

No	Questioner	Question	Response
7a	Lillian Rundblad, Chair of Histon Road Area Residents' Association (HRARA)	<p>An important principle for the Greater Cambridge Partnership has been to involve as many as possible of the local residents and councillors in the various transport projects. The LLF is a forum that gives the opportunity to review and discuss the officers' design work before presentation to the Joint Assembly. The meetings give the Assembly members the full picture before they form their recommendations to the Executive Board.</p> <p>The present Agenda Item 7, GCP Joint Assembly, for Histon Road Preliminary Concept has not been discussed at an LLF and the residents and councillors have not been given an opportunity to express their opinion. In the budget for 2017-2018 we have noticed that sufficient funds are available.</p> <p>We would like to remind the GCP of the November 22nd 2017 recommendation from the Executive Board to "Agree that officers should work up and model a revised concept design for Histon Road that aims to provide improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, to be brought back for board approval in March 2018".</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) As the Joint Assembly has not received any feedback on these concept designs from the Local Liaison Forum, because a meeting has not been scheduled until 5th March, how can the Assembly give them proper consideration and make recommendations to the Board? ii) Will the LLF be able to give feedback direct to the Board meeting on 21st March? iii) Will you agree to recommend that design presentations should always be given first to a LLF meeting so that the Assembly has the benefit of feedback from the local community and councillors before having to make its own recommendations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The chair of the Histon Road LLF agreed the date of the 5th March 2018 for the next meeting of the LLF with the project manager. <p>It was acknowledged at the time that this date would be after the Joint Assembly meeting, but well before the meeting of the Executive Board. However, it was felt that by holding the LLF at least one week or so after publication of the scheme layout would give members the chance to properly review it before discussing in more detail with the project manager. This follows feedback from other schemes where the LLF has been held too early after publication not giving people a chance to digest the information before the LLF.</p> <p>In terms of additional engagement, in early February the project manager also attended the Benson Area AGM to discuss parking issues and also provided information on the wider scheme and how the design was progressing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) In terms of direct feedback, the chair of the LLF is welcome to request to make a representation to the next Executive Board as a councillor. Plus public questions related to a relevant Executive Board agenda item can be directed straight to the Executive Board via the normal questions process as per standing orders. iii) It is important that the arrangement of LLFs should be agreed between the LLF chair and the project manager to reflect local circumstances.
7b	Lillian Rundblad, Chair of Histon Road Area Residents' Association (HRARA)	<p>Bus Lanes and Bus Stops (ref. 3.5, 3.6, 3.7)</p> <p>As Chair of the Histon Road Area Residents Association and Vice-Chair of the Local Liaison Forum, I appreciate that the officers have worked to avoid taking people's private gardens, according to the principle we set forward in Resolution 7. I hope that resolution continues to be upheld. Now in the new plans the bus lane is proposed to run from Blackhall Road south, until just past Carisbrooke Road. However, that creates a problem at Carisbrooke Road: it will be very difficult for residents to cross three lanes of Histon Road on foot or make right turns into or out of Carisbrooke Road while cycling. That is along a popular route to the Mayfield Primary School.</p> <p>I believe that there is a better option that should be considered, one that keeps the same length of bus lane but shifts the starting and ending point to the north. Suppose that the bus lane was shifted so that it ended around Hazelwood Close. This would allow space for a much safer junction at Carisbrooke Road. In addition, it may be possible to combine the proposed toucan crossing at Hazelwood Close with a bus gate, which might even give better bus priority than the current proposal.</p> <p>Please recommend to the Executive Board that this idea be analysed. It complies with the objectives, improves safety and is compatible with the officers' response to Resolution 7 that they would look into alternative measures to help enhance bus journey time and reliability. Thank You</p>	<p>The option to shift the start point of the bus lane further north was considered in detail, however there are significant drainage issues in the section between the proposed Darwin Green junction and Blackhall Road, and also significant level difference between the road and adjacent properties.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the preliminary concept, as presented, provides the optimal position of the bus lane, provides measureable journey time savings and visible priority for buses. The point where the bus lane ends and the interaction with Carisbrooke Road will be analysed further given the comments put forward.</p> <p>The option of bus gates is not currently supported by the County Council, however the design team will further review the option to improve priority for buses through the Gilbert Road junction which would complement the measures provided by the bus lane.</p>
