



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: davidplank@hotmail.com

30 June 2022

“A New Road Classification for Cambridge”

Trumpington Residents' Association Response

Strong Support for the City Access programme

The Association's *strong support* for the Cambridge City Access programme has been expressed on many occasions since the first public consultation in 2016: most recently in our response to the “Making Connections” proposals when we echoed the Citizens' Assembly message two years previously, **“be brave, be bold and take action”** – and said **“The time for action is now”** - **“we urge the GCP to go up a gear and start motoring”**. (TRA Response to “Making Connections”, 12 December 2021).

The proposed new road classification is an essential ingredient in the City Access programme, and *noting that* the proposed road and street categories are “early thoughts” / “initial ideas”, the same *strong support* extends to it. [Consultation brochure, pages 10 & 14] In assessing the proposals, we have restrained our *impatience* with the fact that we are where we are rather than engaged in the programme's long overdue implementation. As the new draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan underlines, *we are at risk of going backwards* as peak road traffic in Cambridge has already reached pre-pandemic levels while public transport is nowhere near those levels and shows signs of deterioration with, for example, the latest bus timetable changes affecting Trumpington. We trust that by no later than Spring next year, public consultation other than on detail will be complete and implementation well under way. [draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, Evidence base, pages 21-27]

Consultation Questions - Responses:

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)?

Strongly 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?

Strongly agree

Question 5

Please tell us your reasons for your answers to questions 3 & 4

Our streets and roads are too dominated by motor vehicles which: create unnecessary congestion and undue delay; pollute our air with more than 100 early deaths in Greater Cambridge attributable to it every year plus much avoidable ill-health; incur significant risk of accidental death and injury; and impair the places in which we live so that our sense of place is eroded - with people's lives turned excessively inward to their own dwelling spaces away from the equally essential outward view which brings communities together through neighbourly contact. The harm caused is again underlined by the recently reported research on toxic particle pollution from motor vehicle tyres of which account is not taken currently and requires assessment as to whether it should.¹

The private motor car has its necessary place in our lives, as do commercial vehicles. But they have become overbearing in their demand on public space to the detriment of our sense of place – and to other modes of travel whose space is diminished by fears for personal safety and obstruction of pavements, cycle and bus lanes. Physical obstacles to the movement of motor vehicles such as modal filters are regrettably an essential part of the change that is necessary. It is to be hoped that when in place the new arrangements for travel in our city and beyond by controlling traffic speeds, will also encourage more temperate manners of driving given the frequent and growing infraction of essential speed limits on our roads by drivers / riders of cars and motorcycles, which is a source of great and justified complaint by our members.

¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/jun/03/car-tyres-produce-more-particle-pollution-than-exhausts-tests-show>

It is for these reasons that we strongly support the proposals for “Network accessibility by transport mode” set out in Table 1 on pages 8 & 9 of the consultation brochure, noting with satisfaction that, for example: school transport and community transport are bracketed with buses; private cars, taxis and motorcycles will be routed “to maximise the use of distributor roads (primary and secondary) and minimise... (their) use of other network street categories”; and the exemption proposed for goods “vehicles operating zero emission freight consolidation schemes” - we assume via approved routes only excluding those operating modal filters. There is a need to clarify the reference on page 9 to “restricted periods” when goods vehicles are to be allowed access to “streets subject to restricted access”.

We also *strongly support* the proposals that: on primary and secondary distributor roads there should be “priority for pedestrians and cyclists at side road junctions”, and “generally a 30mph speed limit or 20mph where the road layout warrants it” with our proviso that *20 mph limits should become the norm not the exception in urban areas*; area access streets will “not allow movements between distributor roads other than by public transport, cycling and walking”, “generally have a 20mph speed limit, with “General car parking limited to short stay”, and “Keep on-street parking to a minimum”; local access streets will also “keep on-street parking to a minimum”; and civic streets will limit motor vehicle access to “residents, those with limited mobility and for deliveries/servicing”, *though we have strong reservations* about buses “not normally (being) allowed” which is appropriate for some civic streets but not others – please refer to our answers to questions 10 & 11. We are pleased to note on page 12 that “the parking aspects of the road classification will be aligned with this (integrated parking) strategy which is being prepared” – *this is essential*.

