



GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP



Melbourn Greenway project:-

You said: We did

Summary of actions we have taken from the Public Engagement



Introduction

Following the public engagement exercise on the Melbourn 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/melbourn-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 – 8 representing the 8 sections of the scheme as outlined in the main report

YOU SAID	WE DID
SECTION 1 – A10 north of Harston	
You supported the proposals to improve this section of the Greenway including widening of pinch points and improving connectivity to the path across Trumpington Meadows.	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account 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 suggested increasing the width of the footway or cycleway in certain locations not already proposed to be widened to improve comfort for active travel users	We have proposed some widening of the Shared Use Path (SUP) on the A10 in this section in certain locations where this can be safely accommodated. We will continue to look for other opportunities to widen the SUP as part of the preliminary design where this is safe and practical.
You supported the idea of a new controlled crossing of the A10, from the path across Trumpington Meadows across to the path to the fields north of Hauxton.	The provision of a controlled crossing at this location currently falls outside of our scope and was not included within any previous cost evaluation, as such we will not be including in this package of works.’ Although it should be noted that as we are reducing the carriageway width we

	are in effect reducing the existing crossing distance.
You suggested that you preferred to retain the layby and parking places on the A10 Cambridge Road just south of the junction with Church Road	We have amended the preliminary designs to ensure car parking (2 spaces) are retained in the layby, as well as the existing bus pull-in and the means to access the post box at this location.
You wanted to see crossing improvements for cyclists and pedestrians at the junction of the A10 Cambridge Road and London Road near Hauxton.	Improvements to the junction with London Road currently fall outside of our scope and were not included within any previous cost evaluation. However, as part of preliminary design we will consider whether minor improvements can provide a more direct connection with London Road for non-motorised users.
You suggested that the Greenway improvements be extended from the current northern extent at the path to Trumpington Meadows, along the A10, up to and beyond the junction with the M11 towards Cambridge	The Melbourn Greenway proposal focuses on the connection to Cambridge via the off-road path across Trumpington Meadows towards Trumpington rather than an on-road connection via the A10 and across the M11 roundabout. This extension idea was not in the original proposals and has not been budgeted for. An improvement to the path up to and beyond junction 11 of the M11 will not be made as part of the Melbourn Greenway.
You expressed your concern given the number of side and access roads across the existing A10 SUP, that cyclists and pedestrians have priority to ensure safety and journey continuity	The proposed alignment in section 2, to the north-west of Harston is to provide an alternative route for users away from the existing busy A10 corridor, reducing interaction and conflict with vehicular activities. The design development of the Melbourn Greenway is to provide priority for Active Travel users wherever safe to do so. As such it is the intention to develop a design to provide priority for Active Travel users across all side road entry points.
You suggested that a link to Newton Village off the main A10 corridor from this section be provided	A link to Newton village is not included within the scope of the Melbourn Greenway programme, nor has this been budgeted for. However, improvements to the crossing of the A10 at the junction with London Road, will help facilitate access to London Road and improve the onward connection to Newton
SECTION 2 – Harston off-road path	
You indicated your support generally for the proposals, providing a connection to Haslingfield and an alternative,	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you

scenic route to the A10 corridor and avoiding the many side roads and driveways.	raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.
You suggested a route alignment at the southern end of the proposed off-road path along the 'Footpath' connecting to Church Street	We are currently assessing the opportunity to use The Footpath as an alternative route alignment at the southern end of the off-road path. This will be subject to determination of its legal status and viability as an Active Travel route.
You suggested that the section of Church Street from the southern end of the proposed path to the A10 SUP, also needed some improvements for active travel users	We will consider a 'quiet road' option along this section of Church Street to provide a continuous provision for active travel users from the off-road path to the A10. This will be looked at in more detail but may include speed humps and other ways of slowing vehicles.
You suggested that a link to Newton Village off the main A10 corridor along Station Road be provided	A link to Newton village is not included within the scope of the Melbourn Greenway programme nor has it been budgeted for.
You expressed your concern that this off-road link is not needed and that it would be more appropriate for active travel users to use the existing Button End route towards Haslingfield. You also suggested that there are existing high volumes of vehicle traffic on Church Street and parked vehicles made use of this section by active travel users, potentially dangerous.	We recognise that there is an existing connection to Haslingfield from Harston, which is partially on road via Button End. We note there is no footway for much of the length of Button End. The proposed new off-road path will provide a safe and high quality connection for active travel users and equestrians, without the need to mix with general traffic.
You expressed your concern about the proposals in respect of type of surfacing materials used, lighting of the route and impact on the countryside generally.	We are currently developing the palette for types of appropriate surfacing materials to be used on off-road paths such as this one, for use across the whole of the Cambridge Greenways. Surfacing materials will be sympathetic to the rural location. We are currently reviewing lighting options for this off road route, with the use of solar studs in the path surface the most likely outcome.
SECTION 3 – Foxton village	
You indicated your support generally for the proposals to provide an active travel route and connection through Foxton	We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you