7c	Lesley Ridgewell, Headline Haircutters, Histon Road, Cambridge (Question to be asked by Lillian Rundbald)	<p>Park and Display along Histon Road, Ref 3.13</p> <p>As I am the isolated business situated at 69 Histon Road, CB43JD, Headlines Haircutters, for 40 years, I ask if there is any more action that can be taken to change the mind of the Officers and Project Manager as regards to removal of the Pay & Display directly outside my Salon. It has been an endless fight for years to secure parking. Firstly, the street opted permit holder only without us being informed and I fought for 2 years to get the meter parking added to this area. Within a short time after this the new changes became public. I have attended many meetings and sent emails to the relevant people I've been told to put my case forward to. I felt hopeful that they would have accepted the suggestion of peak time restrictions on parking. I hoped they would see that this way Businesses stand a chance to remain open and a sense of community continued.</p>	<p>This question raises an important point. The preliminary concept does propose complete removal of parking spaces along Histon Road.</p> <p>Retaining parking outside of peak times on Histon Road may be further considered but does have an impact upon other road users and the capacity of the route.</p> <p>The current thinking is that there would also be peak time only loading restrictions in place, acknowledging that lengthy loading restrictions impact both residents and business.</p> <p>The option for Pay and Display parking in Linden Close will be investigated and further work needs to take place to ensure that</p>

		<p>Now, I have read through <i>Removal of on-street parking</i> and it seems they are pretty firm on business parking being very low down the priority list. I see they still mention a possibility of parking on Linden close. I have said to them in many of my emails that Dominos Pizzas will be sure to hog any spaces as they do now and actually park regularly outside my Salon as they are like a taxi rank waiting for work. When they have filled Linden close they will overflow to my address on Histon Road.</p> <p>I hereby propose that, if the present Park and Display by my Salon is removed, there will be made available improved and designated business parking for Headlines Haircutters nearby.</p>	<p>removal of the parking spaces on Histon Road is properly mitigated.</p> <p>The response to the consultation will be analysed and considered as part of the next steps.</p>
7d	Liz Hughes (Questions to be asked by Lilian Rundblad)	<p>1 Darwin Green cycle and pedestrian link - crossing required Has the development of the plans for the Histon Road fully considered the implications of the addition of a cycle and pedestrian route joining the Histon Road just North of the Carisbrooke Road junction, connecting to nearly 2000 homes on Darwin Green to the Histon Road?</p> <p>There is also outline planning provision for for 27 homes on the former squash court site, including detailed planning consent for how this joins the Histon Road (pdf attached).</p> <p>It is already hard to cross the Histon Road here with just two lanes of traffic, with the proposed inbound bus lane at this point a crossing would be required to enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross safely.</p> <p>2 Limited space - buses prioritised over cycle path? As the attached diagram shows there is limited space on the Histon Road route. Could the Committee consider if it is more important to prioritise a good cycle route, capable of taking trailers etc, above a stretch of bus lane that will end in a few metres?</p> <p>3 Cycles turning right Will there be some islands or provision for cyclists turning right from the Histon Road in bound to town and from the cycleway connecting with Darwin Green North of Carisbrooke Road? It is already difficult to cross the road here, and as a cyclist waiting to turn right here who has already needed to report harassment by a bus driver to Stagecoach, I feel that some provision should be made, especially as this is very likely to become a much more well used turning point for cyclists with the creation of a link to Darwin Green.</p>	<p>The option of a further crossing point in the close vicinity of Carisbrooke road junction was considered. However, given the close proximity to the existing crossing just to the south that would be retained, it was not considered necessary to include another crossing point.</p> <p>The scheme provides much improved infrastructure for cyclists both on stretches of highway and at junctions and aims to balance the requirements with improved public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There is very limited space to include islands along the route without impacting upon the general carriageway, public transport route or cycling and walking provision.</p>
7e	Philip Squires, Judith Perry and Anna Crutchley Committee members of Benson Area Residents Association (BenRa) (Questions to be read out by Lilian Rundblad)	<p>BenRA residents and businesses would appreciate detailed responses within the next consultation to the following concerns:</p> <p>Removal of Parking at the south end of Histon Road</p> <p>Off-peak parking Can the GCP confirm that they will consider retention of parking outside rush hour?</p> <p>If peak time only restrictions are not accepted, the following must be addressed: Businesses What will be the impact on small businesses on Histon Road?</p> <p>Will a detailed proposal for usage of alternative available parking spaces (e.g. Linden Close) be included in the final concept plan?</p> <p>Can the parking spaces in the lay-by outside Cranwell Court (used by customers of Midan) be preserved?</p> <p>Access for carers, disabled people and deliveries Could GCP provide explicit short-term exemptions to parking restrictions for disabled people outside their own houses?</p> <p>Could spaces for carers and disabled be reserved in North Street?</p> <p>Weekend parking BenRA and WSP parking survey results are broadly consistent, however, weekend parking was not addressed by WSP. The BenRA weekend survey identified a potential lack of space in streets closest to Histon Road. Can the GCP guarantee BenRA residents will have adequate parking and access to their own homes at weekends?</p>	<p>The points made about parking and weekend parking will be considered in detail and picked up through the consultation.</p> <p>Retaining parking outside of peak times on Histon Road may be further considered but does have an impact upon other road users and the capacity of the route. The preliminary concept recommends the relocation of parking as the optimal solution when balancing the conflicting demands upon the corridor.</p> <p>The current thinking is that there would also be peak time only loading restrictions in place, acknowledging that lengthy loading restrictions impact both residents and business.</p> <p>The option for parking in Linden Close will be investigated as will the Cranwell Court proposal.</p> <p>It is not considered that air quality and vibration will worsen following implementation of the scheme. Rather, improving facilities for walking, cycling and public transport should contribute to improving air quality.</p> <p>The mitigation ideas put forward regarding rat-running are out of the scope for this scheme and need to be further assessed by GCP</p>

