

18th July 2022

By email

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

**“A New Road Classification for Cambridge”
Great Shelford Parish Council (GSPC) – Response**

Question 1.

GSPC is an organisation representing those who live in the parish of Great Shelford.

Question 2.

The postcode for our residents begin with CB22 5.

Question 3.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the idea of motor vehicles being required to use main roads as much as possible to reduce through trips on local roads and streets by the use of point closures (modal filters)?

Agree

Question 4.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the initial ideas for the level of access for each of the types of road user and class of vehicle?

Agree

Question 5

Please tell us your reasons for your answers to question (3 and) 4

GSPC strongly agrees with the Ambition stated in “A New Road Classification for Cambridge” and recognises the forward thinking illustrated. However, the Greater Cambridge Partnership’s focus on ‘growing and sharing prosperity’, sometimes leads to a City-centric approach which benefits those in the City at the expense of established communities in the environs.

GSPC feels that the Ambition of this initiative must be held as a common objective for all who live close to Cambridge, contributing to its growth and prosperity – and that all should be able to classify their roads appropriately, “stopping local streets being used as rat-runs” and that they should “no longer be open to through-traffic, not requiring access to the immediate area.” GSPC would expect to be highly involved in the re-classification of all our roads and on ensuring that any reclassification of roads close to our

Mrs Libby White BEM FdA FSLCC, Clerk to the Council
PO Box 1492, Cambridge CB1 0YQ
T: 01223 616 622
E: clerk@greatshelfordparishcouncil.gov.uk



community created benefit for our parishioners rather than negative impact through traffic displacement and reduced access.

The enjoyment of our own neighbourhood, the reduction of particle emissions, the provision of effective public transport and of 'Voi' type alternatives, should be provided equitably to all those in Cambridgeshire. Detriment to one locality cannot be permitted for the improvement of another, and so the road classification scheme must be implemented more widely and with parity.

Question 6

How far do you agree or disagree that these road categories are the right ones?

- *Primary distributor – main road for all traffic to get to the city*
- *Secondary – support the primary...other roads that all traffic could use to get to and around the city*
- *Area Access Streets – roads that would link the main roads to C roads in the city*
- *Local Access Streets - roads that would link the main roads to smaller roads in the city*
- *Civic Streets – mainly small streets in the city centre. Access for vehicles would be restricted*
- *Neighbourhood streets – access for vehicles would be allowed but through movements would be restricted*

Agree

Question 7

Please tell us your reasons for these answers

GCP needs to explain more fully the rationale for its proposals and the distinctions between the road categories.

The distinction made between primary and secondary distributor roads is difficult to understand as is the application of these categories to specific roads. More detail is needed: e.g. Hills Road, Lensfield Road, Gonville Place, and East Road (A603): Why are these roads proposed as area access streets which “do not allow movements between distributor roads other than by public transport, cycling and walking” rather than secondary distributor roads?

There are only area and local access streets until the primary distributor roads off the A1134 are reached.

There appears to be significant risk of substantial traffic displacement to the south of the city centre as there are no secondary distributor roads proposed to the south of the city centre to support the primary distributor road network.

Question 8

Looking at Plan 2 on page 13, are there any changes or additions you would suggest to the way the categories are applied to the roads on the map?

Yes

There is an absence of Primary and Secondary Distributor Roads as arterial access routes into the city via a huge swathe from Newmarket Road round to Trumpington Road/Hauxton Road and the A1301 through Great Shelford. In particular, we strongly disagree that Hills Road should become a mere Area Access Street. This classification for Hills Road is likely to divert large amounts of traffic through Trumpington and Great Shelford and these roads are already gridlocked in the morning and afternoon rush hours. In particular, Trumpington Road has many schools and a hospital and diverting increased traffic flows past these important sites appears to be contrary to the objectives of this scheme.

At a minimum, Hills Road should be classified as a Secondary Distributor Road and ideally as a Primary Distributor Road. This will provide proper access to the industrial and entertainment areas at The Junction and Clifton Road Industrial Estate; further into Cambridge it will provide access to the railway station, which is surely essential.

Granhams Road (within the existing map area) should be classified as a 'Local Access Street' along with High Street, Woollards Lane, and Church Street, Great Shelford (currently not shown on the main map footprint but obviously anticipated as carrying the traffic burden to the mapped area). These roads already suffer from congestion and safety issues and it would appear that inadequate consideration has been given to the impact of reclassification measures ending so abruptly on the city perimeter.

A1301 Shelford Road – cannot become a 'Primary Distributor Road' as it is incapable of servicing the additional traffic which would result from the downgrading of Hills Road.

Addenbrooke's Access Road should become a 'Secondary Distributor' enabling the continuation of the M11 link straight through to Addenbrookes. We recognise this is contentious but the high volume of traffic using the minor roads from Harston through Little and Great Shelford as a cut-through from the A10 to Addenbrookes and the City centre, has to be addressed and this can only be through offering a viable alternative route.

