



Horningsea Greenway project:-

You said: We did

Summary of actions we have taken from the Public Engagement



Introduction

Following the public engagement exercise on the Horningsea Greenway proposals held in Autumn 2022; all of the data submitted has now been analysed and compiled into a report outlining the overarching themes that emerged.

The full report of which the below information was based upon can be found on our website under the documents section (<https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/sustainable-transport-programme/active-travel-projects/greater-cambridge-greenways/horningsea-greenway>)

The feedback we received, forms an integral part of the next phase of this project. Where we have been able to, we have incorporated comments and suggestions into the next round of design.

The following information outlines what you said you wanted to improve or disagreed with, and how we plan to act upon this. It outlines where we have acted on your suggestions and made changes to the design of the Greenway or where we have not made changes and the reasons for this.

The table below is broken down into sections 1 – 4 representing the 4 sections of the scheme as outlined in the main report.

YOU SAID	WE DID
SECTION 1 Clayhithe Road to High Street	
You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at Clayhithe Road Road to High Street. Some respondents were pleased with the proposed 20mph speed Limit, while others were happy with the buildouts and there wer those in favour of the proposal as it priorities cyclist.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail below. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.
You expressed concerns for safety in our Road Marking proposals at Clayhithe Road to High Street, some respondent's concerns were about the use of on-carriageway cycle lanes and centrelines.	We propose a Quiet Road treatment in some locations, where cyclists will use the road. This typically includes reducing speed limits to 20mph and using road markings to highlight the presence of cyclists to the drivers. Enhancements will be explored during detailed design to ensure that all users understand the layout of the road.
You indicated your concerns of existing red surfacing having a negative impact on cyclist.	We have noted this comment and will reassess the use of red surfacing in the next stage of design.
You suggested that the 20mph speed limit should be extended further North past Dock Lane.	We will look at the exact location of the 20mph zone at detailed design stage.
You commented that speed reduction measures were unnecessary or would have a negative impact. It was also suggested to include speedbumps, and another respondent commented on adding additional signage or change the curvature,	We are already considering traffic calming in this phase of the design.

visibility, and road furniture to slow traffic down.	
You suggested traffic calming measures, with some respondents believing high traffic volumes justify implementing additional measures along this route because of the traffic impacts from Waterbeach.	The current proposal includes significant traffic calming that would increase the safety of cyclists and pedestrians.
You commented on the use of modal filters along Clayhithe Road.	A modal filter is not seen as appropriate in this location due to the current levels of traffic.
You questioned why there wasn't a proposed crossing at Horningsea but is proposed at Fen Ditton.	We have looked at both villages and cyclists are encouraged to take primary position on the road. A crossing was not deemed necessary at Horningsea.
You commented that you disagreed with the buildouts and that it could ruin traffic flow through the village which would have an impact on safety, while other respondents comments agreed with the buildouts and had no concerns regarding safety.	We will be looking at the design of the buildouts at the next stage of design, but no major changes are proposed.
You suggested route changes by extending the route to the north and cover the entire village. You also suggested that we extend the Horningsea route to include the path to Quy Fen and Ely. You also asked us to consider improvements to existing infrastructure at Clayhithe Road and the cycle bridge at Baits Bite Lock.	We looked at alternative routes and they were discounted. The route was agreed by the GCP Executive Board in 2020. We will consider your suggestions of extending the greenways if there is another phase of Greenways.

SECTION 2 – Horningsea Road (Horningsea to Fen Ditton)

You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at Horningsea Road, with your comments in favour of the scheme and expressing that you welcomed the changes in supporting the 40mph speed limit, while other respondents supported the widening of the cycle path, with one suggestion that it should be widened further.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.
You suggested further user separation along Horningsea Road and highlighted potential needs for equestrian users. You suggested a grass verge or non-paved buffer between carriageway and cycleway.	We are being guided by current Standards (LTN1/20). The design has been developed to balance the requirements of relevant design guidance for sustainable transport routes such as the Greenways, as well as to consider the existing physical constraints of the route.
You suggested further separation along sections of Horningsea Road to stop parking on the path to drop off/pick up primary school children.	We will be addressing parking issues by carrying out a parking survey which will be carried out and reviewed at the next stage of design.
You Suggested the implementation of GreenWave technology that automatically detects approaching pedestrians and cyclists should be installed on the traffic signals on the A14 slip Road.	We will be considering the appropriate technology to detect cyclists at detailed design stage.
You suggested alternative routes, extending or new routes. You thought the route should be extended to	We explored alternative routes in earlier phases on the Greenways. We are being guided by the current standards LTN1/20, the constraints of Horningsea Road and the level

