Both accept that there is a problem, but no easy solution. This has all the hallmarks of another Cambridge transport planning failure.</p> <p>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Charity No 204121.</p> <p>Looking at the 13 corridors proposed in this consultation, there are none through the centre. Two references in the report hint, on pages 15 and 18, at a strategy to promote more cycling around the inner ring road:..</p> <p>"... helping to contribute to an outer ring road of better quality cycle provision around the City Centre, thus potentially avoiding the need for cyclist [sic] to travel through the City Centre."</p>
	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. If that is the strategy, then this should be made clear and evidence provided that it would work. Will the strategy also extend to pedestrianizing the city centre? If so, how would this be enforced, given that, for many trips, it will be the shorter and more attractive route for people cycling?</p> <p>Where will the additional cycle parking be provided on the edge of pedestrianised areas? Has there been a study conducted on what impact this would have on buses and general traffic, in particular in junctions are altered to include cycle and/or pedestrian priority? Given the very high costs involved in converting busy junctions to be safe and attractive for people of all ages and abilities to cycle and walk, where will the funding come from? Without a clear, tested and agreed strategy, plus substantial funding, the inner ring road will continue to be unattractive and relatively unsafe for people to cycle.</p> <p>If that is not the strategy, either because it has not been agreed with the GCP board, or because there is insufficient funding to realise it, then one is needed urgently. Developing and delivering that strategy should be the top priority for investing the £20m because, without it, the active travel component of the Future Investment Strategy, and indeed the wider transport strategy, is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>3. Many of the proposals put forward involve using grass verges. In most locations this will have a negative visual impact on the street scene and neighbourhood. There seems to be no recognition of this in the Future Investments Strategy report, nor of the role of verges in absorbing rainwater and reducing the heat-island effect of roads and buildings. If taking grass verges is deemed necessary, we would expect the GCP to compensate for that impact by improving the landscaping on those streets that are affected (for example through tree planting, flower verges, better street furniture, etc).</p>

	O cont.	<p>CPPF cont. 4. The Queen's Road corridor passes along the Backs, one of Cambridge's most sensitive historic environments. Loss of verges, use of coloured surfaces, installation of additional signage or lighting, etc have the potential to damage this important area. Again, this is not identified in the Future Investments Strategy Report. Any infrastructure on this route corridor will need to follow guidelines set out by Historic England. This would also apply to any other routes that traverse historic areas.</p> <p>5. Many of the proposals put forward include either using pavements as shared paths or reducing pavement widths. These would be to the detriment of pedestrians, who include people with a range of disabilities, users of wheelchairs and mobility scooters, and people conveying children in a pram or pushchair. The report is subtitle, "Active Travel Options", yet this form of active travel appears to be subordinated to cycling, when provision for both should be enhanced. Furthermore, it is walking that sits at the top of the transport hierarchy, and therefore should not, except in exceptional circumstances, be compromised for better cycling provision. We would like to see a clearer indication that all solutions that involve reallocating roadscape from motor traffic, even where that reduces capacity, have been thoroughly examined before any suggestion is made to take space from pedestrians. I trust that you will take our comments into consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely [name] [job]</p>
16/08/2021	O	<p>Dear Greater Cambridge Partnership, The Association's response to the GCP's consultation is attached. We will be grateful for your confirmation of receipt. While our response is supportive of walking and cycling as alternatives to use of the car, the response is critical of the lack of attention to walking as a real alternative and to the needs of pedestrians. Other points of substance are raised which also require attention. For these reasons we ask that amended proposals for the Trumpington and A1134 East-West corridors are the subject of further consultation before the GCP makes its investment decisions. If anything in our response needs clarification or discussion, please contact me.</p> <p>Best wishes [name] For Trumpington Residents' Association</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 1 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England. Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF. www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org Contact: (email) 15 August 2021 "Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge's Active Travel Network" Consultation Response Support for investment in walking and cycling "We want to see a future where half of all journeys in towns and cities are cycled or walked. 58% of car journeys in 2018 were under 5 miles. And in urban areas, more than 40% of journeys were under 2 miles in 2017-18. For many people, these journeys are perfectly suited to cycling and walking." [Gear Change: A bold vision for cycling and walking, Department for Transport, 2020, page 11] -----</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Dear Greater Cambridge Partnership, The Association's response to the GCP's consultation is attached. We will be grateful for your confirmation of receipt. While our response is supportive of walking and cycling as alternatives to use of the car, the response is critical of the lack of attention to walking as a real alternative and to the needs of pedestrians. Other points of substance are raised which also require attention. For these reasons we ask that amended proposals for the Trumpington and A1134 East-West corridors are the subject of further consultation before the GCP makes its investment decisions. If anything in our response needs clarification or discussion, please contact me.</p> <p>Best wishes [name] For Trumpington Residents' Association</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 1 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England. Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF. www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org</p>