We are sure there will be many objections to these and other City Access proposals but it is important that our collective eye is kept on the achievement of the substantial gains for all briefly stated on page 3 of the consultation brochure which would be at great risk were the current undesirable situation not to be addressed in the determined manner *we ask* the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and its constituent bodies to adopt.

Questions 6 & 7

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

Please tell us your reasons for your answers to the question above:

Agree.

Please refer to the answers to questions 4 & 5 above for the reasons for our answer to this question. In addition, we think the classification has sufficient categories to adequately reflect the realities of Cambridge as a whole and its different areas and communities.

The *reason why we say agree rather than strongly agree* concerns the secondary distributor road category and its relationship with the categories above and below it in the proposed

classification. The distinction made between primary and secondary distributor roads is difficult to discern as to substance and rationale, as are the reasons for some of the proposed applications of the secondary distributor road and area access roads categories. Taking practical examples to illustrate the point, why are Hills Road, Lensfield Road, Gonville Place and East Road categorized as area access roads rather than secondary distributor roads while the eastern part of Cherry Hinton Road and High Street Cherry Hinton are proposed to be secondary distributor roads? Why is there no secondary distributor road proposed to the south of the city centre to support the primary distributor road network so that there are only area and local access streets until the primary distributor roads of the A1134 are reached, with the risk of substantial displacement this may entail? What are the essential distinctions being made here? To assist understanding it will be helpful if the GCP explains more fully the rationale for its proposals so that the essential distinctions between these road categories are clearer.

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

Our comments and queries on the proposed application of the classification are as follows:

- *Cambridge Biomedical Campus: Francis Crick Avenue, Robinson Way and Dame Mary Archer Way should be classified as local not area access roads* in support of the Traffic Regulation Order on Addenbrooke's Access Road which prohibits use of the Campus's private road network by through traffic. Unpermitted through traffic on these roads is a major problem due to inadequate enforcement of the TRO by the Campus about which we continue to make vigorous representations. Categorizing these roads as area access roads would be harmful to the planned development of the Campus and to the Campus's neighbours. These roads should not be seen as providing "access to large areas of the city" but as local access roads allowing access to a smaller area, viz. the Biomedical Campus alone.

- *Hills Road, Lensfield Road, Gonville Place, and East Road (A 603):* 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 supporting the primary distributor roads of Fen Causeway, Trumpington Road, Newmarket Road and Elizabeth Way? *This is not clear.* We can think of a possible rationale for the proposal in terms of the unsuitability of this part of the A603 for the role it currently plays, but this would be conjecture. At the same time, *is there not a risk of significant displacement* of traffic on to the A1134? This is not addressed. The case for the proposal together with its

implications and possible mitigation *need to be made explicit* so that it can be assessed and the opportunity for feedback afforded to the public.

- *Cambridge Station and CB1*: It seems *inappropriate* for the Station and the major development area/ employment centre around it to be served solely by neighbourhood roads which, by definition, restrict through movement – relying solely on the proposed Hills Road area access street. Should not Station Road, part of Tenison Road, Great Northern Road & Station Square be categorized as local access streets?

- *Pembroke Street & Downing Street*: Surely, these ancient streets should be categorized as civic streets on which priority would be given to walking, cycling *and buses*, not local access streets available for private car use. We realize this would create a significant issue for the Grand Arcade car park – but the nettle of this ill-placed car park needs to be grasped sooner rather than later with the vast majority of shoppers being required to use the Park & Ride or other bus services to access Grand Arcade and other parts of the city centre as part of the Making Connections extended bus network. This would fit well with the GCP’s belated intention to reduce significantly the number of car parking spaces in the city centre. [Report to the GCP Joint Assembly 9 June 2022, “Parking Strategy and Residents’ Parking Scheme Delivery”] The Association has long argued that the number of parking spaces in the city centre needs to be reduced significantly to help reduce private car use on the city centre’s ancient roads and elsewhere; most recently in our response to the Making Connections consultation, 12 December 2021, page 7.