<p>include links at Snout Corner and Byway 85/5 Fen Ditton. You also suggested a route to the Waterbeach Greenway through Bates Bite Lock. You said we should be considering alternative routes as Horningsea Road fails to meet LTN1/20 design standards.</p>	<p>of use. The LTN 1/20 and scope requires minimum width of 3.0m where available in the interest of the cyclist safety.</p>
<p>You raised your concerns regarding equestrian users on Horningsea Road, with safety concerns associated with a shared use path. Other concerns were that a Pegasus crossing could be an issue as they would not like being boxed in at B1047, High Street and Ditton Lane junction with cars passing in front and pedestrians/cyclist crossing behind. Other respondents expressed concerns for the lack of equestrian users along this section to justify spending on equestrian features.</p>	<p>We have considered equestrians in the design and the greenways schemes will include equestrian travel where possible. We will be including the triple mode signage for pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian usage in the Preliminary designs; however, this will be subject to the Road Safety Audit process and findings.</p>
<p>SECTION 3 – High Street Fen Ditton</p>	
<p>You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users along High Street Fen Ditton. You commented that you felt the proposals will provide benefits for all road users, with some respondents in favour of reducing the speed limit and supporting the quiet road approach.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p>
<p>You are opposed the use of red surface tarmac along High Street as it is believed not suitable in a rural village within a conservation area. It was noted that the colour of the tarmac is unlikely to change behaviours for Cyclist and drivers. Other respondents emphasised the importance of resurfacing the existing surfaces where potholes and repairs are needed.</p>	<p>We will reassess the use of red surfacing in the next stage of design. If it does not impact unduly on design proposals (safety requirements etc), it will be removed.</p>
<p>You said that the Current proposal does not encourage cyclists to stay on the correct alignment and pass immediately west of the War Memorial and that the turning area at church should be retained.</p>	<p>Our proposal realigns the cycle path, and we will retain the existing area outside the church to allow the turning space for large vehicles going into the farm down in Wadloes Path, as well as for vehicles entering the church.</p>
<p>You expressed your concerns with parking in High Street. With several respondents suggested the removal of parking down one side of the street, while others would like to see the removal of all parking or rationalisation of parking into marked parking bays.</p>	<p>We will identify the most appropriate measure to formalise parking areas in the next stage of design.</p>
<p>You commented on Wayfinding signage with some respondents saying there should be clear signage at junctions.</p>	<p>We have a Greenways Wayfinding strategy is in place for continuity throughout the schemes the specific detail will be considered at the next design stage.</p>

<p>You suggested give way road markings at junctions only, but it was also suggested that cyclists will be unable to see give way road markings.</p>	<p>We will address all road markings during the next design stage.</p>
<p>You commented that the cycle lane in the centre is only recommended for one way motorised traffic (based on Dutch Guidance).</p>	<p>Our design doesn't propose the cycle lane in the centre of the road. The design is to encourage cyclists to take the primary position in the centre of the road as in the UK Highway Code Cyclists should use the centre of the lane only in specific circumstances (e.g. approaching junctions or on narrow sections of roads, where an overtaking car would pose a danger to them).</p>
<p>You suggested that there is too much emphasis on cyclist and people should be the priority, as children use this route to school. It was suggested that the proposal was unnecessary as the route does not have high footfall or cyclists. It was suggested that the priority route should be from the shared path to the High Street.</p>	<p>There is minimal traffic going east-west. The changes in the priority will require additional signage and road changes which are not possible in this area.</p>
<p>You offered suggestions to the proposed crossing on High Street, with some respondents saying they were satisfied with the proposed parallel crossing and with some preferring the existing junction as the raised table is effective at slowing traffic into High Street. Some respondents suggested that Traffic Lights to be included at High Street Fen Ditton junction while others thought Traffic Lights were not needed. Some respondents preferred a zebra crossing, and others highlighted safety concerns of a Pegasus crossing for horses and children.</p>	<p>Our proposed parallel crossing is required to connect both ends of the cycle route for consistency. A signalised junction would have a severe impact on the time of travel in and out of Cambridge for all the users. There is no sufficient space to provide fully segregated crossings for all Non-Motorised Users due to existing level constraints.</p>
<p>SECTION 4 – Wadloes Path (Fen Ditton to Cambridge)</p>	
<p>You outlined your broad support for Wadloes Path expressing that they welcomed the changes and felt the proposal could benefit users.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, considering some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p>
<p>You commented on the need for maintenance and the importance of trimming hedges regularly.</p>	<p>The maintenance of Wadloes path will be the responsibility of CCC Highway Authority when the scheme has been completed.</p>
<p>You commented on the surface of the existing path noting that leaves and wet floors can lead to slippery surfaces and skidding. You also commented on the need to check and replace defective solar studs.</p>	<p>We are working closely with Cambridgeshire County Council to review surfaces for all active travel infrastructure. We will also be considering surface treatments and materials in more detail at the construction design stages.</p>
<p>You commented that Wadloes Path should be upgraded to bridleway</p>	<p>The widening of the Wadloes path would require substantial changes, including widening and removal of trees.</p>

<p>status, to ensure safe links between Bottisham Greenway and Marleigh Development.</p>	
<p>You commented lighting along Wadloes Path, where some respondents felt that more lighting would improve the safety for cyclist and pedestrians. Others were in favour of lighting but felt it should be kept to a minimum or the use of solar studs, whilst others commented that they did not want any lighting as it would have an impact on the wildlife and light pollution.</p>	<p>We will be considering the lighting in more detail at the construction design stage. We will be looking at solar stud lighting and we will be considering environmental impacts and user safety.</p>
<p>You expressed your concerns on cutting down existing trees and the potential damage to wildlife and that it may lead to light pollution.</p>	<p>We have no plans to remove any trees from Wadloes Path. The design of the Horningsea Greenway has been developed to minimise impact on existing green infrastructure such as trees and vegetation. Significant environmental work is being undertaken to minimise any impacts on wildlife.</p>