

Produced by the Cambridgeshire Research Group



# Melbourn Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings

Version 1

September 2019

'Cambridgeshire Research Group' is the brand name for Cambridgeshire County Council's Research function based within the Business Intelligence Service. As well as supporting the County Council we take on a range of work commissioned by other public sector bodies both within Cambridgeshire and beyond.

All the output of the team and that of our partners is published on our dedicated website

[www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk](http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk)

For more information about the team phone 01223 715300

<b>Document Details</b>	
Title:	Melbourn Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings
Date Created:	17/09/19
Description:	
Produced by:	Cambridgeshire County Council Business Intelligence Service
On behalf of:	Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership
Geographic Coverage:	Cambridgeshire
Format:	PDF
Key Contact	<a href="mailto:Aaron.Rowinski@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Aaron.Rowinski@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Status:	V1
Usage Statement:	This product is the property of the Research and Performance Team, Cambridgeshire County Council. If you wish to reproduce this document either in whole, or in part, please acknowledge the source and the author(s).
Disclaimer:	Cambridgeshire County Council, while believing the information in this publication to be correct, does not guarantee its accuracy nor does the County Council accept any liability for any direct or indirect loss or damage or other consequences, however arising from the use of such information supplied.

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Methodology Summary .....	6
Key findings.....	6
Support for the Greater Cambridge Greenways network.....	6
Individual elements of the proposed scheme .....	6
Other .....	9
Introduction .....	10
Background .....	10
Consultation and Analysis Methodology .....	11
Background .....	11
Consultation Strategy .....	11
Identification of the Audience .....	11
Design of Consultation Questions.....	12
Diversity and Protected Characteristics.....	12
Analysis .....	13
Quality Assurance .....	14
Data Integrity .....	14
Survey Findings .....	15
Respondent Profile .....	15
Respondent location .....	15
Respondent interest in project.....	17
Respondent usual mode of travel in the area .....	18
Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area .....	19
Respondent age range .....	20
Respondent employment status.....	21
Respondent disability status.....	22
Question 1: In general how far do you support the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network? .....	23
Question 2: How would you intend to primarily travel on the Greenway? .....	24
Question 3: How far do you agree with the following elements of the proposed Greenway Route?.....	25
Differences in support for element 8b: Route through Foxton – through Foxton Village .....	31
Differences in support for element 13a: ‘Route towards Trumpington – Country Park and village route’ .....	32

Question 4: How far do you support speed limit reductions in the following locations?...33	
Differences in support for speed limit reduction at location 4: ‘Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph’ .....	34
Question 5: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations? .....	35
Question 6: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options? .....	36
Summary of major themes .....	36
Question 7: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding? .....	42
Summary of major themes .....	42
Question 8: Please comment if you feel any of these proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s.....	44
Summary of major themes .....	44
Stakeholders responses .....	46
Background .....	46
Summary of major themes .....	46
Email, social media and consultation event responses .....	49
Summary of major themes .....	49

## Executive Summary

Between 17 June and 05 August 2019 the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) held an extensive consultation on a scheme to develop a Greenway route from Melbourn to Cambridge.

The key findings of this piece of work are:

- Analysis of the geographical spread (see figure 1) and the breadth of responses for different groups shows that the Greater Cambridge Partnership has delivered an effective and robust consultation.
- The majority of respondents supported all elements of the proposed Greenway Route.
  - The majority of respondents supported 'Option a: Beside Foxton bypass' for the 'Route through Foxton' Options
  - The majority of respondents supported both Options for the 'Route through Harston' and 'Route towards Trumpington' Options
- The majority of respondents supported all four locations for speed limit reductions
- The majority of respondents supported both locations for the installation of solar studs.
- A great deal of detailed comments were received. From these it was clear that; there were concerns about the environmental impact of the off-road sections of the route; there were discussions about the lighting needed; there were discussions about the need for connections to other villages and employment sites along the route; there were discussions about the need for equestrian access.
- Responses were also received on behalf of a number of different groups or organisations. All of the responses from these groups have been made available to board members in full and will be published alongside the results of the public consultation survey.

## Methodology Summary

The consultation adopted a multi-channel approach to promote and seek feedback including through traditional and online paid-for, owned and earned media, community engagement events in key or high footfall locations along the route and through the wide-spread distribution of around 11,500 consultation leaflets.

2 drop-in events were held across the area to enable people to have their say in person and the opportunity to question project officers.