A1307, Addenbrookes to Gogs – This A Road will become 'Primary Distributor Road'. How does classifying A1307 as primary distributor road fit with the CSET, get rid of commuter traffic concept? Main distributors are defined as being for 'all traffic and for the use of residents, commuters and visitors'.

Why is Queen Edith's Way to become an 'Area Access Street' with no through traffic to Cherry Hinton Road?

The rationale for classification needs to be consistent and fair, with consideration given to displacement impact, at least up to ten miles from the site of the reclassification.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Question 9

To what extent do you agree or disagree with implementing the road classification changes at the same time as the Making Connections proposals, which are subject to GCP Executive Board decision?

Strongly Disagree.

Implementation of the two initiatives should take place in stages and each phase evaluated and lessons learnt before moving to the next stage.

The Making Connections measures are sizeable and we need to ensure and evaluate whether they serve our community effectively. Implementing this proposal concurrently would not allow time for meaningful consultation and planning.

The outcome of these measures if applied without consideration of a wider geography, result in traffic displacement which does not seem to have been thought through. The proposal made in Making Connections for the Great Shelford area are yet to be proved as adequate and adding to this, the road

reclassification scheme would result in considerable displacement to roads already congested, polluted and unsafe.

It is essential that this classification takes place after improvements to the reliability of buses and implementation of NMU routes.

Question 10 - Bus Routes serving the city

The Making Connections proposals, if approved by the Executive Board later this year, would see a significant increase in the number of buses operating in the city, and it might not be appropriate for buses to use some of the roads in the city centre they run on at present. The St Andrew's Street, Drummer Street and Emmanuel Street area, which is where many of the existing bus services begin or end their routes, is already at capacity. Therefore, if buses are routed further out from this area, we would need to look at the options available for alternative bus interchanges as well as some form of zero-emission shuttle bus service that links up with places people want to access in the city centre.

To what extent do you agree / disagree?

Neither agree or disagree

We agree that the St Andrew's St / Drummer St / Emmanuel St area is currently saturated. We note that this is not helped by:

- the current operator's practice of leaving empty buses blocking stops
- long handovers between drivers, with an apparently cumbersome logging-in procedure for the incoming driver
- extended boarding times while non-regular passengers struggle to understand the fare system.

That said, the acceptability of the shuttle bus proposal will depend on the quality of the travel experience. If the shuttle buses are free, frequent, and easy to board (single-deck, multiple doors, step-free boarding), and if the interchange points are sheltered from the weather, well-lit, and comfortable then we would be inclined to support the proposal.

An example of where the concept is admirable but the execution poor, is Hills Road. The idea of segregated cycle lanes in each direction and one lane of motorised traffic in each direction is sound, even if the space allocated to cyclists seems in places out of proportion to that allocated to motor vehicles. But the reality of sitting on the top deck of a bus along Hills Road, with the vehicle swaying as the driver swerves around each central refuge, and shaking and clattering because the road surface of the single lane is so degraded, is a low-quality experience.

The current proposal is too vague and does not consider the impact of having to change from one bus to another, for longer or cross-city journeys; the convenience, cost and practicality all need much deeper consideration.

A shuttle bus service should be frequent and free of charge. User experience has to be high quality and enticing, making travel simple and pleasurable in order to encourage modal shift.

See ... [Getting Around — River City Company](#) as an example

"The Downtown Electric Shuttle is an easy way to get around Downtown Chattanooga and - it's a FREE! Electric shuttles run daily about every 5 minutes from the Chattanooga Choo Choo to the Tennessee Aquarium with stops every block in between. All shuttles are wheelchair accessible".*

Question 11 - Pedestrian and Cycling Priority

To what extent do you agree / disagree?

The initial ideas for a new road classification suggest giving priority to walking and cycling in more streets in the city centre. Moving bus and taxi routes further out would provide an opportunity to increase the area where access could be limited to pedestrians and cyclists only. Motor vehicle access would be restricted by time of day and limited to essential needs.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Neither agree or disagree

Without detailed proposals that take account of road-users' needs, practical measures to ensure considerate use of shared pedestrian/cyclist paths, and information relating to the time restrictions, it is impossible to respond.

We value Cambridge City centre and the heritage, tourism and amenity benefits. Great care needs to be taken not stop people from accessing the city centre, accidentally creating deterrents when attempting to improve transport provision.

Less footfall in city centre would have a detrimental economic impact and access must be pleasurable for all.

Question 12 - Through-cycle movements

Removing more traffic from central area streets will benefit both pedestrians and cyclists. There would also be an opportunity to create alternative routes for cyclists to avoid the busiest pedestrian areas where contact between both groups can sometimes cause delay and friction.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Agree

We support the suggestion that the GCP should "look at creating alternative routes to give cyclists the choice to avoid these streets". We do not understand the lack of progress made to date with regard to Greenways, and suggest that these be implemented urgently and used as a learning opportunity.