	O cont.	<p>The Trumpington Residents' Association (the "Association", or TRA) strongly supports this government ambition and the relevant Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Initiatives which pre-date "Gear Change". Road conditions are a significant barrier to walking and cycling as healthy alternatives to use of the car. Trumpington's roads are starting to become as congested as they were before the Covid-19 pandemic, and will become more so as committed growth in Greater Cambridge, particularly but not only at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, continues apace. The increase in working at home may have some long-term effect but many of the jobs concerned on the Campus and elsewhere are not suited to remote working. Also, according to the National Infrastructure Commission's assessment, actual change may be significantly less than initial speculation: "The analysis (of historical disruptive events) suggests that permanent behaviour change is less likely to emerge than might be expected...few substantial events have triggered long lasting</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. behaviour change." [National Infrastructure Commission, Behaviour change and infrastructure beyond Covid-19, May 2021, page 16] It is in this context that the Association welcomes the "Cycling Plus" initiative and the proposal to invest in thirteen priority corridors in Cambridge including "Trumpington Road" and "A1134 East-West". In the time available, this response necessarily concentrates on the proposed Trumpington Road corridor as that is likely to have the greatest benefit for Trumpington residents - and fits with the strong support we gave to the Melbourn Greenway with which it will connect. [Melbourn Greenway, Consultation Response, TRA letter, 1 August 2019] Pedestrians are active travellers too Our welcome for the Cycling Plus initiative would be less qualified were it not for the absence of proposals for walking (including running). As long as the conditions are conducive, walking is a real alternative for many journeys, particularly the shorter ones and as links in an overall journey. However, the proposals, and the analysis which supports them, focus on cycling to the exclusion of walking, when to mutual benefit they should be considered hand in hand. The WSP report on which the proposals are based is clear from the outset that – "... this study has focused upon identifying high-trafficked cycle radial routes within the City and South Cambridgeshire, which are currently poorly served by attractive and safe cycle infrastructure." (Our emphasis) ["Future Investment Strategy: Active Travel opportunities", WSP, March 2021, page 3]</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. The focus on cycling alone is deficient. It is important that walking is treated as an active travel partner not a residual. Many of the barriers to active travel are similar for pedestrians and cyclists - for example road junctions which are difficult and hazardous to cross and dangerous left turning movements by vehicles. Given their interaction on shared use / active travel paths and in other ways, opportunities to improve the current unsatisfactory conditions for both cyclists and pedestrians should be looked at together. Improvement of road junctions, which is a major issue for the Trumpington Road corridor, should be looked at from both points of view. This will help to ensure that account is taken of the need to improve crossing facilities for pedestrians as well as cyclists. It would also assist assessment of the possible impact of cycle gates and cycle bypasses on pedestrian movement and of verge reductions on pedestrian safety before detailed proposals are made. And it would help to ensure robust testing of the proposed "removal of guard railing". [WSP report, page 14] That railings provide necessary protection for pedestrians in the Trumpington Road corridor is evident from the damage they experience.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. We recommend that prior to implementation, a joint walking and cycling assessment of the Trumpington Road corridor is carried out to identify the means best "suited to cycling and walking" as real alternatives to the vehicles which unduly dominate our roads to the public detriment. ["Gear Change" – see extract above] Logically, the same recommendation applies to the A1134 East-West corridor – and the other proposed corridors.</p> <p>Improvement of Shared Use Paths</p> <p>The proposals also need to take full account of the fact that for many walkers, including some of our members, shared use of paths with cyclists is not a happy experience. It acts as an additional disincentive to walking as an alternative mode of travel - additional to the greater deterrent vehicles represent. In the words of two of our members:</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Member A - "... the busy path beside the busway is not good for pedestrians. It is too narrow. Pedestrians and cyclists are not separated. At busy times we are forced to walk one behind the other instead of side by side and we must constantly be on the alert for cyclists approaching from behind... Pedestrians and cyclists should be separated from each other and both must be separated from vehicular traffic... visitors from The Netherlands regard the arrangements for cyclists on places like Hills Road rail bridge as very dangerous. Recently, life for pedestrians has become even more hazardous with the introduction of motorised scooters. For pedestrians, these scooters are fast, silent and deadly... In addition to those provided for public use, there appear to be an increasing number of privately owned scooters on public roads and footways. At the moment, the needs of pedestrians feel sadly neglected in Cambridge and the wider county. You'll have to change that. Please start by listening to us." [6 June 2021] Member B –</p> <p>"... provision should be made for the disabled when using shared pavements. Currently the introduction of shared pavements and cycle paths means that it is a terrifying experience using these 'walkways'. Cyclists regularly hurtle towards you at speed and then swerve at the last moment. This is intimidating and frightening.</p> <p>Motorcycles...now also use cycle paths on shared pavement/ cycle routes around Trumpington...</p> <p>Essentially, the shared pedestrian / bicycle routes are second roads.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian pavement any longer...</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 4 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL</p> <p>The disabled should not be expected to jump into a hedgerow or onto a road to get out of the way of oncoming vehicles on pavements.</p> <p>Warning bells are ineffective, I cannot hear them... pedestrians should not be expected to make way for bicycles. This is a pavement after all...</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Currently the council is not providing a safe place to walk." [4 July 2020]</p> <p>We are aware that cyclists also have some issues with their pedestrian shared users, particularly where interests differ, as between swift cycling to get to work and walking for recreation. Action is required to improve this state of affairs.</p> <p>On busy routes, separation of pedestrians and cyclists is necessary, as well as their separation from vehicles. Adequate space is required for both cyclists and pedestrians, and better space for one should not be at the expense of less space for the other. Where additional space is required to provide a safe and comfortable experience for pedestrians and / or cyclists it should as a general rule come from the carriageways. It should not be taken from bus lanes as that would harm public transport which has an important part to play in improving conditions for cyclists and pedestrians by reducing road congestion and pollution. Given the significant issues this raises in many locations, as the corridor proposals illustrate, we recommend that the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and Cambridgeshire County Council should develop plans to secure supportive and safe conditions for cyclists and pedestrians over a period of years, including necessary infrastructure investment.</p> <p>In the meantime, we recommend that the principles which should underpin these long-term plans are devised at an early date and applied to the improvement of the thirteen corridors to the extent that current conditions allow. At present these principles are too often implicit which leads to misunderstanding and ineffective action. They need to be addressed explicitly so that conflicts within them can be resolved to mutual benefit. This may not fit with the GCP's immediate timescale but it is better to take a little more time to ensure that the available investment is used to best effect.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. In responses to previous GCP public consultations, we have recommended efforts to improve mutual understanding between cyclists and pedestrians using shared paths. For example:</p> <p>"Given the higher levels of walking and cycling to which the GCP, rightly, aspires, we suggest that further thought is given as to how best to minimize this conflict, particularly with the greater speeds that cyclists may wish to achieve, and the safety issues this might raise: the aim being to achieve a partnership in shared use rather than unhelpful conflict. We realize this is a wider issue than in Trumpington alone, which might benefit from a Greenways Project-wide approach to improve mutual understanding. Development and communication of mutual "rules of the road" might be one approach, learning from international good practice." [Melbourn Greenway consultation response, TRA letter, 1 August 2019, page 3]</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 5 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL</p> <p>The same suggestion was made in response to two public consultations on the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme – TRA letters of 31 October 2019, page 2, & 4 December 2020, page 7] There has not been a response. We ask again that the GCP addresses our suggestion.</p> <p>The proposed corridors</p> <p>We recommend as a general principle that pedestrians and cyclists should have priority over vehicular traffic other than buses. This encourages active travel and supports use of public transport – thus helping to secure modal shift away from use of the car with all the attendant benefits.</p> <p>We also recommend that the means best suited to secure priority for pedestrians and cyclists are achieved when they are considered together. For example, where a cycle path and a separate pedestrian path exist beside a main road, both should have priority over vehicular traffic entering or leaving side roads. This works well in The Netherlands.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Trumpington Road Corridor</p> <p>A High Priority</p> <p>The Association agrees that the proposed corridor is a high priority. Many residents and people who travel through Trumpington would benefit more from the corridor if conditions for cycling and walking were improved, allowing good quality journeys to the employment, retail and leisure activities in the central area and other parts of Cambridge. This suppressed demand is not satisfied by reliance solely on the Cambridge Guided Busway maintenance track / shared path from Trumpington Park & Ride to Cambridge Station (shown as a Greenway in WSP's "Future Investment Strategy" report, page 23). The need for the corridor was anticipated in the Melbourn Greenway public consultation two years ago, and proposals have been awaited since. [Consultation leaflet, route section 13B]</p> <p>Link with the Melbourn Greenway</p> <p>The proposal is silent on this crucial link, which is surprising given its importance and prominence in the Melbourn Greenway public consultation two years ago - and the subsequent inclusion of a section of the Greenway's shared use path in the Cambridge South West Travel Hub project linking with Trumpington Park & Ride. The Melbourn Greenway public consultation leaflet proposed a -</p> <p>"Connection across Trumpington Park & Ride site to the Busway Maintenance Track and towards Trumpington High Street"</p> <p>And noted that -</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 6 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL</p> <p>"Designs for bus and cycle improvements for Trumpington Road and High Street are being considered."</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. [Melbourn Greenway Consultation Leaflet, penultimate page]</p> <p>It is essential that this vital link is well planned and we urge the GCP to ensure that this work is done as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>As noted above, the Melbourn Greenway consultation envisaged use of the Park & Ride bus maintenance track to the west of and parallel with Hauxton Road to connect the Greenway with Trumpington High Street for both northbound and southbound journeys by cyclists (with pedestrians continuing to use the Hauxton Road footpaths). This opportunity, which we strongly support, still exists and should be addressed as a safer option for cyclists than travel on or alongside the busy A1309 - including avoidance of the dangerous busway bridge "pinch point" referred to by WSP. [Future Investment Strategy, sections 8 & 9, page 14]. Opportunities to anticipate this are being missed, for example in the recent expansion of the Park & Ride and subsequent installation of electricity charging points at its north eastern end - when it should have been possible to secure effective linkage with the bus maintenance track. This option also requires safe crossing of Consort Avenue and the track's intersection with the Waitrose access road to be addressed</p>