Quantitative data was recorded through a formal consultation questionnaire (online and hard-copy) with 1529 complete responses in total recorded. A significant amount of qualitative feedback was gathered via the questionnaire, at events, via email and social media and at other meetings.

**This report summarises the core 1529 online and written responses to the consultation survey and the 33 additional written responses received.**

## Key findings

Support for the Greater Cambridge Greenways network

### *Quantitative*

- 1461 respondents answered the question on how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network.
  - The majority of respondents supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network (94%)

Individual elements of the proposed scheme

### *Quantitative*

- 1452 respondents answered the question about how far they agreed with the individual elements of the proposed Greenway Route.
  - The majority of respondents supported all of the following elements of the proposed Greenway route:
    - Element 1: 'A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston' (90%)
    - Element 2: 'A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn' (90%)
    - Element 9: 'Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing' (81%)
    - Element 11: 'Proposed improvements to shared use path between Harston and Trumpington' (81%)

- Element 3: 'New surfacing along existing track 'London Way' (79%)
  - Element 7: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - New informal crossing at junction with Foxton and Shepreth Road' (78%)
  - Element 12: 'Resurface access bridge and improve approach ramps' (78%)
  - Element 5: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn' (76%)
  - Element 4: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Back Lane junction, Melbourn' (75%)
  - Element 6: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - Entrance to Melbourn Science Park to include a new crossing of Cambridge Road with a central refuge' (74%)
- 3 elements had multiple options available
  - For the element 8: 'Route through Foxton' Options:
    - The majority of respondents supported 'Option a: Beside Foxton bypass' (70%)
    - Just over half of respondents supported 'Option b: Through Foxton Village' (51%)
  - The majority of respondents supported both Options for element 10: 'Route through Harston':
    - 69% supported 'Option a: Through the fields west of Harston'
    - 66% supported 'Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston'
  - The majority of respondents supported both Options for element 13: 'Route towards Trumpington':
    - 71% supported 'Option b: via Trumpington Park & Ride'
    - 64% supported 'Option a: Country Park and village route'
- 1439 respondents answered the question on far they supported speed limit reductions in four specific locations.
  - The majority of respondents supported all four locations for speed limit reductions:
    - Location 1: 'Melbourn High Street: 20mph' (65%)
    - Location 3: 'Foxton Level Crossing: 30mph' (62%)
    - Location 2: 'Foxton Village: 20mph' (58%)
    - Location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph' (55%)
- 1437 respondents answered the question about how far they supported the installation of solar studs in two specific locations.
  - The majority of respondents supported both solar stud locations:
    - Location a: 'Between Royston and Melbourn' (83%)
    - Location b: 'Between Harston and Trumpington' (80%)

## Qualitative

- Question 6 asked respondents whether they had any additional comments on the proposed route options. 731 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
  - Support for element 1: A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston
  - Support for element 2: A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn
  - About the need for the Greenway routes to connect to nearby villages and employment centres along the route
  - About the need for equestrian access along the route
  - Concerns about the environmental impact of element 13a: Route towards Trumpington: Option a: Country Park and village route
  - About the need for cycle/pedestrian priority over side roads
  - Discussion about the connect to Meldreth Station, the 20mph speed limit, and the lack of a segregated cycle route for element 5: Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn
  - General positive comments about the proposals
  - Debate about the need for element 10a: Route through Harston Option a: Through the fields west of Harston
  - Concerns about the lack of cycle path usage
  - Discussion about the levels of lighting needed along the route
  - Support for element 13b: Route towards Trumpington Option b: via Trumpington Park & Ride
  - About the need for maintenance on the route and on existing paths/roads
  - Support for element 9: Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing and the need for the railway bridge/underpass improvements
  - Concerns about the environmental impact of the proposals and the need for planting along the route
  - Concerns about the suitability of element 3: New surfacing along existing track 'London Way'
  - Debate about the suitability of element 10b: Route through Harston Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston
  - Concerns about the inclusion of shared use paths
  
- Question 7 asked respondents whether they had any comments about the suggested options for signage and wayfinding. 424 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
  - About the need for wayfinding along the route to include more information
  - About the need for signage to be clear to understand and visible
  - General positive comments about the signage, wayfinding, and lighting choices
  - About whether the signage and wayfinding proposals were needed
  - Concerns about the amount of signage
  - Discussion about the levels of lighting needed along the route
  - About the need for equestrian usage to be included on the signage



