



# **Greater Cambridge Greenways**

## **Haslingfield Greenway**

### **You Said: We Did**

February 2023

*This document is a summary of the actions we have taken following outcomes from the public engagement undertaken for the Haslingfield Greenway.*



## Introduction

Following the public engagement completed for the Haslingfield Greenway design proposals held in the Summer 2022; all of the data submitted from the public has now been analysed and compiled into a report outlining the overarching themes that emerged.

The full report from which the below information was based upon can be found on our website - <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Active-Travel-Projects/Greater-Cambridge-Greenways/Haslingfield-Greenway/Haslingfield-Greenway-Summary-Engagement-Report-2022.pdf>

The feedback we received forms an integral part in the subsequent stages of the project and, where possible, have been incorporated into this next phase of design.

The following information outlines what you said you wanted to improve or disagreed with, and how we plan to address this. It outlines where we have acted on your suggestions and made alterations to the design of the Haslingfield Greenway design or provided justification on where we have not.

YOU SAID	WE DID
<b>River Cam Crossing</b>	
You expressed concern regarding potential impact on wildlife. You specifically noted the potential impact of the new bridge between Burnt Mill Weir and the existing bridge on the red listed species. You also suggested that the proposed path and fencing along the existing bridleway could disrupt the wildlife living in the verges and hedges.	We will look to conduct detailed ecology surveys later this year to determine the presence of protected species along the entire route corridor. The results from this will inform our strategy to mitigate the impact of the scheme on potentially affected species during the construction and operational phases.
You highlighted the need for the proposed shared use path along the existing bridleway to be appropriate for use by farm and construction vehicles.	We will further investigate where the scheme interfaces with agricultural accesses. The shared use path will be designed to take the impact of heavy agricultural and construction vehicles. We will continue to engage with the respective landowners to accurately determine these interface locations.
You highlighted that flooding is a concern in this area.	In order to reduce the impact on flooding risk in this area and the requirement for flood compensation measures, we will look to move the proposed bridge location to where the current bridge is located. We will also locate the multi-user path to the north of the river and the existing bridleway alignment between River Lane and the River Cam crossing will be left as per existing arrangements, except for modest improvement where there are width constraints.
You raised concern regarding the retainment of the existing bridleway provision, emphasising the need to keep 3m of bridleway for horse riders, to avoid using hard surfaces, such as tarmac, and to	As a general design principle and where possible, we will aim to retain existing bridleways as they are with a shared-use path built alongside. However, where this is not feasible, due to width or other

consider that if a new surface path is constructed it should be alongside the existing bridleway.	constraints, we will consider appropriate surfacing for all users in these locations. At locations where the width of the existing bridleway is less than 3m, subject to land availability, the bridleway would be widened to make the route more amenable to users.
You raised the introduction of continuous fencing along the riverbank as this could potentially restrict access to the river which is a popular route for walkers.	We will examine the rationale for the continuous fencing in more detail. Our intention is to consider the use of fencing in short sections where there is a potential safety issue for cyclists. We will look to maintain access to the river from the bridleway.
<b>Cantelupe Road / River Lane</b>	
You raised concerns that the current traffic levels do not justify the traffic calming measures proposed along this section.	We will look to minimise traffic calming measures and signs on Cantelupe Road to respect the rural nature of this section.
You expressed concerns that the raised tables proposed along Cantelupe Road and the large agricultural and commercial vehicles which will often use this route could lead to noise pollution.	We will investigate the height of the raised table located at Cantelupe Road junction with River Lane to strike a balance between offering safety for cyclists negotiating a right-angle bend and not causing undue noise.
<b>Bourn Brook Crossing</b>	
You indicated your concerns in relation to biodiversity along this section, including where the route crosses the Bourn Brook.	Due to the identified environmental constraints and scheduled monument in this area, the alignment of the route at the crossing of the Bourn Brook is being investigated further. We will develop these proposals and continue discussions with relevant landowners.
You commented on the proposed shared route and grass section in this segment immediately north of Cantelupe Road and the existing farm track. It was suggested that agricultural vehicles will continue to use this route and therefore this should be considered in designs to accommodate this.	We will further consider traffic calming measures or appropriate warning signs, sympathetic to the rural nature of the location, to slow down vehicles and to emphasise priority for non-motorised users. We consider the low frequency of agricultural vehicles on this section and width restrictions justifies the level of intervention proposed.
<b>Grantchester Section</b>	
You expressed concern regarding the route through Grantchester, due to safety issues, narrow road widths, the pinch point at Burnt Close, and the risk of urbanisation to the village. You suggested alternative routes which included the Baulk Path and provided feedback on the options suggested along the Broadway section.	In response to this feedback, we propose to defer the decision on the Grantchester section of the Haslingfield Greenway route until formal public consultation (not engagement) can be undertaken in 2023. In preparation for this consultation, we would like to work collaboratively with the Grantchester Parish Council, local Members, key stakeholders and landowners to develop an option for this section of the route, which includes proposals for landscaping and suitable materials for use in Grantchester as a