	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. It is also vital that the Trumpington Road corridor's linkage with the Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road Junction is well thought through given its complexity - which will increase significantly when the Cambridge South West Travel Hub's public transport route joins it together with the Melbourn Greenway's shared use path and the new southern access road to the Trumpington Meadows development which is under construction. A cycle crossing for cyclists who wish to turn right from Addenbrooke's Road into Hauxton Road is not good value. Most cyclists wishing to cross Hauxton Road or turn right into it, travel on the shared path on the northern side of Addenbrooke's Road and use the controlled crossing facility at the junction traffic lights, or continue on the cycle path to Trumpington Park & Ride traffic lights and use the recently improved crossing facility there.</p> <p>We recommend that the cycling link with the Melbourn Greenway, northbound and southbound is achieved through use of the Bus Maintenance Track from Trumpington Park & Ride to the Waitrose Junction; and that the proposals for "Sections 7, 8 & 9 – Hauxton Road", "Addenbrooke's Road Junction", "Park and Ride Junction", "Consort Avenue and Waitrose Junctions" are reassessed accordingly. This should include proposals to improve conditions for pedestrians using the existing Hauxton Road footpaths. [Future Investment Strategy: Active Travel Opportunities", WSP, March 2021, page 14]</p> <p>Waitrose Junction This crucial junction is not addressed adequately in the proposal. Due to the absence of controlled crossing facilities at the junction of the Waitrose access road with Hauxton Road, it is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists alike. It is also a busy and complex junction which</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Interacts closely with Shelford Road Junction, with left and right crossing movements from Hauxton Road into and out of the access road, and a right-hand crossing lane on Hauxton Road southbound into the access road fed in part by traffic turning left out of Shelford Road using a lead-in lane on that road. Because these issues are not addressed, the action envisaged in "Section 7 - Hauxton Road", is not adequate to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists – as well as taking no account of the Park & Ride bus maintenance track option recommended above. We ask that the action needed at this junction to provide a safe and convenient route for pedestrians and cyclists is reassessed, and includes consideration of the Park & Ride bus maintenance track option.</p> <p>Shelford Road Junction The northbound footpath is very constrained in this area and it is difficult to see how "a cycle bypass for northbound cyclists" could be provided without unacceptable impairment of the footpath to the detriment of pedestrians, or removal of trees. [WSP report, page 14] There should be no diminution of the existing pedestrian footpath and the protection afforded to pedestrians by the existing railings at this junction should not be diminished. It also needs to be made clear whether or not removal of trees is proposed so that the implications may be assessed.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Trumpington High Street – Sections 5 & 6 There is no case for taking space for dedicated cycle paths from the "narrow footways" in this difficult section, as the WSP report appears to contemplate. [Page 14] The restricted footpaths in these sections should be reserved solely for pedestrians. Some of them are very narrow indeed, and cyclists using them represent a hazard not only to pedestrians but also to some householders whose dwellings open directly on to the pavement. To ensure the pavements are reserved for pedestrians, and to provide safer conditions for cyclists, improvement would require some space to be taken from the carriageways to provide better dedicated cycleways on the north and southbound carriageways. It is difficult to see an alternative.</p> <p>Hauxton Road – Sections 7, 8 & 9 Reference is made above to the interaction between the Shelford Road and Waitrose Junctions. If understood correctly, the requirement for "removal of lead-in lanes" in section 7 may refer to the lead-in lane from Shelford Road northbound to Hauxton Road southbound. This lead-in lane is important not only for southbound traffic generally but also for access to Waitrose where the short right turn lane into the access road can easily become congested with a tailback beyond the southbound traffic lights. Were the lead-in lane to be removed, significant queues at peak times might also be anticipated on Shelford Road with vehicles waiting at the traffic lights. It is not clear that this has been adequately thought through. Also, it is not clear what other "lead-in lanes" might have to be removed; does this refer to the Hauxton Road southbound left turn lead-in lane to Shelford Road southbound? If so, that would have a significant impact on the operation of the Shelford</p>

	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 8 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL</p> <p>Road Junction at peak times which would require careful assessment before decision. We ask for clarification and full assessment of these points before a decision is made.</p> <p>The proposal to "take space from grass verges and highways to create raised highways in both directions" is sufficiently unspecific to warrant caution. If the Park & Ride bus maintenance track option commended above is not preferred following assessment - for which we would need persuasive evidence - residents will want more detail of what precisely is proposed before expressing a definitive view. We ask for detail of the proposal and for discussion with us and others before the GCP makes a decision.</p> <p>We are also not clear what is meant by "removal of lead-in lanes" in sections 8 & 9. Again, we ask for essential detail before a decision is made.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Church Lane Junction</p> <p>It is not clear to us that "a cycle bypass for southbound cyclists" is feasible at this junction given the restricted footpath at this point, the width of which needs to be retained for pedestrian safety. Nor without more information are we convinced of its necessity. We ask for more information before the GCP makes a decision.</p> <p>Trumpington Road – sections 2 & 3</p> <p>Section 2: The Association would be opposed to a proposal to reduce the width of the southbound bus lane if this is what is intended. Priority for buses over other carriageway users should be improved not diminished. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>Section 3: The meaning of the proposal to "remove right turning lane on the southbound approach to this junction" is not clear to us as we are not aware of such a lane at the junction with Long Road. If it refers to the southbound dedicated left turning lane into Long Road eastbound, we may agree in principle with the proposal to replace the lane with "a segregated cycle track" - subject to assessment of the traffic impacts at peak travel times including on buses, provision for safe crossing movements by drivers of vehicles wishing to turn left, and to simultaneous improvement of the pedestrian crossing facilities.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. A1134 East-West Corridor</p> <p>In the limited time allowed for this public consultation the Association has not been able to assess this corridor in the depth accorded to the Trumpington Corridor. It is nonetheless important to Trumpington residents. We see some similar issues including proposals to introduce narrow shared paths using existing footpaths, which are inimical to the mutual needs of both pedestrians and cyclists, and for "reallocation" of grass verges which provide protection to pedestrians as well as amenity to the area. There is also insufficient detail of what is proposed. We realize that compromises are necessary to secure benefits for pedestrians and cyclists - but the balance between detriment to pedestrians and</p> <p>Trumpington Residents' Association Response Page 9 of 9 DP/15.08.2021 v2 FINAL</p> <p>reallocation of carriageway space in these proposals does not seem right and should be reassessed.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Trumpington Residents' Association cont. Maintenance of foot & cycle paths The present state of many foot and cycle paths is a major disincentive to walking and cycling. Their lack of maintenance is lamentable: an example being the unsafe surface of the path by the Chaucer Road/Brooklands Avenue/Trumpington Road junction. If cycling and walking are to become alternatives attractive enough to lure hesitant drivers out of their cars, investment in surfaces and barriers to maintain a good standard is essential. The relevant authorities need to ensure that this standard is achieved. Capital investment in improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists will fail to achieve its potential unless followed up with adequate recurrent revenue spending on maintenance.</p> <p>Getting this right</p> <p>The Association realizes that there is a degree of urgency about action to improve active travel in Greater Cambridge. Yet it is even more important to ensure that action taken to improve the lot of pedestrians and cyclists is the most beneficial that can be taken. We recommend that further assessments are made of the proposals and alternatives to them before firm decisions are made. Given the importance of the proposed corridors to Trumpington and other parts of Greater Cambridge, it will be appreciated if amended detailed proposals are the subject of further consultation before decisions are made. It will also be appreciated if peak holiday periods are avoided for this consultation to assist voluntary associations such as ours to give them the attention they need in the midst of contemporaneous deadlines set by other transport bodies.</p> <p>Prepared by [name] For Trumpington Residents' Association 15 August 2021</p>
16/08/2021	O	<p>Please see attached for a response to the Cycling Plus survey and consultation from the Green Party.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention.</p> <p>[name] [address] Mob: [telephone number] e-mail: [email]</p>
	O cont.	<p>Green Party cont. 1 Consultation: Cycling plus, investing in Greater Cambridge Active travel network General concerns</p> <p>Cambridge Green Party strongly supports proposals to increase active travel (i.e. "physically active modes such as cycling, walking, or horse riding, and walking or cycling as part of a longer journey") to help reduce the carbon footprint of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire residents. The IPCC report of 9th August 2021 demonstrates the very urgent need to reduce carbon emissions caused by petrol or diesel-powered vehicles, and the current congestion in the city makes it clear that even electric-powered vehicles will need to be limited in number. Active travel offers many additional benefits, including improved health and well-being as a result of reduced pollution and noise, and through the creation of safer spaces for play, leisure and travel. Active travel is an important part of meeting "Vision Zero" for carbon emissions, and also reduces deaths of pedestrians</p>