- *Civic streets ban on buses*: We do not support the proposed blanket ban on buses on all civic streets and the associated unspecific and probably impractical intention to relocate the bus interchanges from Emmanuel Street, St Andrew Street and Drummer Street, and the undesirable proposal to exclude buses from Regent Street and part of Downing Street. These proposals if implemented without amendment would be a *significant disincentive to use of buses*. Please refer to our detailed answers to questions 10 & 11.

- *Queen’s Road, A1134*: If this is the GCP’s intention, we do not agree with the proposal that buses should not be allowed to use this road as appears to be proposed in Plan 3 - because this would significantly impair the cross-city bus service - and be inconsistent with the Making Connections proposed extended bus network and its proposed classification as a primary distributor road in Plan 2. For example, how would Trumpington residents get a bus to Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road,

Castle Street or Huntingdon Road? *If this is the intention, the proposal needs to be changed.*

- *Major employment centres:* The consultation brochure does not make explicit the GCP's intentions concerning access to the six major employment centres in Cambridge and the associated emergence of Cambridge "as the heart of a rapidly growing polycentric city region", as highlighted in the draft Local Transport & Connectivity Plan. Two of these are mentioned in the comments above. These sites "account for 63% of all jobs within the Cambridge urban area, and 40% of all jobs within Greater Cambridge." The draft Plan emphasizes the need for "continued investment in the region's transport network to provide the capacity, connectivity and accessibility (they) require." [draft LT&C Plan, Pages 67&68] Given their significance and the extent of their travel needs, *we suggest* that the contribution of the new road network classification to their needs in the context of the other parts of the City Access programme is made explicit.
- *Trumpington High Street:* It could be seen as ironic that Trumpington High Street is to be classified as a primary distributor road with all that goes with it in terms of traffic volume, air / noise pollution and urban hustle in a hugger mugger "village" setting while Hills Road with its large, well set back houses is proposed as an area access street which would "not allow movements between distributor roads other than by public transport, cycling and walking". Comparisons are to an extent of course invidious but the point we are making is not to argue against our High Street's proposed classification but *to underline the need for extra measures* to improve the environment of areas unfortunate enough to be afflicted by a primary distributor road in our midst – including *the particular concentration proposed in Trumpington* – Hauxton Road, Addenbrooke's Road, Shelford Road, Trumpington High Street, Long Road and Trumpington Road. *We ask* that such extra measures are included as part of the City Access programme.

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 agree

This is *essential*. They are integral parts of the City Access programme. The Making Connections measures make the new road classification possible by reducing the volume of

traffic on the city's roads, particularly by introducing road charging and a workplace parking levy, reducing the number of car parking spaces in the city centre, and making major improvements to the bus network. On its own the new road classification would be difficult to achieve – let alone achieve effectively – because changes in classification alone do not reduce traffic. The new road classification *adds to and significantly enhances* the Making Connections package of measures. Together they are more than the sum of their parts.

We also agree with the GCP that introducing them at the same time “would mean more opportunities to reallocate space on the roads for walking, cycling and public transport...” [Consultation brochure, page 14] It is essential that this reallocation takes place to make the changes as effective as possible in improving the reliability of buses and making roads safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists to use. In this regard we are not clear what the GCP means at the end of the same sentence by “or other active travel.” If this refers to *e-scooters* we have *strong reservations* arising in part from their use and misuse during the government's “trial period”. E-scooters should have no place on pavements and stronger measures should be taken to stop their use in this way. It is also highly questionable whether they should be allowed to use cycle paths / shared use paths given the considerable difference in relative speeds, with e-scooter users, particularly but not only those on currently unlawful scooters with even higher speeds, causing alarm and distress to both pedestrians and cyclists.