<p>village including the traffic calming measures and speed limit reduction.</p>	<p>raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.</p>
<p>You indicated that rather than using chicanes to slow traffic, speed humps may be more appropriate</p>	<p>This will be reviewed in more detail as part of the ongoing preliminary design for this section</p>
<p>You suggested that there was no need for the proposal to “tighten up” the radii of the Station Road/High Street junction to help slow down vehicles. This is because vehicles have to stop to give way at the junction anyway so are already slowing down.</p>	<p>This will be reviewed in more detail as part of the ongoing preliminary design for this section</p>
<p>You expressed support for creating a shared use path for pedestrians and cyclists along Shepreth Road from the junction of the A10 Royston Road and the start of the footpath at the southern end of Foxton village</p>	<p>This proposal is out of scope, does not have any budget allocation and will not be taken forward in preliminary design.</p>
<p>You indicated a preference to have the toucan crossing on the south side of the junction of Shepreth Road and the A10 Royston Road, rather than the north as currently shown in the proposals.</p>	<p>Our investigations have determined that it is not possible to provide the toucan crossing on the south side of this junction due to the proximity of a bridge structure.</p>
<p>You expressed your concern at the principle of improving Station Road and the High Street for active travel users, partly as the roads are too narrow and due to issues with on-street parking. Some respondents suggested the reduction in speed limits was not necessary.</p>	<p>The traffic calming and speed reduction proposals are considered to be an appropriate solution for Station Road and the High Street and are in line with the latest guidance on cycle design set out in the Government’s Gear Change and LTN 1/20 documents.</p>

SECTION 4 – Shepreth Link

You indicated your support generally for the proposals to provide an active travel route connection to Shepreth station from the A10 corridor, including the traffic calming measures and speed limit reduction.

We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.

You expressed your desire to see improvements for active travel users to the junction of A10 / Fowlmere Road / Shepreth Road. This includes making it easier to cross the junction between Fowlmere and Shepreth Roads and crossing the mouth of Fowlmere Road using the shared use path.

We will continue to explore potential for enhanced active travel crossing arrangements at this junction in line with LTN 1/20 design standards as part of preliminary design. However, it should be noted that design options are restricted due to the high-speed nature of this section of the A10.

You outlined concerns relating to traffic calming and speed reduction proposals along Fowlmere Road

The traffic calming and speed reduction proposals are considered to be an appropriate solution for Fowlmere Road and are in line with the latest guidance on cycle design set out in the Government's Gear Change and LTN 1/20 documents.

You outlined support for extending the extent of the proposals to both Barrington and Fowlmere villages.

Whilst we understand the support for further connections to these villages, this is out of scope of the Melbourn Greenway programme.

SECTION 5 – Melbourn village

You indicated your support generally for the proposals to provide an active travel route and related improvements through Melbourn village from the A10 corridor, including the traffic calming measures, footway widening, new crossings and speed limit reduction.

We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.

You expressed your support on the need to improve the connection from the A10 Shared Use Path across to Dunsbridge Turnpike as a means of

We agree with this idea and are currently developing a signalised toucan crossing connecting the A10 Shared Use Path to Dunsbridge Turnpike.

<p>connecting onwards to Melbourn. The current refuge at this location is felt to be unsuitable for crossing pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	
<p>You also expressed support for improvements for active travel users at the junctions of the A10 with Cambridge Road and Frog End (near the Dobbies Garden Centre).</p>	<p>Whilst we recognise that some active travel users will use this junction, either using the A10 (both directions) or to / from the direction of either Frog End or Melbourn we are not proposing any changes to this junction at this stage. Instead we are focusing on crossing improvements on the A10 at Dunsbridge Turnpike.</p>
<p>You expressed some concerns about the proposals to reduce speed limits from 30 to 20mph through the village and about the prospect of a speed reduction from the current 60mph on Cambridge Road to 20mph at the start of Melbourn village.</p>	<p>We will be looking at introducing a stepped approach to speed reduction at this location, which will likely involved a reduction in speeds from 60mph to 40mph to 20mph. The detail will be included in the preliminary design proposals.</p>
<p>You expressed concern about the poor existing state of footways and the road surface through Melbourn village</p>	<p>Whilst the condition of footways and carriageways is outside of the scope of this project we will pass this information onto the Highway Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
<p>You expressed some concerns from a safety perspective about widening of footways and narrowing of carriageways to accommodate this. You also indicated that parked vehicles on Melbourn High Street would cause safety issues for active travel users. You expressed support for 20mph speed reductions to other side roads off the High Street including on Mortlock Street / Meadow Lane outside of the Melbourn Primary School.</p>	<p>As part of the ongoing preliminary design we are reviewing in detail the proposals to widen parts of the footway and the impact this will have on the carriageway. Widening will only take place where it can be demonstrated that there will be no impact on safety or increase to traffic congestion / bus journey times. We will also review the existing on-street parking arrangements as part of this work. We recognise the support for further speed reductions on other roads off the High Street but this is out of scope of the Greenway programme. These proposals will be referred on to CCC.</p>
<p>You expressed some concerns regarding reducing the width of carriageway in the vicinity of</p>	<p>As part of the ongoing preliminary design we are reviewing in detail the proposals to widen parts of the footway and the impact this will have in terms</p>

