

# FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

Greater Cambridge Partnership  
Mandela House  
4 Regent Street  
Cambridge CB2 1BY

By email to: [Consultations@greatercambridge.org.uk](mailto:Consultations@greatercambridge.org.uk)  
Attn: Unknown

17 July 2022

**Dear Sirs,**

## **FDPC Survey Response to “A New Roads classification for Cambridge”**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation. In Summary, we support the overall aims listed as bullet points on Page 2 but object to those elements of the current proposals that will have negative consequences for our residents. Some of our responses to the above consultation do not sit easily in your on line survey. We have however, tried to align some of our response with your questions to facilitate your evaluation.

There are three roads passing dwellings in our Parish all of which can be expected to suffer the impacts described on Page 3 of your brochure where you report “... roads could see an increase in the amount of traffic as local roads and streets are closed to through traffic.” This therefore runs contrary to the actions taken and responses to consultations made previously by FDPC which support measures on our village roads to reduce speeds, traffic volumes, use by HGVs and also separate or improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. Your plan to “...use traffic modelling to assess changes in traffic to consider what could be done to address any increases.” does not provide adequate safeguards or commitments to remove those increases. Note also that there are other developments in or adjacent to the parish which are in progress or in planning and are expected to increase traffic on village roads; we therefore object to your proposal to add in more traffic due to the proposed reclassification scheme.

It is noteworthy that the vast proportion of vehicle traffic on our three roads originates from the A14 on journeys into the City with returns later in the day, some others from within the city but with only a tiny proportion undertaken by our residents. The current proposals export the congestion problems in the City, caused by others, from the City onto our three roads. This is both unfair to our residents and disproportionate. The classification of Coldhams Lane and East Road as Area Access Roads with the restrictions described in Table 2 are particular proposals that would result in more congestion at the junction of Newmarket Road and Barnwell Road and in turn feed through as greater congestion on the B1047 and Newmarket Road to the east.

### **A) The B1047 (Ditton Lane/Horningsea Road).**

You propose this becomes a ‘Primary Distributor Road (PDR)’; the same category as the B1049 (Histon Road), the A1309 Milton Road and A1307 Huntingdon Road. However,

## FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

we consider Ditton Lane/Horningsea Road should be categorised differently from the other proposed PDR roads since it acts more as a link or feeder from the A14 and C310 in Cambridgeshire to the A303/A1134 Newmarket Road within the City. The B1047 currently has an 18-tonne weight limit in both its County and City sections. Speed-reduction measures have been introduced in Fen Ditton to minimise accidents under both LHI (SCDC and FDPC expenditure) and other budgets. These measures include the raised junction at Fen Ditton crossroads, central islands and other geometric measures on the carriageway north and south of the crossroads; signage and speed sensitive signs.

Any plans to increase traffic speed or capacity or weight limits will be objected to by the Parish Council; furthermore, there is little scope to increase capacity since this road passes through a narrow section in the village and in Abbey Ward as well as passing our primary school. We do not agree that this road should be in the same class as the other Primary Distribution Roads. We object to any change of classification that might lead to satnav users being shown this as an unrestricted or preferred route.

### **B) High Ditch Road.**

You make no proposals for this road. However, as with the B1047, weight limits, speed restrictions and previous measures are in place. Your plans for other roads in the city and Airport Way will tend to increase rat-running traffic on High Ditch Road and are therefore objected to by the Parish Council; furthermore there is little scope to increase capacity since it also passes through a narrow section in the village.

### **C) A1303/A1134 Newmarket Road.**

You propose this becomes a 'Primary Distributor Road (PDR)'; we agree that this road does act as a major route into Cambridge. Irrespective of whether the proposed road classification scheme is implemented, we believe the end of the 30mph section should be moved eastwards to the Park and Ride junction so that the housing development at Marleigh does not connect to a 40mph section.

### **D) Cyclists and Pedestrians.**

Any more detailed development of your proposals should recognise that the main cycle connections in use between the City and the Parish are off the main roads and further improvements and connections are expected under the Greenways schemes and through Marleigh. Where pedestrian footpaths run along roads such as the Ditton Lane or Church Street, there appears to be little scope for further development of separate alignments. The proposed classification would do next to nothing to increase active travel within the parish.

FDPC would welcome the introduction of enforceable 20 mph zones in our built up areas.

### **E) Public Transport.**

The proposal's 'Background and Context' repeat the proposition that lower traffic levels could support improvements to public transport and active travel. Such improvements are presented as if they would benefit our residents, however, even with a supportable

## FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

increase in bus services on the B1047, the predicted increases in traffic on this road and congestion at Barnwell would undermine the benefits and there is no scope to introduce bus lanes such as are in the various stages of planning or construction on the Newmarket Road, Milton Road and Histon Road.

Responses

Q1 – respondee’s details are given in this letter

Q2 CB5 8

Q3 Disagree. The description is too vague to be supportable as a general proposal. For example, the measures may be highly appropriate for “Neighbourhood Streets” such as Dudley Road but not for Area Access Streets if Coldhams Lane and East Road put into that class.

Q4

**Walking:** Strongly Disagree. The description is too vague to be supportable as a general proposal. For example there is no merit in attempting to provide walking access on the eastern side of the B1047 where it runs past the Cemetery.