- Concerns about the use of abbreviations

Other

*Qualitative*

- 289 respondents left comments about whether they felt the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any person/s or group/s that fall under the Equality Act 2010. The main themes were:
  - Discussion about the benefits the proposals would have on those with disabilities and what would be needed to achieve this
  - That the proposals would have a positive impact on those with protected characteristics
  - Discussion about the benefits the proposals would have on older and younger users and what would be needed to achieve this
  - About the need for equestrian access to be included on the route

# Introduction

## Background

In 2016, the Greater Cambridge Partnership commissioned a consultant to review twelve Greenway routes that would enable cyclists, walkers and equestrians to travel safely and sustainably from villages around the city into Cambridge.

The consultant identified a number of missing links that could be provided, creating initial proposals for the villages below:

- Waterbeach Greenway
- Horningsea Greenway
- Swaffham Greenway
- Bottisham Greenway
- Fulbourn Greenway
- Linton Greenway
- Sawston Greenway
- Melbourn Greenway
- Haslingfield Greenway
- Barton Greenway
- Comberton Greenway
- St Ives Greenway

In April 2017, £480,000 of City Deal funding was allocated to the Greenways scheme to take the project through a public engagement and consultation phase.

Each Greenway then went through an initial public engagement phase. Residents and stakeholders attended events and discussed how the local area is meeting the transport needs of its users. This information was then fed into the designs for initial proposals for each route.

After taking on this feedback finalised designs were created, the Greater Cambridge Partnership then ran a public consultation between 17 June and 05 August 2019 to gather and record the public's views on the route. This consultation was promoted via online advertising, social media promotion, posters in key locations, emails, engagement events and consultation leaflets to over 11,500 households.

Public consultation is undertaken as part of wider stakeholder engagement in advance of any decisions on final options to consider and facilitate necessary input in the development of the scheme. The main stakeholders for this consultation were:

Individuals or organisations that are interested because they live in the community the scheme may affect, for example interested parties, potential users of the scheme, local businesses, bus operators, developers, landowners and local action groups. Government agencies and local authorities. For example district and parish councils, Environment Agency, Highways England and Natural England.

# Consultation and Analysis Methodology

## Background

The consultation strategy for this stage of the Melbourn Greenway proposals was designed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership communications team with input from the County Council's Research Team. During the design process reference was made to the County Council's Consultation Guidelines, in particular taking into account the following points:

- The consultation is taking place at a time when proposals are at a formative stage (with a clear link between this consultation round and the previous consultation);
- Sufficient information and reasoning is provided to permit an intelligent response from the public to the proposals;
- Adequate time given for consideration and response given the significance of the decision being taken;
- Plans in place for a full analysis of the results and for these to be presented at a senior level to enable the consultation to be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals.

## Consultation Strategy

### Identification of the Audience

The consultation was open for anyone to contribute to. The key target audience were individuals or organisations that are interested because they live in the community the scheme may affect, for example interested parties, potential users of the scheme, local businesses, bus operators, developers, landowners and local action groups. Government agencies and local authorities. For example district and parish councils, Environment Agency, Highways England and Natural England. This understanding of the audience was then used as a basis upon which to design the consultation materials, questions and communication strategy.

### Design of Consultation Materials

It was identified that the audience for the consultation required a great deal of detailed information upon which to base their responses. So whilst the key consultation questions were relatively straight forward (people were asked to express how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network, how far they supported the 13 elements of the Melbourn Greenway route, how far they supported the speed limit reductions in 4 locations, and how far they supported the installation of solar studs in 2 locations) an 8 page information document was produced and supplemented with

additional information available online and at key locations.

This document explained the Greater Cambridge Partnership's strategy and the time-scales to which it was working and discussed the reasons why a Greenway was being developed for Melbourn. It also provided detailed maps, information and costings on each of the options to enable residents to compare the pros and cons for each element.

### Design of Consultation Questions

The consultation questions themselves were designed to be neutral, clear to understand and were structured to enable people to comment on all the key areas of decision making. This was done in order to help people to understand and comment on both the Greater Cambridge Partnership's strategy and the local implications of this.

For the first half of the consultation survey there was a focus on questions relating to the options for the Melbourn Greenway scheme. Questions then moved on to capture the detail of why respondents were choosing particular options. The second half of the survey focused on multiple choice questions relating to respondents' journeys and personal details, allowing measurement of the impact of the Melbourn Greenway scheme on various groups.