	O cont.	<p>Green Party cont. We recognize that the survey is specifically to gather views on existing and proposed active travel routes, but we feel that it is nevertheless useful to offer some general comments.</p> <p>A Dutch-style system for cycling with separate pathways for walking and cycling should be used, and in some areas additional streaming of separate cycle lanes for fast commuters, with slower lanes for leisure cyclists, people with children, disabled people with special needs and older people.</p> <p>Our main concern is that the survey has a single question relating to disability and nothing about addressing women's safety, which we feel this is completely inadequate.</p> <p>Disabled people often have particular needs for routes that avoid traffic, and active travel infrastructure should be designed with the requirements of such users in the forefront, whether independent wheelchair users, disabled cyclists or users of mobility scooters. Disabled people have very varied transport needs and the GCP should be seeking their views, if not through this survey, then through other means such as advisory committees, in order to fulfil the Disability Act requirements. Consultation with this group should be based on the Equitable Leadership model, drawing on the direct daily experience of members of this community.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Green Party cont. The issues of women's safety was highlight by Sarah Everard's sad death, and all involved in designing transport routes need to be aware of this and reduce all possible risks. The GCP should therefore be taking specific advice from women's groups on how to improve active travel safety, as well as making sure that local police are involved. This will enable women to participate fully in all active transport options, and help to decrease their use of private transport.</p> <p>The development of good cycling infrastructure requires both long term and short term thinking. It must include provision of safe parking for people shopping, commuting to work or taking periods away from home, and cargo bike and specialist disability transport. This means thinking about luggage storage and good links to public transport. For example, the lack of lifts at Cambridge Railway Station multi-story cycle park makes the upper floors inaccessible to many. It is usually impossible to find suitable parking on the ground floor which has very very limited space for cargo bikes and specialist cycles, particularly those designed for people with disabilities. Furthermore, many people are not strong enough to raise their bikes onto the higher level of the 2-rack system (often the only spaces available) and may be unable to push their bikes up the ramps to the 2nd and 3rd floors. Locations for safe and legal parking of cycles in surrounding streets are extremely limited.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Green Party cont. Cambridge Green Party suggestions for use of the £2 million funding</p> <p>Since this is a response on behalf of all members, we have not prioritised any one of the 13 possible new corridors. However, we consider high priorities for use of the funding to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routes to be designed and built to the highest standards, with separate cycle and pedestrian pathways, and routed to be "Off Road" • Priority given to routes that will ensure children can travel to school off-road and using active transport • Growth of trees adjacent to corridors to be taken considered more carefully – many recently constructed cycle paths are now in a bad state of repair as a result of root growth (e.g. busway cycle path to Trumpington; the beginning of the Tins etc) • Regular maintenance of all existing routes and the new ones to be assured (many existing routes are not adequately maintained) • Dropped kerbs to be put in place wherever needed; in many parts of the City these are absent but are vital for independent wheelchair users, people carrying luggage and parents with buggies; • Good connections between cycling/pedestrian routes and public transport access points to be ensured; • Where active transport routes have to cross roads, crossings must be carefully designed, especially where cycle routes intersect with each other and/or cross roads.

	O cont.	<p>Green Party cont. • Major improvements need to be made to awareness-raising materials and signage for “off road” safe routes, and these should be kept up to date. The information should be presented in different formats, including signage, Apps, paper form and updated Google Maps, and should be widely distributed to schools, parents and active users of the system and in public places. Many people are unaware of existing active travel routes. The current cycle maps are out of date and do not show the active travel routes that have been added in the last few years.</p> <p>We understand that the £2 million currently available will only cover the cost of 2 Greenways. We propose that the funding is used in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement one of the routes (the one that will bring greatest benefit to local people) to the highest quality, ensuring that Dutch standards are used. • Support two or three smaller projects that will fill gaps in current city cycle and walking provision, such as improving pathway surfaces and facilities for pedestrians and disabled users, and providing better parking, luggage storage and signage, focusing on disabled groups, women’s safety and local communities.
16/08/2021	O	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Cycling plus consultation. I am writing as [job]of the University of Cambridge Primary School in Eddington. The school very much encourages active transport, has a number of sustainability initiatives, and is very keen to increase the number of children travelling by foot, bike or public transport to school. The school has a high proportion of children travelling from Girton, and a key barrier to sustainable travel is safety. Specifically, the parent community have raised concerns around the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and direct access for cyclists travelling from Girton to Eddington (and beyond). There is currently no safe and direct way to access Eddington from Girton, either via the Ridgeway (which involves mounting the pavement in order to cross a busy Girton Road) or by turning right into Eddington from Huntingdon road (which involves cutting across busy traffic). • Safe and direct crossing for pedestrians on Huntingdon Road to access Eddington when coming from Girton. <p>The Committee would be very supportive of initiatives to improve cycling and pedestrian provision in the corridors I Girton to Oakington and J Huntingdon Road North. This includes the addition of a crossing on Girton Road to facilitate access to the Rideway for pedestrians and cyclists, as referenced in the Huntingdon Road North scheme, and a signalised pedestrian crossing near Thornton Road, as referenced in the Huntingdon Road North scheme.</p> <p>We would be really happy to meet with you to discuss these issues in more detail.</p> <p>With best regards [name]</p>
16/08/2021	O	<p>Please find attached a response to the Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge’s Active Travel Network consultation from Smarter Cambridge Transport.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>[name] Smarter Cambridge Transport https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=www.smartertransport.uk&umid=b1ecbade-9ccb-4c7f-90e3-b7748a535b72&auth=df9d20fa411d87c1803ee3b11535af83ce4c7acf-2d273399d588f3f4665521031a3a2aee3ade429e [email] / [telephone number]</p> <p>www.smartertransport.uk @SmarterCam Page 1 of 6 To: Greater Cambridge Partnership Subject: Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge’s Active Travel Network Date: 16 August 2021 Contact: [name] / [telephone number] / [email] [address]</p> <p>Response to Cycling Plus consultation About Smarter Cambridge Transport Smarter Cambridge Transport is a volunteer-run think tank and campaign group. It was formed in 2015 to advance sustainable, integrated and equitable transport for the Cambridge region. It is run by a team of around 30 people, with a wide range of expertise and interests, and led by [name], a qualified transport economist. Its website is at www.smartertransport.uk.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. About Smarter Cambridge Transport Smarter Cambridge Transport is a volunteer-run think tank and campaign group. It was formed in 2015 to advance sustainable, integrated and equitable transport for the Cambridge region. It is run by a team of around 30 people, with a wide range of expertise and interests, and led by (name), a qualified transport economist. Its website is at www.smartertransport.uk.</p> <p>Executive Summary This is a poor-quality consultation, purporting to be about "active travel" when, in fact, it is about prioritising some disjointed and ill-thought-through cycling improvement schemes in and around Cambridge. Confusingly, these overlap with several of the county council's Cambridgeshire Active Travel Schemes without any cross-reference or explanation.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. The funding available will cover just two of the thirteen short-listed schemes, which still omit key routes, including east of Barton Rd and Burrell's Walk. Rather than attempting to resolve conflicts in the city centre between pedestrians, cycles, buses, taxis and private vehicles, the report proposes making most, but not all, of the inner ring road attractive for cycling. This has huge ramifications for city traffic, bus services and the level of investment required. As a strategy, it needs to be thoroughly tested before it is adopted by default.</p> <p>The lack of an overarching strategy is yet again evident here. We continue to see proposals to narrow pavements and designate more pavements and footpaths as 'shared use' to avoid reducing capacity for motor traffic. The latter outcome is still referred to as a "risk", even though it is a stated and agreed objective of the Greater Cambridge Partnership.</p> <p>The very limited range of organisations involved pre-consultation, primarily representing large employers, have skewed the recommendations. Consultation with residents, schools and other groups would have identified many of the shortcomings we have identified. The lack of consideration for the needs of disabled people and parents of babies and infants is especially concerning.</p> <p>Comments The following points relate to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Future Investment Strategy: Active Travel Opportunities report, on which the Cycling Plus consultation is based.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. Cycling, not active travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report is mistitled: it is exclusively about improving provision for cycling, not active travel, which includes walking, running, using a wheelchair, and riding a mobility- or scooter. In fact, in several places, it proposes reducing the quality of provision for walking. • There are multiple references to "taking space from footway". No data is provided to show that the remaining width would be appropriate to the long-term future demand. Government and GCP policies to promote active travel will lead to an increase in people walking (as well as cycling and e-scooter), so current data on pedestrian flows (where even available) are not a good guide to future demand. • There are multiple references to "shared use footway", acknowledging that this will "provide a lower level of service for cyclists", but failing to acknowledge that shared-use pavements and paths provide a much poorer experience for people walking, exposing them to greater danger and stress. At best, shared-use is an interim solution for a low-traffic route. It should not form part of a long-term strategy to promote active travel.