		<p>Environment</p> <p>Can the GCP reassure residents that air quality and vibrations will not worsen as a result of changes on Histon Road? What specific measures are proposed to reduce noise and vibration?</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>An original major objective of the City Deal (Objective 6, to assess the impacts on existing residents) must now be addressed. Will the GCP now undertake to work cooperatively with BenRA, WIRE and ORRA to develop traffic calming measures within the Huntingdon – Histon Road triangle to deal with the expected increase in rat running through Canterbury/ Benson Streets and Oxford/Windsor Roads?</p>	
7f	Matthew Danish of Camcycle	<p>What has happened to walking priority? Resolution 8 of the Local Liaison Forum states that: 'At minor road junctions, cycle lanes and footways should be continuous and have priority.' For example the popular Copenhagen-style crossing design could be used. The officers' response supported the resolution and stated that they would seek as much priority as possible.</p> <p>But that doesn't seem to be the case when we look at the latest plans. Sixteen of the side road junction are designed with priority given to cars (see Appendix for the full list). Some junctions are raised, and some are dropped, but in both cases the priority markings favour motorists over pedestrians.</p> <p>Giving priority for people on foot at side road junctions would better meet the project objectives of bus and waling priority, while making the scheme friendlier for people walking along Histon Road.</p> <p>We request the Assembly to recommend to the Executive Board that they instruct the officers to design side road junctions so that the footway is continuous and has priority over turning traffic, as described by Resolution 8.</p> <p>On a separate topic, we would like to commend the officers for working to incorporate many other ideas from the Local Liaison Forum into this current concept. There is much progress, especially at major junctions. However, we have serious doubts about whether the proposed 1.5m cycle lane next to a 3m bus lane could be considered suitable for all ages and abilities. We would like the designers to keep these questions in mind when working: could children safely cycle here? And their grandparents as well?</p> <p>We recognise the difficulties that officers face and will simply note right now that we hope continue engagement throughout the consultation and final design process to try and find solutions.</p> <p>Thanks You.</p>	<p>Engagement with residents and stakeholders will continue throughout this process.</p> <p>The intention remains to provide pedestrian priority at side roads where visibility and other safety issues allow. Further assessment and design work therefore needs to be undertaken before the design is finalised.</p>
7g	Nicola Davies Anne Mullinger Brian Walker Mary Wheater of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE)	<p>1. Can the GCP please confirm that all currently permitted turns for all forms of transport will remain at the junction of Histon Road, Victoria Road and Huntingdon Road, commonly known as Murketts Corner, and that no new turning restrictions will be imposed?</p> <p>2. Would the GCP consider the potential time-saving in bus journey times offered by smart ticketing, compared with the 2.5 min saving predicted for peak time journeys as a result of the proposed bus lanes in Histon Road? Such a system would also save journey time on buses throughout the city, without any need for road modifications.</p> <p>3. Would the GCP please consider retaining the lay-by in front of Cranwell Court for short-term parking, with the cycleway running next to the footpath, allowing parking between the cycleway and the moving motor vehicles? This would reduce the impact of the proposed Histon Road parking restrictions on local businesses and carers for Histon Road residents and also improve safety for cyclists. The bus stop could be located elsewhere.</p> <p>4. We welcome the improved proposals for Histon Road and its main junctions. Would the GCP now consider, in conjunction with BENRA, WIRE and ORRA, another of the original major objectives of the City Deal, ie. objective 6: to assess the impacts on existing residents? This includes mitigation of the consequences for local residents of side streets. There is a particular concern about traffic inappropriately using Canterbury Street and also the Windsor Road/Oxford Road link.</p>	<p>No turning restrictions are proposed.</p> <p>Smart ticketing is beyond the remit of this project, but such an initiative would compliment the scheme and offer even greater benefits for public transport users.</p> <p>The Cranwell Court proposal will be considered. Whether or not there is another suitable location for the bus stop will be a key consideration here.</p> <p>The mitigation ideas put forward are slightly out of the scope for this scheme and need to be further assessed by GCP</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the section leading to the A14 junction and proposals to deliver improvement to the inbound cycle lane are included in the preliminary concept design.</p>

		5. Can the CPP please confirm that the scheme for Histon Road been extended beyond the junction with Kings Hedges Road to the junction with the A14?	