The main tools for gathering comments were an online survey and a paper return survey attached to the consultation document. It was recognised that online engagement, whilst in theory available to all residents, could potentially exclude those without easy access to the internet. Therefore the paper copies of the questions were widely distributed with road-shows held to collect responses face to face. Other forms of response e.g. detailed written submissions were also received and have been incorporated into the analysis of the feedback.

The survey included the opportunity for 'free text' responses and the analysis approach taken has enabled an understanding of sentiment as well as the detailed points expressed.

### Diversity and Protected Characteristics

A complete set of questions designed to monitor equality status (gender, ethnicity, sexuality) were not included within the direct questions on the survey. This was because previous feedback from the public has suggested that these questions were overly intrusive given the context of providing comments on the strategic aspects of a new transport route. Previous consultation has highlighted the importance of taking into account accessibility at the detailed scheme design stage.

It was decided therefore to only collect information on matters pertinent to travel, that is to say age, employment status and disability (although not the nature of disability). A free text option provided opportunity for respondents' to feedback on any issues they felt may impact on protected groups.

## Analysis

The strategy for analysis of the consultation was as follows:

- An initial quality assurance review of the data was conducted and a review with the engagement team carried out to identify any issues or changes that occurred during the consultation process.
- A set of frequencies were then produced and checks made against the total number of respondents for each question and the consultation overall. A basic sense check of the data was made at this point with issues such as checking for duplicate entries, data entry errors and other quality assurance activities taking place.
  - **Duplicate Entries.** Measures were in place to avoid analysing duplicated entries. The online survey software collects the timestamp of entries so patterns of deliberate duplicate entries can be spotted and countered.
  - **Partial Entries.** The system records all partial entries as well as those that went through to completion (respondent hit submit). These are reviewed separately and in a few cases, where a substantial response has been made (as opposed to someone just clicking through) then these are added to the final set for analysis.
  - Within the analysis a search for any unusual patterns within the responses was carried out, such as duplicate or 'cut and paste' views being expressed on proposals.
- Closed questions (tick box) are then analysed using quantitative methods which are then presented in the final report through charts, tables and descriptions of key numerical information.
- Data was also cross-tabulated where appropriate, for example, to explore how respondents in particular areas or with different statuses answered questions. Characteristic data was then used to provide a general over-view of the 'reach' of the consultation in terms of input from people of different socio-economic status and background.
- Free text questions were analysed using qualitative methods, namely through thematic analysis. Key themes are identified using specialist software and then responses tagged with these themes (multiple tags can be given to the same response). At this stage totals of tagged themes are created and sample quotes chosen for the final report that typify particular tagged themes. Comment themes are listed in order of the number of comments received, from most to least. In the reporting of themes 'most' represents where over 50% of respondents' comments were applicable, 'some' represents 25%-49%, and 'few' represents less than 25% of comments.

- The final report is then written to provide an objective view of the results of the consultation.

## Quality Assurance

### Data Integrity

- A visual check of the raw data show no unusual patterns. There were no large blocks of identical answers submitted at a similar time.
- Date / time stamp of submissions showed no unusual patterns.
- Text analysis showed no submissions of duplicate text.

# Survey Findings

## Respondent Profile

In total, 1501 residents and 28 stakeholders responded to the consultation survey.

### Respondent location

Respondents were asked for their postcodes during the survey, but were not forced to enter a response. 1172 respondents entered recognisable postcodes, while over a fifth did not (329 respondents).

Based on the postcode data provided most respondents resided in:

- Melbourn (21%)
- Outside Cambridgeshire (31%)
  - The majority of these resided in Royston (71% of those outside Cambridgeshire, 22% of those who provided postcodes)

These postcodes were used to group respondents by parish (or ward in the case of Cambridge) and then into one of two categories, where significant;