**Cycling:** Disagree. The description is too general to be supportable. Pedestrians and cyclists often have to share a path with mutual discomfort and inconvenience. It does not follow that cyclists need to be banned from all paths where pedestrians are inconvenienced. Each path should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered.

**Bus:** Strongly Disagree. The proposal is too draconian. Bus routes through Neighbourhood Streets roads such as Dudley Road and Fison Road allow residents to catch a bus close to where they live and as well as allowing the buses to bypass complicated, congested junctions.

**Cars and Motorcycles:** Strongly Disagree. The proposal is too draconian. Reducing the use of other network street categories appears a legitimate aim but minimizing is only appropriate for Neighbourhood Streets. Furthermore “closest available distributor road junction” implies a rule to squeeze all such traffic onto a single junction; this does not stand up if one considers the example of journeys between the A10 and the Biomedical Campus. Each link should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered. It would be useful to consider if small motorbikes/scooters should always be lumped in with cars.

**Commercial Vehicles:** Neither Agree or Disagree. The proposal is a bit simplistic since it lumps HGVs/Coaches with light commercial vehicles.

**Emergency Vehicles:** Strongly Agree. Rapid access to a point of need is critical.

Q5 – included in text above

Q6

**PDR** – Strongly Disagree. The proposal is too draconian. There may be a role for weight limits on some roads, there may be a locations where excluding some users is useful eg pedestrians from Milton Road immediately south of the A14. Each road should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered.

**SDR** – Strongly Disagree. The proposal is too draconian. There may be a role for weight limits on some roads, there may be a locations where excluding some users is useful eg

## FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

south bound pedestrians and cyclists pedestrians from Airport Way. Each road should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered.

**AAS** – Strongly Disagree. The proposal is too general. The danger word is “suitable”; since there would be disagreement between the City planners, drivers and residents on the road in question or the road to which displaced traffic will go. Each road should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered.

**LAS** – Neither Agree or Disagree. The proposal is too general although the definition of the movement function appears reasonable. Each road should be considered case by case and a wider range of factors considered.

**CS** – Disagree. As a category the definition almost works but taxis need to be considered. Applying this category to Parkside, Regent Street and Park Terrace seems bizarre. Note also that in some cities, pick up and drop off by private cars is allowed which then have to leave the pedestrianized zone within a short period of time; an imaginative solution that allows visitors to use hotels etc in the zone.

**CS** – Strongly Disagree. See Q4 for role of buses.

Q7 See text above

Q8 FDPC concludes the changes to proposals within the City that are required to avoid foreseeable negative impacts on our roads are:

- B1047 to SDR with existing weight limits retained
- Coldhams Lane to SDR
- East Road to SDR
- Lensfield Road to SDR
- Hills Road to SDR
- Cherry Hinton Avenue to SDR
- Local Roads in Abbey, balance of CS and NS to be reconsidered

Q9 Strongly Disagree. The Road Classification scheme has too many areas where individual circumstances are important and as such is too simplistic to support the Making Connections decisions. Such decisions should be supported by detailed plans and not clouded by a generic classification system.

Q10 Disagree. Shuttle buses, taxis and deliveries will also need to access most of the roads shown on Plan 3. The primary point that buses will need to route away from Drummer St /St Andrews appears necessary.

Q11 Disagree. Shuttle buses, taxis and deliveries will also need to access most of the roads shown in on Plan 3. If people have to carry purchases or luggage too far they wont go there. The brochure indicates cyclists may need to be given alternative routes. However this lumps together cyclists passing through the City centre with cyclists wanting to access the city centre.

Q12 Disagree. The objection is that conflicts with pedestrians may be due to cyclists wanting to access the city centre not traverse it. There is also a timing issue for different users.

## FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

Q13 Neither Agree or Disagree. Note remarks above about people with bags or luggage

Q14 Strongly Disagree. Hackney Cabs should be considered on their merits case by case and not lumped in with private cars. The premise they are as polluting as cars may be incorrect since the licence conditions are different.

Q15 Neither Agree or Disagree. Pooling deliveries or double handling will increase costs. Licensing restricted to certain types of vehicles might reduce pollution but not numbers.

Q16 See above

Q17 All categories are Important

Q18 Excluding any of them would have adverse impacts on people in the community who need them

Q19 Education staff on short visits? Police? Vendor vans?

Q20 Neither improve nor worsen. The classification is unimportant compared to the actions taken on individual roads. User behaviour is important.

Q21 See 20 above

Q22 No comment but see also answers above

Q23-28 Does not apply to a response from a body such as FDPC

Q29 Other – raised by Councillors and by notification to the Clerk

Q30 Yes please. By email as given below.

We hope that the issues we raise will be taken into account and we would be happy to answer any queries you may have about our comments.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Charles Jones  
Pp Sarah Smart;  
Parish Clerk  
Fen Ditton Parish Council  
email: [clerk@fenditton-pc.org.uk](mailto:clerk@fenditton-pc.org.uk)

## FEN DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

C/C Councillor Anna Bradman CCC  
Councillor Claire Daunton CCC  
Councillor Graham Cone SCDC  
Councillor Carla Hofman SCDC  
Councillor John Williams SCDC