7h	Michael Page	<p>The details and text shown in the diagrams of Appendix A on the website are not actually readable – hence my question.</p> <p>I am generally in favour of the concept of floating (or by-pass) bus-stops so long as there is sufficient width and length of waiting area to enable pedestrians and wheelchair users to manoeuvre and queue in comfort and safety.</p> <p>Most importantly, vulnerable pedestrians and wheelchair users are reporting a need to have reassurance and confidence when crossing over the cycle lane to get access to and from the footpath.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can we have an assurance from officers that there will be zebra-crossing type markings across the cycle path, and perhaps signage, to clearly indicate that cyclists should give way to pedestrians when approaching these bus-stops? 2. Will Assembly members make a recommendation to that effect to the Executive Board? 	<p>Extensive work that has been undertaken by the County Council in developing the current floating bus stop design alongside disability groups, cycle campaign groups, and other stakeholders, including an independent study to demonstrate their effectiveness and safety.</p> <p>Where floating bus stops are proposed the designs aim to provide a minimum island width of 2.3m, and in most cases it has been possible to provide up to 2.5m, in order to allow adequate space for wheelchair users to manoeuvre.</p> <p>The current position is that zebra crossings are not included in the design of floating bus stops and that it is important to try to provide a consistent design across the City.</p>
8a	Mal Schofield, Resident of Newnham	<p><i>"West of Cambridge Package – Park & Ride 2.4. The proposals for a Park & Ride at Junction 11 support the Greater Cambridge Partnership's transport vision of delivering public transport improvements across the City and tackling traffic congestion. They also support delivery of the CAM Mass Rapid Transit system and the P&R proposals would, working in partnership with the Combined Authority, ultimately transition to form part of that network. This approach was recommended by the recent Strategic Options Appraisal undertaken by Steer Davies Gleave."</i></p> <p>However <i>"Beyond the city, local planning documents also identify seven radial corridors (or spokes) connecting Cambridge to new developments and the local villages within and adjacent to South Cambridgeshire. These corridors are</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge – Waterbeach and Ely (to the north); • Cambridge – Newmarket (to the east); • Cambridge – Haverhill (to the southeast); • Cambridge – Saffron Walden (to the south); • Cambridge – Royston (to the southwest); • Cambridge – Cambourne and St Neots (to the west); • Cambridge – Northstowe, St Ives, Huntingdon and Alconbury (to the northwest). <p>Source: Greater-Cambridge-Partnership-First-Last-Mile-Strategy-Report-2017. Steer Davies Gleave</p> <p>The deployment of P&R facilities appears to be a critical foundation piece in the formation of an attracting and resilient public transport network.</p> <p>An eighth corridor, Cambridge - Comberton has been added (Chris Tunstall) in recent report submissions.</p> <p>Question. Is the Assembly in its "Vision" preparing in the longer term time frame for a minimum of two P&R sites/travel hubs on each corridor?</p> <p>(In the case of the Cambridge to Royston corridor, P&R/travel hub facilities are being considered also at the proposed Foxton Rail interchange.)</p> <p>The southern guided busway is not, so far, a Trumpington P&R connection.</p> <p>Supplementary question; food for thought only.</p> <p>What city centre capacity will be needed, where and when, to accommodate the extended P&R bus services, prior to any decision in relation to alternative access such as tunnelling?</p>	<p>The assessment of Park & Ride and Travel Hub requirements will be based on transport modelling to predict where it is needed, within the context of the GCP and Combined Authority strategy and plans.</p> <p>The location of Park & Ride and other interchange sites will be best placed where traffic can be intercepted most effectively. A blanket approach such as two sites per corridor is not appropriate as in some cases demand may warrant multiple sites along a route, in others it may not.</p> <p>The expected growth in the Greater Cambridge area means that the number of buses serving the city is expected to increase significantly by 2031. The Combined Authority is currently undertaking a review of the countywide bus network, and within the context of that review the GCP will need to finalise proposals for the optimal routing of the network and of interchange facilities.</p>