- 'Foxton and further South' (covering 43% of respondents). This category covered:
  - Barrington
  - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth
  - Fowlmere
  - Foxton
  - Great and Little Chishill
  - Guilden Morden
  - Ickleton
  - Litlington
  - Melbourn
  - Meldreth
  - Orwell
  - Shepreth
  - Shingay cum Wendy
  - Steeple Morden
  - Thriplow
  - Whaddon
  - Wimpole
- 'Rest of Cambridgeshire' (covering 25% of respondents). This category covered:
  - Bluntisham
  - Bottisham
  - Bourn
  - Caldecote
  - Cambourne
  - Chatteris
  - Comberton
  - Coton
  - Earith
  - Fenstanton
  - Fulbourn
  - Girton
  - Godmanchester
  - Grantchester
  - Great Abington
  - Great Shelford
  - Hardwick
  - Harston
  - Haslingfield
  - Hauxton
  - Hemingford Grey
  - Hilton
  - Histon
  - Impington
  - Little Shelford
  - Milton
  - Newton
  - Oakington and Westwick

- Perry
- Rampton
- Sawston
- South Trumington
- St Ives
- St Neots
- Stapleford
- Swaffham Prior
- Swavesey
- Teversham
- Wentworth
- Whittlesford
- Wisbech
- Abbey
- Arbury
- Castle
- Cherry Hinton
- Coleridge
- East Chesterton
- King's Hedges
- Market
- Newnham
- Petersfield
- Queen Edith's
- Romsey
- Trumington
- West Chesterton

A full breakdown of respondent locations can be found in Appendix 1.

The following map shows the rate of response by parish/ward:

**Figure 1: Map to show areas of response**






Respondents were asked a series of questions about their personal circumstances and the results can be seen below. Please note that respondents did not have to enter information on these questions.

### Respondent interest in project

1469 respondents answered the question on their interest in the project. Respondents could select multiple answers for this question.


**Figure 2: Interest in project**



- The majority of respondents indicated they
  - Were a 'resident in South Cambridgeshire' (63%)
  - 'Regularly travel in the area' (57%)
- Under two fifths indicated they 'work in the area' (35%)
- Over a fifth indicated they were a 'resident elsewhere' (23%)
- Few respondents indicated they:
  - Were a 'resident in Cambridge' (13%)
  - Were a 'local business owner/employer' (4%)
  - 'Occasionally travel in the area' (4%)
  - Had an 'other' interest (4%)
  - 'Study in the area' (3%)

## Respondent usual mode of travel in the area

1475 respondents answered the question on how they usually travel in the area. Respondents could select multiple answers for this question.




- The majority of respondents indicated:
  - They were a 'car driver' (81%)
  - They usually travelled by 'bicycle' (65%)
- Just under half of respondents indicated they usually travelled 'on foot' (48%)
- Over a quarter of respondents indicated they were a 'car passenger' (26%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual mode of travel was:
  - As a 'bus user' (12%)
  - 'Other' (6%)
  - As a 'horse rider' (5%)
  - A 'powered two-wheeler' (2%)
  - As a 'van or lorry driver' (2%)
  - 'Not applicable' (<1%).

## Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area

289 respondents answered the question on their usual workplace destination if they commuted from Melbourn. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.


**Figure 4: Usual workplace destination**



- Over two fifths of respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was 'Other' (42%).
  - 14 respondents left information indicated what their 'other' workplace destination was. These included: Royston, Melbourn, Stevenage, Wellingborough, London, central Cambridge, Harston, Hitchin, and Bassingbourn.
- Over a fifth indicated it was 'Addenbrooke's/Biomedical Campus' (21%)
- Less than a fifth indicated their usual workplace destination was:
  - 'Cambridge City Centre' (17%)
  - 'Science Park or Business Park' (16%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was:
  - 'Cambridge train station' (6%)
  - 'University of Cambridge' (5%)
  - 'West Cambridge site' (2%)

## Respondent age range

1469 respondents answered the question on their age range.




- Average working ages from '25-34' to '55-64' were well represented when compared to the general Cambridgeshire population
- Ages from '15-24' were slightly under represented, only accounting for 2% of respondents

## Respondent employment status

1463 respondents answered the question on their employment status. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.


**Figure 6: Employment status**



- The majority of respondents indicated they were 'employed' (65%)
- Less than a fifth indicated they were 'retired' (19%)
- Few respondents indicated:
  - They were 'self-employed' (10%)
  - They were in 'education' (4%)
  - They were 'a stay at home parent, carer or similar' (3%)
  - They were 'a home-based worker' (2%)
  - That they would 'prefer not to say' (2%)
  - They were 'other' (1%)
  - That they were 'unemployed' (<1%).

## Respondent disability status

1501 respondents answered the question on whether they had a disability that influences the way they travel.




- 5% of respondents indicating that they did.