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.

Please see **Background and Context on page 4** of the brochure (Making Connections), **City Centre Bus routes on page 14** of the brochure and **Plan 3: Bus routes and Pedestrian / Cycling Priority on page 15** of the brochure.

10

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

Neither agree nor disagree

We give this answer rather than “Agree” for three important reasons.

The first is that the bus routes proposed in Plan 3 would mean significant walking distances from bus stops to the city centre, particularly but not only for Trumpington Park & Ride users. This would be a disincentive to use of the Park & Ride for some current and future users who would otherwise have used the current stop in Downing Street outside John Lewis. We do not accept the objection to use of part of Downing Street by buses and want other approaches to be tested first in addition to the welcome proposals for “some form of zero-emission shuttle bus service that links up with places people want to access in the city centre” and “enhanced shop mobility”. [Page 14 of the consultation brochure] To be effective, the proposed shuttle bus service should be frequent and free of charge.

Pembroke and Downing Streets should become cyclist, pedestrian and bus only streets, thus excluding their inappropriate use by the private car arising from the ill-located Grand Arcade car park? Combined with restriction of deliveries to limited hours and strict enforcement of the parking restrictions against their abuse by some commercial vehicles, this could much improve the present environment of these ancient streets. It would be more in the spirit of the City Access programme to opt for public transport over the private motor car whereas the reverse is currently proposed by the GCP for these streets, which is unsatisfactory. Our proposal is in addition to improved bus stop facilities being provided near the junction of Trumpington Street and Pembroke Street.

*The second reason concerns the unclear/unsatisfactory proposals for bus interchanges. As long as they are additional to current capacity, we support the “need to look at options for alternative bus interchanges” given the stated lack of capacity in the St Andrew’s Street, Drummer Street and Emmanuel Street area to take additional bus services. [Page 14] **But** unless truly reasonable alternatives are to be made available, we do not want the existing capacity in these streets to be reduced given their convenient location for bus and guided bus users and the incentive to their use this offers. This is a critical issue given the city centre’s centrality to the “Making Connections” “City Bus Network Proposals”, with ALL of the bus corridors linking with the city centre. The existing city centre bus interchange capacity is essential to these proposals, and there seems little feasible prospect of replacing it satisfactorily. [Making Connections consultation document, 18th to 25th pages] It seems at the least doubtful that reasonable alternatives can be found: where would these be? Unless or until truly reasonable alternatives can be found, the Association believes that the current bus interchange capacity in the city centre must be retained – together with a commitment to speed up the vital change to use of emission free buses facilitated by an increased public funding programme. [Draft Local Transport & Connectivity Plan, Climate Change, page 40] To achieve this, it is necessary to allow the use by buses of the proposed Civic streets of Drummer Street, Emmanuel Street, St Andrew Street, part of Downing Street and Regent Street.*

The third reason relates to cross city bus journeys, which some residents have to make for work and/or other purposes. At present, they are able to change buses in the city centre to complete their journeys. The proposals as they stand do not cater well for these journeys. For example, how would Trumpington residents get a bus to Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road, Castle Street or Huntingdon Road – without city centre bus interchange facilities and when, for no stated reason, Queen’s Road is not proposed as a potential bus route?

In short, the measures to be taken need to be much more bus user friendly than these proposals are. The arrangements for bus user access to the city centre and across the city need to be significantly improved if the essential shift of mode to the bus is to be achieved. Please also refer to our answer to question 11 which is relevant to this conclusion.

Question 11 - Pedestrian and Cycling Priority

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.

Please see **Pedestrian and Cycling Priority on page 14** of the brochure and **Plan 3: Bus routes and Pedestrian / Cycling Priority on page 15** of the brochure.

Please also see the Cambridge City Council’s **Making Space for People vision** document in the Documents section of the consultation website.