	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. Lack of overarching, holistic strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status of this report is de facto strategic, in that it was adopted by implication at the March executive board meeting, and contains the recommendation, "this work should be used as an ongoing reference and be reflected on should additional funding opportunities present themselves." Yet it is not set within a strategic framework for how space (and traffic signal times) should be allocated between pedestrians, cycles, buses, taxis and private vehicles. • The report contains an implied strategy of encouraging more people to cycle around the inner ring road, rather than through the city centre (on pages 15 and 18): "... helping to contribute to an outer [inner] ring road of better quality cycle provision around the City Centre, thus potentially avoiding the need for cyclist [sic] to travel through the City Centre." This would have wide repercussions for all modes of traffic: significantly reduced capacity for motor vehicles on a critical route, potentially increased delays for buses, and huge costs and disruption entailed in redesigning large and busy junctions to provide protected routes for cycles. It therefore needs to be tested thoroughly before it is adopted as a strategy. • The identified "risks" relating to road capacity highlight the lack of a strategy on capacity reduction. A target has already been agreed (10–15% reduction on 2011 levels), but there is still no plan for whether or how that reduction in traffic will translate into reduced capacity. What steps will enable and trigger a reduction in capacity (e.g. provision of new active travel routes, bus services or delivery distribution depots)?
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • The risk identified for Queen's Rd, "potentially difficult to remove coach parking," highlights the lack of a strategy for managing tourist coaches or, indeed, for supporting sustainable tourism in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy is needed to remove conflicts between buses and people walking and cycling, and to cater to a large growth in the number of buses travelling into the city as part of efforts by GCP and the Combined Authority to promote travel by bus. This report contains almost no reference to the conflicts on Silver St, Trumpington St, Pembroke/Downing St, St Andrew's/Regent St, Emmanuel St, Parker St, Park Terrace, Hobson St, King St, Jesus Lane Bridge/Magdalene St, Round Church St and Park St. • A strategy is required to reduce or remove conflicts between cycles and pedestrians on narrow and busy streets in the city centre, whilst also catering to a large growth in the number of people walking and cycling in the city. This report contains no reference to the conflicts on Garret Hostel Ln, Trinity Ln, Senate House Passage, St Mary's St, Market St, Sidney St, St John's St and Trinity St. <p>Inconsistency with stated objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A "risk" identified for the Gonville Place intervention states, "high traffic impact, which may be unacceptable to traffic modellers". Why would traffic modellers have a veto? Their role is to test if a scenario is likely to meet a desired outcome. What is the desired outcome?
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • There are multiple references to "loss in traffic capacity" and "impact on traffic capacity" as a risk. The GCP has an agreed objective of reducing traffic in the city, by 25–30% on 2019 levels. Therefore, capacity reduction is not a risk. The only risk is that the intervention is not co-ordinated with other measures to ensure that demand to travel can be met satisfactorily in other ways (i.e. some combination of active travel, public transport, ridesharing, remote-working, home-delivery, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibly having to install traffic signals at the Butt Lane/High St junction in Milton is classed as a "risk". How can be this be a risk when its purpose would be to enhance safety? • De-scoping of some junctions, e.g. Chesterton Road–Elizabeth Way roundabout and Mitcham's Corner gyratory, is accompanied by a note that it "may present a gap in the network for cyclists wishing to use this route". The doubt implied by the word "may" is wrong; it should be "would". The critical Addenbrooke's Hospital roundabout has been de-scoped because it "would be very expensive and complex." There is no justification for de-scoping elements of the network at this stage, before a cost–benefit analysis has been performed. • Some other junctions have been de-scoped because they are being reviewed separately, e.g. Newmarket Rd–East Rd and Coldham's Lane–Barnwell Rd roundabouts. The latter is inaccurately described as already having funding: the allocation by the Combined Authority was deemed insufficient to proceed with the scheme. If these projects are not delivered, or delivered to a sub-standard design, they will leave critical weak links in the active travel network.

	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. Incomplete analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not one mention in the entire report of the needs of disabled people, users of wheelchairs or mobility scooters, or people conveying babies in prams or young children in pushchairs. Their needs argue for wider pavements and footpaths, less sharing with cycles and e-scooters, more controlled and priority crossing, and more benches. No such enhancements are proposed; quite the reverse: many of the proposals are for narrower pavements and more shared-use paths. • There are multiple references to use of grass verges to widen the carriageway to accommodate raised cycle lanes, perhaps most controversially along Queen's Road. Grass verges are an important feature in the urban realm: they visually enhancing the cityscape; provide a psychologically calming effect; slow rainwater run-off; lock up carbon dioxide in the soil; and reducing the urban heat-island effect. Their removal should not be recommended without an appreciation of the environmental and heritage impacts. If there is a clear net benefit in removal of a grass verge, and no alternative is viable, even after reducing the carriageway width, then new green space should be created or significantly enhanced elsewhere, ideally close by. • Major trip destinations appear not to have been considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Further education colleges (Hills Rd, Long Rd, Parkside, Queen Edith's Way, Kings Hedges, Milton, Impington, Comberton, Cottenham) – ARU campus (East Road/Mill Road) – Supermarkets and retail parks (e.g. Newmarket Road and Coldham's Lane) • On page 3, the report states, "Following engagement with key business organisations and locations," What "locations" and, more specifically, who?
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • How are the businesses engaged with (listed below), and invited to participate in two workshops, representative of all the people who may cycle in the city? What about representation from residents, residents' associations, schools, small businesses, retailers, bus operators, Camcycle, Living Streets, Cambridge Area Bus Users, Cam Sight, Milton Cycling Campaign, et al?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cambridge Science Park, – Addenbrooke's NHS Trust – University of Cambridge – Cambridge Ahead – Cambridgeshire County Council – Greater Cambridge Partnership. <p>Inadequate funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report concludes that just four roads, Mowbray Rd, Perne Rd, Long Rd and Queen Edith's Way, should be prioritised. This is all that the £20 million the GCP has allocated to active travel, out of the £75 million Future Investment Strategy funding for "public transport improvements and sustainable travel", will pay for. Even that is uncertain, given the costs are only estimates. • The two recommended schemes, out of a shortlist of thirteen, are connected to just three of the greenways (Sawston, Trumpington and Linton). Three greenways (Haslingfield, Comberton and Hardwick) will still lack an unconflicted, direct route to the city centre, railway stations and the Biomedical Campus. Only the Fulbourn greenway will have a relatively unconflicted and direct route to all three of those destinations.
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • The funding allocated was intended to fill gaps in the cycle network that will otherwise undermine investment in the greenways and cross-city cycling schemes. This is an extract from the Executive Board report on Future Investment Strategy, 10 December 2020 (our emphasis added):</p> <p>5.6 Firstly, recognising the opportunity to encourage active travel and build on the emergency measures and existing GCP spend commitments, it is proposed that an allocation is made to enable targeted investment in gaps in the cycling network. Planned investments through the GCP programme, as well as by partners, will significantly improve the cycling network across Greater Cambridge. The Greenways will provide a step-change in provision outside the city, and the Chisolm Trail and Cross City cycling projects will provide much needed connections. However, there will still be gaps in the network that could discourage people from cycling and taking advantage of the new infrastructure. In order to maximise the potential for use of new active travel routes and leave a strong active travel network as a City Deal legacy, it is suggested that an additional allocation is made to address gaps. Initial analysis suggests that there would be a range of potential schemes that could be taken forward, and further work would be needed to refine the final list of projects.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • The estimated cost of all thirteen schemes, which would still not provide a comprehensive city network, totals £94.6 million. Will the GCP fund any more than two of these schemes? Given that the GCP's entire budget is already over-allocated by £128 million, what scheme(s) would be de-prioritised to ensure the active travel network can be completed?</p> <p>Poor quality consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questionnaire relates to active travel generally, yet the supporting report is concerned only with cycling, and the proposed schemes are almost exclusively about improving provision for cycling. • The questionnaire refers to "personal security and safety", but does not drill down into what factors are important, for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor road/path maintenance: The very real risk of being injured, especially when roads are wet or lighting is poor, is a strong deterrent to cycling and, for less mobile people, walking. The experience of physical discomfort is also a deterrent, possibly subconscious. - Visibility – field of view and lighting: Being visible to other people, and being able to see someone who may pose a threat or danger sufficiently early to take evasive action are both very important. - Secure cycle parking: Theft and vandalism are often very stressful, can disrupt someone's life, and even lose them their job.
	O cont.	<p>Smarter Cambridge Transport cont. • Extensive use is made of technical language and jargon that responders to the consultation cannot reasonably be expected to understand, or to appreciate the implications in terms of cost or time to implement, associated risks, and disruption caused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CYCLOPS junction - Dutch roundabout - modal filter - clashes with utilities - cyclist priority features - improve cycle movements - traffic impacts - reduced level of service for pedestrians - land consent and approval - CCC - bus cage [!] <p>• A second consultation on active travel, the county council's Cambridgeshire Active Travel Schemes, is being conducted in parallel with this one. Even though they overlap in several of the interventions described, there is no cross-referencing or explanation of how either fits within a comprehensive strategy for promoting active travel.</p>
16/08/2021		<p>Dear [name]</p> <p>An apology is always welcome, so thank you.</p> <p>However, I would have preferred accompanying answers from the GCP to my questions, including why it took a week to post the hard copy without a return address etc, and a handwritten and unsigned note on a "sliced" section of an A4 page, as well as timely guidance on submitting my survey responses on time - I would still appreciate an answer to that question please. I also appreciate advice on copying a submission but how would I scan the survey submission; when I rang at the end of July it was suggested that I should write my answers on a word document and copy and paste into the online form. What I did do after some experimentation and wasteful use of commuter paper and ink was to print each section before "saving and continuing"; not something that I would recommend as it took me a good deal of time and an extravagant use of paper to accomplish (10 plus pages).</p> <p>Why does the GCP not just design the surveys so that one can simply copy and store and/or print a copy before submission, and have a recognised system for a hard copy response (our original request was due to logistical reasons for not responding online). It can be done quite readily. Not your personal doing, I assume, but all of this creates an impression of a not a very professional system for an organisation the size and spending power of the GCP, so please pass on my comments, intended to be constructive, as well as allowing me to express some reasonable displeasure.</p> <p>As we had not received that guidance by mid morning (received 56 minutes after the deadline time of noon today), and we had no reason to believe that the deadline would be extended, we submitted our responses online, using our pre-written hard copies for reference, being glad that we did not assume that we would have time to drive to the return address in Huntingdon when we live south of Cambridge (we had assumed Cambridge or Cambourne and leaving home around [location]).</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>[name]</p>