	<p>conservation area. We believe this will enable the public and residents of Grantchester to truly understand what this section of the route would look and feel like. The option would then be taken out to public consultation, along with an option for no Greenway in this location. The results of the public consultation will then determine whether the Grantchester section of the route will be included or omitted from the Haslingfield Greenway route.</p>
<p><b>Cambridge Rugby Club to Grantchester Road junction with Barton Road</b></p>	
<p>You suggested that Selwyn Road should be considered as an alternative route for the Greenway as it is recognised as a popular route for cyclists.</p>	<p>We can confirm that Selwyn Road is outside the current scheme scope.</p>
<p>You responded to the proposed traffic calming measures stating that, particularly the speed bumps, could compromise safety rather than improve it.</p>	<p>We will look into the profile and spacing of the sinusoidal humps as to not be detrimental to highway safety and can confirm that no safety concerns were raised in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.</p>
<p>You raised concerns that the proposals may impact the Cambridge Rugby Club with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking on match days;</li> <li>- The Cambridge Pumping Station; and</li> <li>- Encroachment on the minimum run-off area around each rugby pitch which is a safety standards requirement.</li> </ul>	<p>We have amended the designs to swap the multi-user path and the grass verge, as depicted on the concept drawings, such that the arrangement mirrors what's currently on the ground. The amended proposal involves sealing the existing access path, which will be accessible to vehicles on match days, installing a fence separating the pitch from the path and ensuring the grass verge can be used as parking space during match days and for soft surface users during other times. We can confirm that the latest topographical survey indicates that the multi-user path would have no impact on the water pumping station or the minimum run-off area.</p>
<p>You raised concerns regarding conflict between cyclists and parked cars along Grantchester Road between the Rugby Club entrance and the Grantchester Road/Barton Road junction.</p>	<p>At this stage, we can confirm that parking on Grantchester Road between the Cambridge Rugby Club entrance and the Grantchester Road/Barton Road junction will remain as per current arrangements due to the significant loss of parking spaces on this section if parking restrictions are to be enacted on one side.</p>
<p><b>Grantchester Road junction with Barton Road</b></p>	
<p>You suggested simplifying the proposed parallel crossing at the Grantchester Road and Barton Road junction.</p>	<p>We have simplified the design of the parallel crossing.</p>
<p>You recommended turning the bus stop bay into an 'in-lane' bus stop due to suboptimal width.</p>	<p>We have updated the design to have the bus stop within the carriageway.</p>

<b>Lighting</b>	
<p>You expressed support for lighting along the route whether this be low-level lighting, usual street lighting or solar studs. Particularly regarding women's safety and travelling in the dark. However, you also noted that lighting shouldn't be used along more rural route sections and the Grantchester section due to either light pollution, sensitivity to wildlife and/or it isn't needed.</p>	<p>We will consider lighting and types of lighting in more detail at the construction design stage. We are also developing a lighting strategy across the Greenway network. We will consider options for solar stud lighting, overhead lighting, or both, seeking input from key stakeholders. Any lighting proposals we make will consider the rural setting of particular route sections, environmental impacts and user safety.</p>
<b>Materials</b>	
<p>You provided comment regarding materials and proposed surface treatments along different route sections. The majority of comments received were opposing the use of tarmac, stating that a surface treatment that is sympathetic to the rural landscape, such as soft surface treatment (e.g. grass or vegetation) would be preferred. You suggested that the colour of surfaces should be in-keeping with the rural setting and mentioned the risks associated with loose surfacing materials.</p>	<p>We will consider surface treatment and materials in greater detail at the construction design stage, and we will continue to develop a surfacing strategy across the Greenways network. We will consider options for hard-surface and soft-surface treatments alongside input from key stakeholders. We will consider the rural setting of the particular route sections, environmental impacts and user experience. During the next phase of design, we will also consider issues with drainage, durability and maintenance of possible materials and surface treatment.</p>
<b>Signage</b>	
<p>You expressed support for the signage of the greenways however, you indicated that signage should be sympathetic to the rural settings of the greenways, markings should be clear for cycle lanes at junctions and comments referred to ensuring that all users should be aware of each other when using the Greenways.</p>	<p>We will continue to consider signing and road marking options to ensure proposals will be in accordance with an agreed strategy across the Greenways network. We will seek to provide a cohesive approach which will consider all users of the Greenways. Proposals will also be made in agreement with CCC and in line with latest guidance.</p>