11

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

Agree – but with strong reservations

We strongly support the proposals for Civic streets giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists and for their not being available to private car users. However, unless amended to allow buses to use some Civic streets their application as proposed by the GCP would be a significant disincentive to use of buses, increased use of which is a key objective of the City Access Programme. Please refer also to our answer to question 10 above.

*Also, we do not agree with the proposal that **Pembroke and Downing Streets** up to Grand Arcade Car Park should not be Civic streets and should continue to be used by private cars. These streets are an integral part of the city centre’s ancient street network and *should be**

classified as Civic streets for use by pedestrians, cyclists and buses, with such parking spaces as are absolutely essential for Grand Arcade users being located elsewhere.

With amendment to ensure necessary incentive for bus use, we agree that the GCP's approach would greatly benefit both pedestrians and cyclists, *and add* that it would significantly improve the present environment and sense of place of these historic streets, *as long as* the proposed motor vehicle access is "restricted by time of day *and* limited to *essential* needs." (Our emphasis)

It is important to make the general point that *cyclists should be discouraged from cycling on pavements which are not shared use paths* but reserved for the use of pedestrians. It is a *matter of concern to our members* that a significant number of cyclists do not appear to understand that pavements are not for their use unless designated as shared use paths; and that their illegitimate use causes concern and on occasion alarm to pedestrians, particularly but not only to members of the public with sensory disabilities whose safety is put at risk. Public education and enhanced enforcement are necessary to achieve this.

In addition, *we wish to underline* to transport planners the need to ensure that when creating shared use paths, sufficient space should be provided for use by pedestrians and that if additional space is required for shared use in line with national standards, *it should be taken from road space not from space currently devoted to pedestrians* including protective barriers and verges. This was not the case in the GCP's "Cycling Plus" proposals as they affected Trumpington to which we objected, stating that "The focus on cycling alone is deficient. It is important that walking is treated as an active travel partner not a residual." [TRA Consultation Response to "Cycling Plus: Investing in Greater Cambridge's Active Travel Network", 15 August 2021, Page 2]

As far as actual use by pedestrians and cyclists of shared use paths is concerned, *we repeat our repeated request* for a code of good practice to encourage their mutually considerate use:

"Also, in a previous response the Association raised the need for some kind of code for use of the Path – as follows:

"The **shared use path** to be provided alongside the dedicated busway is an important part of the proposed public transport route. In the Association's response to the recent consultation on the Melbourn Greenway, we noted:

"There is at present a level of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians which should not be exaggerated but does exist. 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.” (TRA letter to the GCP dated 1st August 2019).

This applies equally to the shared use path element of the CSET Scheme, and is drawn to your attention accordingly.”

Is it the GCP’s intention to pursue this proposal? We think there is a need for the reasons given, with the addition of its benefit to equality of use by people with disabilities, including sensory disabilities, who we know from member feedback are nervous of using shared paths due to cyclist speeds and lack of awareness.”

[TRA responses to: Melbourn Greenway consultation, 1 August 2019, page 3; and to two Cambridge South East Transport consultations, 31 October 2019, page 2, and 4 December 2020, page 7]

We have yet to receive an answer and ask that our repeated suggestion is given active consideration.

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.

12

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

Agree

We agree that “in some streets at busy times the interaction between walking and cycling can cause delay and friction”, and for this reason support the suggestion that the GCP should “look at creating alternative routes to give cyclists the choice to avoid these streets”. If achieved, this would benefit pedestrians as well as cyclists. *Additionally*, in appropriate instances, consideration should also be given to *pedestrian only streets*.

Please refer also to our answers to questions 10 on bus routes and 11 on pedestrian and cycling priority which are relevant here.

Question 13 - 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.

13

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

Strongly agree

Please refer to our answer to question 10 above in which we “welcome proposals for “some form of zero-emission shuttle bus service that links up with places people want to access in the city centre” *on the understanding that* the service would be frequent and free of charge – and “enhanced shop mobility”. [Page 14 of the consultation brochure]”

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. Please see **Taxis on page 16** of the brochure.