16/08/2021	O	<p>Dear Greater Cambridge Partnership,</p> <p>Please find attached Camcycle's response to the consultation and our apologies for the slight delay in this submission.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>[name] [job] CAMCYCLE p: [telephone number] e: [email] w: camcycle.org.uk t: @camcycle Join: camcycle.org.uk/membership Charity no. 1138098</p> <p>Charity Number 1138098 www.camcycle.org.uk @camcycle Cambridge Cycling Campaign Bike Depot 140 Cowley Road Cambridge CB4 0DL 01223 690718 contact@camcycle.org.uk www.camcycle.org.uk Greater Cambridge Partnership SH1317 Shire Hall Cambridge CB3 0AP</p>
	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. 16 August, 2021</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>Cycling Plus consultation</p> <p>Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,600 members working for more, better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities in the Cambridge region, together with partners throughout the county. Our focus is on cycling as a mode of sustainable transport for everyday trips, including but not limited to: shopping, going to work or school, attending a doctor's appointment, visiting friends or family, and leisure. Many of our members and their families cycle for these purposes on a regular basis and therefore have great interest in the improvement of active travel infrastructure and route networks that would enable them to choose cycling and walking for as many of their local journeys as possible.</p> <p>We made an initial response to the 'Future Investment Strategy: Active Travel Opportunities' report at the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly in February 2021 and the comments we made then still apply.</p> <p>In general, we welcome the introduction of proposals to deal with cycling 'missing links' in the Greater Cambridge region. We believe that the GCP would gain excellent value for its money by building a network of high-quality cycle routes suitable for all ages and abilities.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. However, we remain concerned about the lack of integration of these schemes with other active travel projects (and a holistic transport and urban realm strategy) and call for a commitment to the use of Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 as a basis for designing high quality cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>We are concerned that some of the specific 'gap analysis' sections in the Active Travel Study make low-quality suggestions that would be worse than nothing, such as shared-use pavements or narrow advisory cycle lanes. Many would also reduce important green space such as grass verges, and create a negative impact for those walking or using mobility aids.</p> <p>The experience gained from the current GCP project on Histon Road has revealed the importance of getting these elements right at the design stage. We must not create schemes which remove valuable pavement width or verges instead of tackling the more difficult – but essential – need to reallocate roadspace.</p> <p>We have a number of additional concerns:</p> <p>Method of consultation The Department for Transport's 'Gear Change: One Year On' report, published in July 2021, emphasises the importance of capturing a genuinely representative picture of local views from consultations on cycling schemes using consultation materials which include proper evidence and information about the effects of the proposals. We do not feel the GCP Cycling Plus consultation reflects this approach.</p>

	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. • It is primarily online-only; little effort has been made to engage with local community groups beyond a few major employers. Ideally, a diverse range of stakeholder groups should be brought together for consultation to understand the needs of each group and how to address them appropriately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timing of the consultation has overlapped with both the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the Active Travel Schemes consultations from Cambridgeshire County Council which is confusing for the public and integration with these projects is unclear. • The main document explaining the schemes to residents is a long technical paper from WSP written for an audience knowledgeable in transport jargon, using terms such as 'CYCLOPS junction' and 'cyclist priority features'. • The need for improvements to active travel is not set clearly enough in the context of local or national needs to reduce motor traffic. There are some references in the consultation brochure to 'connectivity', 'quality of life' and 'greener, healthier journeys' and in the WSP document to 'long-term modal shift', but we don't think it is clear enough to the general public how these specific cycling improvements might help address local targets for pollution, congestion and decarbonisation or the national target for half of urban journeys to be cycled or walked by 2030. • Members have told us it is confusing to choose between 13 schemes: does it become a popularity contest, where the 'winning' areas are those with the loudest voices?
	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. We believe that the work presented to the GCP's Executive Board in March 2021 should have been adjusted for consultation in a way that was as accessible to as wide an audience as possible, with early input from ourselves and other active travel and disability groups used to shape inclusive proposals for discussion.</p> <p>Lack of integration with other schemes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation is named 'Cycling Plus' and the reference document is titled 'Active Travel Opportunities' but focuses exclusively on cycling. Following on from the LCWIP consultation which did consult on both cycling and walking this is a very disappointing oversight. All schemes within the busy and growing Greater Cambridge area will need to improve facilities for those walking, cycling and using other active travel modes including mobility aids and should certainly not disadvantage users. Promotional graphics for the consultation included pedestrians and equestrians but neither were addressed in the materials, and we are dismayed to find that in the entire report there is no mention at all of disability and the specific needs of disabled people when using different modes of active transport. 2. How do these schemes integrate with the LCWIP and Active Travel Schemes and the GCP's 'City Access' programme? If each of these projects is considered in isolation, there is a risk that instead of connecting up 'cycling missing links', this scheme will simply contribute to the existing piecemeal mix of high- and low-quality infrastructure which does not enable those of all ages and abilities to complete safe and accessible journeys to their destinations.
	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. 3. Many of the items that have been 'de-scoped' in the Active Travel Opportunities document are dangerous junctions that are major barriers to cycling, including the Addenbrooke's Hospital roundabout, Coldhams Lane roundabout and Mitcham's Corner gyratory. We know that cycle routes are only as good as their weakest links; the temporary proposals for Mitcham's Corner (part of the Active Travel Scheme) should be used to inform longer-term designs for change here. LTN 1/20 (6.1.13) states that 'trials may be used to give a real-world indication of the effects of road space reallocation... They help make a strong statement of the intention to give greater priority to active travel modes, and offer a high-profile way to stimulate feedback in the stakeholder participation process'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Similarly, designating the difficult sections of Chesterton Road and High Street 'a low speed zone with advisory cycle lanes' will not remove the barrier these intimidating sections of road present unless enforcement of 20mph limits is improved and traffic is reduced. In our LCWIP response, we called for improvement to the 'missing link' on the portion of Green End Road between High Street and Nuffield Road, as it is clear that the existing advisory lanes present a barrier to many cyclists of all ages and abilities. They often create more danger than doing nothing as they cause drivers to pass too closely to those riding a safe distance from the kerb on narrow streets. LTN 1/20 also states that 'advisory lanes are not recommended where they are likely to be blocked by parked vehicles', which would certainly be the case on Chesterton High Street. 5. Multi-modal journeys (integration with rail and bus) and journeys other than 'commuter, school and leisure' trips should be considered. Many major trip destinations such as further education colleges, supermarkets and retail parks seem to have been missed out of the analysis. 6. Links to the Greenways are essential to enable active travel options for those travelling into Cambridge. The recommend A1134 schemes are connected to just three of the greenways (Sawston, Trumpington and Linton). The Haslingfield, Comberton and Hardwick Greenways will still lack a direct and conflict-free route to the city centre, railway stations and the Biomedical Campus.