Question 13 – Equality of Access

Alternative ways around for disabled people If the area of pedestrian priority is extended, we will need to make sure that the longer walking distances are not a barrier for disabled people and/or those with mobility needs. This would be done by providing alternative ways to get around the city centre, such as enhanced shop mobility or exploring a form of zero emission shuttle bus service to link up the whole area. Restricting access to some streets to pedestrians, cyclists and other active travel modes could help to improve safety for everyone.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Agree

Please refer to our answer to question 10

Question 14 - Taxis

Taxis contribute to congestion and have an impact on air quality in the same way as other motor vehicles do. However, they are the only viable transport option for some people. Since the 1990s, taxis (hackney carriages and private hire cars) have been permitted to use all bus lanes and bus gates in the city, and they are exempt from some access restrictions in the city centre. Since that time the number of taxis has increased significantly, and this approach may not be appropriate in future. Under a new road classification,

taxi journeys could be treated in the same way as other car journeys. We also need to consider whether hackney carriages and private hire cars should be treated in the same way.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach both for hackney carriages and for private hire cars?

Neither agree nor disagree

This “approach” is not clear. We would want to consider and comment on a detailed proposal and understand how it would be enforced.

Questions 15 - City Centre Deliveries

Combining deliveries where possible for the final part of the trip and using lower emission vehicles or e-cargo bikes would help to reduce congestion and improve air quality in the city. Allowing easier and more frequent access for these vehicles would encourage businesses to combine their deliveries. Other delivery vehicles would still have access during permitted periods.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Neither Agree or Disagree

We do not see this as relevant to this consultation. The idea is admirable but extremely hard to implement. We suggest this is left to market forces to develop.

Question 16. Please tell us your reasons for your answers above in Key Considerations

Our reasons are shown below each question in the Key Considerations section and relate to

Questions 9 to 15, above.

Question 17

How important or unimportant do you consider exemptions for the following categories?

Categories: “Blue badge holders, based on levels of disability”; “Care workers”, Health workers”; “Public service vehicles, such as refuse collection vehicles”; and “Delivery vehicles making multiple drops”

Very important

Question 18.

Please tell us your reasons for your answers

Our response covers all categories but must be limited for care /health workers to when carrying out their professional duties.

Question 19

Are there other users who should be considered for exemption?

Yes, Registered carers

Questions 20

Road Safety Road safety is a key consideration for a new road classification. As part of the wider City Access project, a new classification could encourage a shift towards greater use of public transport and encourage active travel which would reduce overall traffic levels in the city.

To what extent do you think a new classification would improve or worsen safety, and help reduce road casualties?

Neither improve nor worsen

Question 21. Please tell us your reasons for the above answer

It is not possible to answer this based on the level of detail supplied. Plans need to be evidenced and wider impact assessed – what is the impact on the environs where traffic, pollution and risk will all be increased?

Question 22

Please comment if you feel any of the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s.

GSPC feels that the emphasis on improving city centre traffic impacts unfairly on those in neighbouring communities who contribute to the growth and economic development of the area, those with longer journeys, those with registered disability and those with lower-level physical or psychological needs.

Questions 23 – 28

Not applicable

Question 29

How did you hear about the consultation.

Local Newspaper

Question 30

Contact Details

The Clerk
Great Shelford Parish Council
PO Box 1492
Cambridge CB1 0YQ

Please add to the mailing list: Libby White - clerk@greatshelfordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Additional Responses

General statement

Great Shelford Parish Council (GSPC) welcomes consideration of road classification and agrees with many of the principles stated but has significant concern about the geography considered, the lack of appreciation of likely displacement and the inconsistent application of new classifications. Detail, testing, analysis and review will be critical to making this a success and the implementation cannot be rushed or rail-roaded.

Under current proposals, the scope for traffic displacement onto roads such as Lime Kiln Hill, which is, in parts, narrow and dangerous, is significant, as is the likelihood of increased traffic circumventing the city via Great Shelford from the M11. Cambridge Road, Granhams Road, Hinton Way and High Street/Church Street Great Shelford will all be subject to additional traffic, congestion and pollution and this is not an acceptable trade-off.

The review and reclassification should cover a larger geography, specifically including roads up to 10 miles from the current review perimeter, e.g. the A1301 through Great Shelford, Hinton Way, Granham's Road and the roads from Hauxton to Great Shelford and from Trumpington through Grantchester to the A603.

GSPC feels that the emphasis on improving city centre traffic impacts unfairly on those in neighbouring communities who contribute to the growth and economic development of the area, those with longer journeys, those with registered disability and those with lower-level physical or psychological needs.

The precise distinctions between the proposed categories need to be developed further and shared with the communities potentially affected.

This plan needs to benefit everyone in Greater Cambridge; residents, visitors, employees in order to be welcomed and not judged as a city-centric scheme with benefit largely for able-bodied residents living in the city centre.