14

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 is because “this approach” is not clear. What is actually being proposed?

In the context of what the City Access programme aims to achieve it would be logical to treat taxis in the same way as private cars – *with exemptions only for taxi journeys where exempted persons would otherwise be unable to get to where they need to go*. This would be difficult to enforce and is open to abuse. If regulation was to be used as a means of enforcement, we assume it could only be applied to licensed hackney carriages – therefore, other taxis could not be exempted. *Is this what is being proposed?*

We would agree that taxis – whether licensed hackney carriages or private hire cars - should *not be allowed to use bus lanes* as they are not a form of public transport – if this is what is being proposed. *Bus gates are a different matter* as their use by taxis would be necessary to enable some exempted persons to get to where they want to go who would otherwise be unable to do so.

The total number of taxis may be a distinct if related matter requiring a different approach. This is not clear in the consultation document. If there has been a significant increase in taxi journeys as stated, this is clearly undesirable as it aggravates the problems the City Access programme aims to overcome – while bearing in mind that many taxi drivers are in insecure employment on relatively low incomes, perhaps particularly so in the instance of private hire car drivers.

The *location of taxi ranks* seems to be a relevant issue which is not mentioned in the consultation brochure. Clearly, it is convenient for potential passengers to have ranks close to the city centre. However, this attracts taxis to the centre which is counterintuitive given the need to reduce pollution and improve the environment in other ways. It is not clear whether the GCP has considered this point. If not, *we suggest* that it should.

Questions 15 & 16 - City Centre Deliveries

Combining deliveries where possible for the final part of the trip and using low-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.

Please read **City Centre deliveries on page 16** of the brochure.

15

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

16

Please tell us your reasons for your answers above in Key Considerations

Strongly agree

As the consultation brochure points out, city centre “deliveries to businesses would need to be made in a different way”. Clearly, *these deliveries are necessary and provision should be made for them*. However, unlimited access by goods vehicles would undermine the objectives of the City Access programme. Therefore, we support the form of “final part” access envisaged by the GCP, which would also contribute to the necessary reduction of air and noise pollution. *We also support* the examination of this and other options such as deliveries by commercial vehicles outside “restricted periods”, with businesses and residents to inform a decision on how best to proceed. As we say, these deliveries are necessary and it is important that relevant decisions are well informed and take account of the views of those affected.

Questions 17 & 18

17

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

18

Please tell us your reasons for your answers above

Note: The question specifies: “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 for all categories

This is *on the understanding* that exemptions for care workers and health workers are for journeys when they are carrying out their care and health roles.

In addition, there should be exemption for journeys by relatives and others to provide support to residents who have significant personal care needs.

Question 19 Are there other users who should be considered for exemption? (Please specify)

Answer: Not that we can think of.

Questions 20 & 21 - 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.

20

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

21

Please tell us your reasons for the above answer

Answer: Notwithstanding the brevity of the passage on page 16 of the consultation brochure, *this is a very important benefit* of the new road classification proposals and of the City Access programme more generally. Given the appalling toll of deaths and serious injuries on our roads, this initiative should be seen as an important contribution to the Road Safety Partnership's "Vision Zero" strategy which is working towards there being "no deaths or serious injuries on the Partnership's roads... by 2040." [Draft Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, page 14] Despite the initiatives to improve road safety, as the draft Plan points out, "The trend in those Killed or Seriously Injured is relatively flat." Anyone who reads the Cambridgeshire local news regularly will have been struck by the high incidence of reported accidents involving deaths and serious injuries. *We suggest* that this aspect of the new road classification and of the City Access programme is accorded *a very high priority*.

Equalities

We have a duty to ensure that our work promotes equality and does not discriminate or disproportionately affect or impact people or groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, such as younger or older people, or disabled people.

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.

Answer: The proposed exemptions if managed carefully should address any unduly adverse effects relating to this important statutory duty. The proposals as a whole should have a positive effect.

Prepared by David Plank
For the Trumpington Residents' Association
28 June 2022