	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. Lack of inclusive design strategy and methodology</p> <p>The 'Active Travel Opportunities' report was adopted at the March 2021 meeting of the Executive Board, but is not set within a strategic framework for how roadspace (and traffic signal times) should be allocated between pedestrians, cycles, buses, taxis and private motor vehicles across Cambridge and beyond. This should be set by the upcoming 'City Access' programme; without further details of the latter, it is difficult to see how the two projects will integrate where space is limited, particularly on the inner ring road. We are concerned that the report displays an outdated attitude to transport engineering which is inconsistent with both the overall objectives of the GCP and this project in particular.</p> <p>1. There are multiple references in the report to 'Loss in traffic capacity' and 'impact on traffic capacity' as a risk. Capacity reduction is not a risk, it is a goal: the GCP has an agreed objective of reducing traffic in the city, by 25–30% on 2019 levels. The only risk is that the intervention is not co-ordinated with other measures to ensure that demand to travel can be met satisfactorily in other ways (i.e. a combination of active travel, public transport, ride-sharing, remote-working, home-delivery and so on, as is due to be explored by the City Access project).</p> <p>2. There are multiple references to 'shared-use footway', acknowledging that this will 'provide a lower level of service for cyclists', but failing to acknowledge that shared use pavements and paths provide a much poorer experience for people walking, pushing children in prams and pushchairs or using mobility aids. Inclusive design for cycling should never come at the expense of users higher up the transport hierarchy. LTN 1/20 makes clear in its design principles (1.5.4 and 1.6.1) that the needs of pedestrians must be considered early in the process and that shared-use routes should not be used in streets with high pedestrian or cyclist flows.</p>
	O cont.	<p>Camcycle cont. 3. There are multiple references to use of grass verges to widen the carriageway to accommodate raised cycle lanes. Camcycle has a clear policy that the reallocation of road space must be considered first before green space is allocated for cycle routes (see Cycle routes through rural and urban green spaces at camcycle.org.uk/policy). Green spaces including grass verges are important features in the urban realm and their removal should not be recommended without an appreciation of the environmental and heritage impacts. The preservation of green space is environmentally, socially and economically important and will become even more so as the need for enhanced mitigation of the effects of climate change increases. For example, verges provide important areas for rainwater runoff and urban trees help to cool streets. If there is a clear net benefit in removal of a grass verge, and no alternative is viable even after reducing the carriageway width, then new green space should be created or significantly enhanced close by.</p> <p>Important links in the cycling network should not be designed in isolation using a top-down approach, but in collaboration with local communities. The aim should be to develop schemes which improve facilities for all active travel users following the guidance set out in LTN 1/20. This requires an inclusive, 21st-century approach to transport strategy which will allow the GCP to meet its overall goals while also preserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, On behalf of Camcycle, [name] [job]</p>
16/08/2021		<p>Camcycle cont. Cycle routes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out effective inspection and maintenance so that Water co sinking valve and manhole covers and drainage gully gratings do not fail early and are rectified as soon as defective. 2 Joints in tarmac at trench tops etc are properly constructed and sealed so that slots do not form later in the surface. 3 Thermoplastic line markings are not laid over red tarmac/bitmac. When the line tears off, the wearing course goes too. <p>Such hazards, if spotted in time by cyclists, will cause the cyclists to swerve and so make the cyclist use a greater width of lane than necessary.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4 In new schemes for cyclists approaching a segregated layout ,mark an approach route for cyclists so that vehicle drivers are not surprised by a cyclist trying to take up a position near the centre of the road. 5 Deter vehicle parking in cycle lanes near well-used shops. An occasional parking ticket campaign should pass the message. 6 For pedestrians' benefit a few notices/prosecutions where front garden vegetation is allowed to grow over or into footways should make walking easier for all. <p>[name] [address] Sent from Mail for Windows</p>

16/08/2021	O	<p>Please find attached a response from the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum.</p> <p>[name] Cambridgeshire Local Access forum (CLAF)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum [job]: [name] c/o Cambridgeshire County Council Flood & Biodiversity Team [address]</p> <p>Tel: [telephone number] Email: [email]</p> <p>Monday 16th August 2021</p> <p>Cycling Plus: Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network consultation</p> <p>To whom it may concern: The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum (CLAF) was established through the statutory provisions of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and its remit is to advise relevant bodies as defined in Section 94(4) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 on matters relating to access to the countryside. Section 94(4) bodies are required by the legislation to take the views of the Local Access Forum into account. The Cambridgeshire LAF welcomes this opportunity to provide input into the Cycling Plus: Investing in Cambridge's Active Travel Network plan and how it might be revised and improved to better reflect the existing and potential future use of the non-motorised transport network across the County.</p> <p>We have the following points to make: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a general rule all active travel routes should be suitable for all active travel users and not just for cyclists and as a result, we think this plan should be renamed as an Active Travel network for all non-Motorised Users (NMU). </p>
	O cont.	<p>Cambridge Local Access Forum cont. We are pleased to read that the funding available will be concentrated on the two or three routes most heavily used, so that not all routes will have a tarmac surface. We realise that tarmac needs less maintenance than a softer surface, but it is important to note that walkers/horse riders escape from the urban environment to avoid walking on tarmac, which is very hard on the feet, and horse riders much prefer a softer surface. There are alternative surfacing materials that are more suitable for all users and we would request that these are investigated before making a final choice on surfacing material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of equestrianism to the economy and health and wellbeing, as a whole should not be overlooked. It should also be recognised for its inclusiveness as an activity for disabled people. <p>The CLAF would be happy to discuss further our concerns and how we might contribute positively to the Plan but also work together to resolve any issues.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[name]</p>
17/08/2021	I	<p>Dear [name]</p> <p>I can empathise with front line staff having to deal with business at home during the pandemic, particularly with complications such as having young children at home at the same time; we have had our own challenges, like so many. I hope that you and others had the appropriate level of additional support from GCP, and I do not want to add to your load by e-mail ping pong. You have given an explanation, for which I thank you: the pandemic is not an excuse for the GCP as an "Organisation" however. My displeasure is not with the front-line staff but the system under which they are working, be it training, including communication, or systems being simplified and additional home-office support provision.</p> <p>Picking up on a couple of your points in a spirit of constructiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ConsultCam's survey model; if there is doubt about its fitness-for-purpose in Qs (built in bias, as I believe, not necessarily intentional); or format/communication/copying methods, as your mail seems to also imply, change the model Getting a hard copy should not rely on those completing the survey to lose privacy/anonymity, by giving an e-mail address. <p>I wish to pose some questions to GCP re the processes used and outcomes from hazard identification and risk analysis in the area of shared active pathways and segregated cycle paths and footpaths, particularly in the context of Cambridgeshire's vision zero aspirations. Can you please provide a suitable contact.</p> <p>Thank you again.</p> <p>[name]</p>