<p>High Street and Station Road and at High Street / Mortlock Street. Concern this will cause road safety danger, congestion, delay and pollution.</p>	<p>of reducing the width of the carriageway. Widening will only take place where it can be demonstrated that there will be no impact on safety or increase to traffic congestion / bus journey times.</p>
<p>SECTION 6 – Meldreth link</p>	
<p>You indicated your support generally for the proposals to provide improved active travel connections from Melbourn to Meldreth.</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.</p>
<p>You expressed strong support for the proposals to widen and re-surface the footpath to Meldreth station from Station Road. Furthermore, you suggested that lighting would be needed to this path including to the underpass beneath the A10.</p>	<p>We will develop the proposals as part of the ongoing preliminary design, to include details on path widths and surfacing materials. We are currently considering arrangement for lighting on this section of off-road path. There is an existing project, being led by the Community Rail Partnership to improve lighting at the underpass beneath the A10.</p>
<p>You indicated support for a new accessible crossing of the railway at the end of the above mentioned path to replace the existing bridge.</p>	<p>This proposal is out of scope of the Greenways programme. However, Network Rail, who own and manage the station, will be made aware of this issue.</p>
<p>You indicated some concern about the width of the road where Station Road crosses the railway line and the need to improve conditions here for pedestrians and cyclists. You expressed equal levels of support and concern regarding proposals for introducing a 20mph zone along Station Road.</p>	<p>As part of the ongoing preliminary design we are reviewing improvements to arrangements for active travel users at this location. This is likely to be based on the use of road markings and signage arrangement to improve conditions for active travellers.</p>
<p>SECTION 7 – ROYSTON ROAD</p>	
<p>You expressed strong support for the proposals to create a new Shared Use Path on the east side of the A10 between Royston Road and the junction with the A505. You indicated that provision of this link would provide much needed</p>	<p>We will develop the design proposals further to preliminary design stage, taking into account some of the specific changes and comments you raised through the public engagement, which are outlined in more detail below.</p>

improvements in active travel connectivity between Royston and Melbourn.	
You suggested that it would be important to ensure active travel and equestrian user safety along this section through an adequate buffer between the road and the new shared use path	We agree with this comment and will ensure provision is made for active travel and equestrian users on this section and that an adequate buffer is in place for safety reasons.
You indicated that the success of this active travel connection to Royston is completely linked to whether the bridge across the A505 and onward connection into Royston can be provided	These comments are noted and we agree that there is a relationship between provision of a new route along this section of the A10 and the ability to cross the A505 to enable an onward connection into Royston.
You suggested that a new crossing of the A10 near the junction with Royston Road be provided to enable users to access the existing path on the west side of the A10.	Whilst we appreciate the benefits of undertaking this junction crossing scheme it is out of scope of the Melbourn Greenway Programme and no funding is available.
SECTION 8 – A505 bridge	
You expressed overwhelming support for the proposed A505 bridge, which aims to provide further connectivity along the A10 into and out of Royston.	We will take forward the design of the bridge and will continue to look for opportunities for funding of the bridge scheme in conjunction with other stakeholders, including Hertfordshire CC.
You expressed concern that there has been many years of discussion about a bridge crossing at the location but that the funding has not been identified to date. Furthermore you indicated that there was probably no point in having a walking, cycling and equestrian connection between Melbourn and Royston if this bridge, a critical component of the link, is not delivered.	We will take forward the design of the bridge and will continue to look for opportunities for funding of the bridge scheme in conjunction with other stakeholders, including Hertfordshire CC.
You indicated some concern about the proposed location of the bridge and in some cases a	These comments are noted but our review has determined that the current location of the proposed bridge is the optimum location due in

<p>preference for a connection from the north side of the A10 / A505 direct to the south side of the A10 into town</p>	<p>part to the topography of the land as well as integration with the existing SUP to the south of the A505 in Royston.</p>
<p>You suggested that the previously operational foot tunnel beneath the A505 (which has been filled in) and which is some 700m south-west of the proposed bridge location be used as a crossing instead</p>	<p>The tunnel at this location has been filled in and does not represent a viable opportunity for a crossing. Subways or underpasses can be intimidating and undesirable places for pedestrians and cyclists. A bridge crossing over the A505 remains the preferred solution.</p>
<p>You indicated that Greater Cambridge Partnership and Hertfordshire CC should prepare a robust and realistic plan B, if the bridge funding is not secured in the lifetime of the Greenways programme</p>	<p>This comment is noted. At the current time we are advancing the project on the basis that the bridge is part of the overall scheme. We are actively identifying ways for funding the delivery of the bridge.</p>
<p>You indicated the design of the bridge should be fully accessible and that provision should be made for equestrian use</p>	<p>This comment is noted and will be taken into account when we commence work on the design of the bridge.</p>
<p>You expressed some concern about the case and demand for a bridge crossing on the A505 at all</p>	<p>Our planning and review work has indicated that a crossing of the A505 is critical to secure an active travel link between Royston and Melbourn. We are undertaking outline business case work to further consider the benefit of the scheme.</p>