10/08/2021		<p>Hello {name}</p> <p>On 30th July I called the CGP number re the active walking/cycling survey. I explained to "[name]" that I was not able to access the online survey for a number of reasons and after speaking to the GCP duty person (why could I not speak to that person myself?) {name} came back and I was promised hard copies of the survey form within a few days. Here we are on the 10th August and no forms. Another reason for having reason to doubt the GCP. Can you please arrange urgently the sending of those forms please.</p> <p>Also, can you please advise where I can access easily the minutes of the June and July meetings to which I submitted Questions, in order to see the responses.</p> <p>Thank You</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>{names}</p>
16/08/2021	O	<p>Thank you {name}, that helps. Although I worked over the weekend to submit a response in time, I know other groups are still working on theirs. I will be interested to learn how many people have responded to this consultation because public awareness of it is very low, and it is difficult to understand what is being proposed without reading the dense, technical report.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>{name}</p> <p>Smarter Cambridge Transport www.smartertransport.uk {name}@smartertransport.uk / 01223 312 377 / 07941 471 573</p>
08/07/2021	I	<p>Fix the bloody road surfaces first! You'd have a terrific ready built cycle network. Just kick the cars off it..</p>

14/07/2021		Like that'd work! Fix the footpaths and combined cycle and footpaths. That's the one dominant comment coming from active travellers. Ensure safety with smooth surfaces, no overhangings and clear markings.
06/07/2021		Is this a joke? Can somebody enlighten them please? These are the ppl spending Emillions of public money who seem to know little about people. #invisibleillness #chronicillness #partiallysighted #hardofhearing to name a few. It's not rocket science. But this is quite worrying.
05/07/2021		Because there are no safe, segregated routes to ride. Thats not there. Two fails in the first 5 questions? Someone poke me after @GreaterCambs stop biasing their surveys to get pointless answers that even if they implement won't change a damn thing. i.e. never.

05/07/2021		FAIL. You've created a survey on active transport that biases the results against people saying they walk or ride a bike to the shops @GreaterCambs . AND THATS THE FIRST QUESTION. Delete this. Start again. For flips sake whats wrong with you?
06/07/2021		Very important. At the last census, almost twice as many commuted to Cambridge from East Cambs than from Hunts. Even greater now I suspect, mostly coming from Ely. A10 Corridor is key and exists beyond Waterbeach! Major cycle infra needed WBC↔ELY.
08/07/2021		The biggest thing I can say as a cyclist in trumpington is it doesn't feel like there has been any investment in cycling and there is no plan. What are these cycling links you speak of? A few Sheffield loops does not count. The busway cycle path is dangerously busy and needs work

08/07/2021		Also the road surface along trumpington high Street and adjacent roads is horrendous. There will be a terrible accident soon I'm sure. Crossing the M11 roundabout to hauxton still feels suicidal. Finally why is a Facebook group more effective than the police for stolen bikes?
08/07/2021		I would love to talk about more public water fountains, pumps, showers, better routes like dna, council rental cargos, subsidies for businesses to improve bike infra or even clip on bike trailers to borrow, etc. but if the road surface is like rally cross... Get the basics done
05/07/2021		There are plenty of cyclists in East Cambridgeshire who currently use GCP infrastructure. If GCP infrastructure (eg the Greenways) connected with East Cambs infrastructure, then cyclists in both areas as well as tourists would benefit (also more cyclists).

05/07/2021		I cycle most weeks in the GCP area but the questionnaire isn't appropriate to me because I live just outside the GCP area. It's the same with the LCWIP, there are boundaries between South and East Cambridgeshire that are not crossed, despite a need.
05/07/2021		How many more consultations will there be before anything actually happens? How about sending some GCP folk out on bikes and working out for yourselves what a horrorshow it is most of the time. The main problem is there are too many cars.
06/07/2021		Also, don't forget to make use of the Greater Cambridge Bike Life report - https://sustrans.org.uk/media/5949/bikelife19_greater-cambridge_web.pdf ... - lots of useful data, and the 2021 report will be out early next year (we are surveying your residents currently too).

05/07/2021		I don't mean to be rude here, but have you taken a look at what's happening on Histon Road alone? temporary one way street - fine - but the cycle lane leading up the road has been turned into a permanent car park by the Iqbro supermarket. people will die. sort it out
13/07/2021		To many people, the elderly and infirm and those sensible accept that cycling is too dangerous with modern traffic, active travelling is getting in and out of the car.
14/07/2021		Instead of the focus being on cycling, focus on safety, proficiency and education. Make junctions safer, they're the biggest danger. Improve foot and cycle paths surfaces and cut back bushes and tree branches. Improve signage and markings.

13/07/2021		Well I hope two cycling consultations for the same area run at the same time by different transport bodies one of which is deciding how to spend £20m in Greater Cambs & the other preparing a county strategy which it has no funding makes sense to someone?
14/07/2021		Yes @greatercambs City Deal have decided to spend £20m on cycling (part of £120m ringfenced to date) but dont know what to fund with it.CambsCC are writing a cycling strategy so they can get government to fund it. Can local gov't get more disfunctional than this?
08/07/2021		I suggest you spend £10m on cyclist training on Highway Code, understanding the needs of other road users, proficiency, and wearing appropriate hi vis apparel.

17/07/2021		Mill Road doesn't seem to be included; is that because it is now widely accepted as a cycling Shangri-La and doesn't need further public input, and the £millions needed for permanence are already guaranteed?
17/07/2021		We drove 250 miles back from the West Country yesterday. There were a few responsible cyclists but, I am afraid the majority were not. 20 cyclists in single file on a fast windy road. Thoughtless. Plenty of other instances which show that investment is needed to improve cyclists.
17/07/2021		Pity no-one is taking account of the effect these measures have on disabled people, people who rely on their cars, most with Blue Badges who even the @Cambs_Traffic @CambsCC don't care enough to assist. Can't give access over Mill Rd bridge, blocked from disabled parking, what next?

17/07/2021		Discrimination against 4 protected of the classes: Elderly (frail), Disabled, Pregnancy & Maternity, Women (sex) The majority of the first 3 groups do not cycle, and women have many more caring responsibilities than men, where they are transporting shopping or relatives.
17/07/2021		Take it you are all geared up to have these removed by Monday morning?
17/07/2021		Don't you think you ought to also protect those who rely heavily on their vehicles? For instance, disabled people who aren't wheelchair users, Blue Badge holders who've already lost parking spaces on Kings Parade and can't cross Mill Road bridge. They've become The Forgotten.

16/07/2021		Can't wait to see you have these all removed by Monday morning as restrictions are now lifted. Your excuse is no longer valid 😊
15/08/2021		What do you expect the outcome to be when this isn't widely known but promoted to all Camcycle members? Do you actually expect the outcome to represent the general public opinion? After the awful outcome of the decision to close one main road then close others there's no hope
14/08/2021		What about Waterbeach, our pavements are a wreck and you can even take major chunks home. Shame on you GCP get the infrastructure to a safe standard first. We had another paramedic call out due to a trip on our Third World paths. [name] we need your help !!!

13/08/2021		How about asking @grantsapps to bring back #Motorail wouldn't that be a great way to cut pollution/congestion and to extend the range of #ElectricVehicles ? #COP26 #ClimateCrisis
10/08/2021		Another consultation? When are you going to start building the safe cycle routes everyone always asks for in these never ending consultations?
15/08/2021		Just done my response to @GreaterCambs #CambCyclingPlus consultation (http://greatercambridge.org.uk/cycling-plus). Ugly that its just a vote for 3 best of 13 schemes poll. Pitting communities against each other to get cycle improvements.

15/08/2021		All thirteen cycle routes are needed, especially in the context of mode shift needed for tackling the climate crisis. But we're made to scrap over a budget that wouldn't build a mile of new motorway.
15/08/2021		Here are my thoughts on the two #CamcCyclingPlus schemes nearest me. For what little its worth as I'd assume central schemes will gather more votes. https://(contact)/2021/07/21/cycling-plus-for-histon-and-impington/
19/08/2021		<p>Hi,</p> <p>I do know that the cycle path on Butt lane is dangerous. It is so overgrown and to narrow to start with. I know of three people who have fallen off their bikes due to colliding with other cyclists as there is no room. I also know of someone taken off by overgrowing brambles which cannot be seen at night.</p> <p>In summary, a dangerous cycle path with no lighting, running alongside a national speed limit road.</p> <p>There is no point in investing millions in cycle paths that are a risk to those who use them</p> <p>This needs immediate attention.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>[name]</p>
