## Question 1: In general how far do you support the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network?

1461 respondents answered the question on how far they supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network.

**Figure 8: Support for the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


- The majority of respondents supported the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network (94%)

28 stakeholders answered this question. 27 'strongly supported' or 'supported' the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network (96%). 1 stakeholder had 'no opinion'.

## Question 2: How would you intend to primarily travel on the Greenway?

1462 respondents answered the question on how they intended to primarily travel on the Greenway. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.

**Figure 9: Mode of travel on the Greenway**




- The majority of respondents indicated they would be ‘cycling’ on the Greenway (78%)
- Under two fifths indicated they would be ‘walking’ on the Greenway (33%)
- Under a fifth indicated they would be ‘running’ (15%)
- Few respondents indicated they would be ‘horse riding’ (5%) or using ‘other’ means to travel on the Greenway (2%)
  - Respondents who indicated they used ‘other’ means to travel on the Greenway were asked to specify. These included using mobility aids, using a skateboard/scooter, personal motorised vehicles, indication they could not/would not use it, bus, carriage driving, and litter picking/greenery trimming
- Few respondents indicated they ‘did not intend to travel on the Greenway’ (7%)



## Question 3: How far do you agree with the following elements of the proposed Greenway Route?

1452 respondents answered the question about how far they agreed with the individual elements of the proposed Greenway Route.

**Figure 10: Support for elements of the proposed Greenway Route**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*

The majority of respondents supported all of the following elements of the proposed Greenway route:

- Element 1: 'A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston' (90%)
- Element 2: 'A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn' (90%)
- Element 9: 'Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing' (81%)
- Element 11: 'Proposed improvements to shared use path between Harston and Trumpington' (81%)
- Element 3: 'New surfacing along existing track 'London Way' (79%)
- Element 7: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - New informal crossing at junction with Foxton and Shepreth Road' (78%)
- Element 12: 'Resurface access bridge and improve approach ramps' (78%)
- Element 5: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn' (76%)
- Element 4: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Back Lane junction, Melbourn' (75%)
- Element 6: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - Entrance to Melbourn Science Park to include a new crossing of Cambridge Road with a central refuge' (74%)


28 stakeholders answered this question. The majority of stakeholders supported all of the following elements of the proposed Greenway route:

- Element 1: 'A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 26 stakeholders (93%)
  - 2 stakeholders had 'no opinion'
- Element 2: 'A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 25 stakeholders (93%)
  - 2 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 stakeholder left no answer
- Element 9: 'Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 21 stakeholders (75%)
  - 5 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 2 stakeholders 'opposed' this element
- Element 4: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Back Lane junction, Melbourn' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 20 stakeholders (74%)
  - 7 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 stakeholder left no answer

- Element 5: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 20 stakeholders (71%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion'
- Element 11: 'Proposed improvements to shared use path between Harston and Trumpington' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 20 stakeholders (71%)
  - 7 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 'opposed' this element
- Element 7: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - New informal crossing at junction with Foxton and Shepreth Road' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 19 stakeholders (73%)
  - 7 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 2 stakeholders left no answer
- Element 12: 'Resurface access bridge and improve approach ramps' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 19 stakeholders (68%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 stakeholder 'opposed' this element
- Element 6: 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn - Entrance to Melbourn Science Park to include a new crossing of Cambridge Road with a central refuge' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 18 stakeholders (67%)
  - 9 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 left no answer
- Element 3: 'New surfacing along existing track 'London Way' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 18 stakeholders (64%)
  - 9 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 stakeholder 'opposed' this element

3 elements had multiple options available.

**Figure 11: Support for element 8: 'Route through Foxton' Options**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


For the element 8: 'Route through Foxton' Options:

- The majority of respondents supported 'Option a: Beside Foxton bypass' (70%)
- Just over half of respondents supported 'Option b: Through Foxton Village' (51%)

27 stakeholders responded to the question on this element:

- 'Option b: Through Foxton Village' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 20 stakeholders (74%)
  - 7 stakeholders had 'no opinion'
- 'Option a: Beside Foxton Bypass' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 18 stakeholders (69%)
  - 7 stakeholders had 'no opinion', 1 stakeholder 'opposed' this option, and 1 left no answer

**Figure 12: Support for element 10: ‘Route through Harston’ Options**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


The majority of respondents supported both Options for element 10: ‘Route through Harston’:

- 69% supported ‘Option a: Through the fields west of Harston’
- 66% supported ‘Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston’

28 stakeholders answered the question on this element:

- ‘Option a: Through the fields west of Harston’ was ‘strongly supported’ or ‘supported’ by 21 stakeholders (78%)
  - 6 stakeholders had ‘no opinion’ and 1 left no answer
- ‘Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston’ was ‘strongly supported’ or ‘supported’ by 18 stakeholders (64%)
  - 8 stakeholders had ‘no opinion’ and 2 were ‘strongly opposed’ to this option

**Figure 13: Support for element 13: 'Route towards Trumpington' Options**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*

The majority of respondents supported both Options for element 13: 'Route towards Trumpington'

- 71% supported 'Option b: via Trumpington Park & Ride'
- 64% supported 'Option a: Country Park and village route'


27 stakeholders answered the question on this element.

- 'Option a: Country Park and village route' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 19 stakeholders (70%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion'
- 'Option b: via Trumpington Park & Ride' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 18 stakeholders (67%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 stakeholder 'strongly opposed' this option

## Differences in support for element 8b: Route through Foxton – through Foxton Village

Cross-tabulation of the data showed significant differences in support for element 8b: 'Route through Foxton – through Foxton Village' by a number of different groups. Noticeable differences, when compared with the overall response, are depicted in figure 14.

**Figure 14: Difference in support for element 8b: Route through Foxton – through Foxton Village**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


Although more of the respondents from the following groups supported element 8b: 'Route through Foxton – through Foxton Village' than opposed it, fewer respondents supported it than the overall response:

- This element was supported by less than half of respondents who indicated they were:
  - A 'resident in South Cambridgeshire' (49%)
  - Usually travelled in the area as a 'car driver' (48%)
  - Usually travelled in the area as a 'bus user' (47%)
  - 'Self-employed' (48%)
  - Located in the 'Rest of Cambridgeshire' (48%)
- This element was supported by just over two fifths of respondents who indicated they:
  - Were aged '65-74' (40%)
  - Were 'retired' (42%)
  - Had a 'disability that influences travel decisions' (43%)

Differences in support for element 13a: 'Route towards Trumpington – Country Park and village route'

Cross-tabulation of the data showed significant differences in support for element 13a: 'Route towards Trumpington – Country Park and village route' by respondents who indicated they usually travel in the area as a 'bus user'. Noticeable differences, when compared with the overall response, are depicted in figure 15.

**Figure 15: Differences in support for element 13a: Route towards Trumpington – Country Park and village route'**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


Although more respondents who indicated they were a 'bus user' supported element 13a: 'Route towards Trumpington – Country Park and village route' than opposed it, less than half of these respondents supported it (49%), less than the overall response.



## Question 4: How far do you support speed limit reductions in the following locations?

1439 respondents answered the question on whether they supported speed limit reductions in four specific locations.

**Figure 16: Support for speed limit reductions**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*

The majority of respondents supported all four locations for speed limit reductions:

- Location 1: 'Melbourn High Street: 20mph' (65%)
- Location 3: 'Foxton Level Crossing: 30mph' (62%)
- Location 2: 'Foxton Village: 20mph' (58%)
- Location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph' (55%)

28 stakeholders answered this question


- Location 1: 'Melbourn High Street: 20mph' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 19 stakeholders (70%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 1 left no answer
- Location 3: 'Foxton Level Crossing: 30mph' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 19 stakeholders (70%)
  - 6 stakeholders had 'no opinion', 2 stakeholders 'opposed' this location, and 1 left no answer
- Location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 18 stakeholders (64%)
  - 8 stakeholders had 'no opinion' and 2 stakeholders were 'opposed' to this location

- Location 2: 'Foxton Village: 20mph' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 17 stakeholders (63%)
  - 9 stakeholders had 'no opinion', 1 stakeholder 'strongly opposed' this location, and 1 left no answer

Differences in support for speed limit reduction at location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph'

Cross-tabulation of the data showed significant differences in support for the proposed speed limit reduction at location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph' by a number of different groups. Noticeable differences, when compared with the overall response, are depicted in figure 17.

**Figure 17: Differences in support for speed limit reduction at location 4: Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*


Although more of the respondents from the following groups supported the proposed speed limit reduction at location 4: 'Grantchester Road, Trumpington: 20mph' than opposed it, fewer respondents supported it than the overall response:

- Half of respondents who indicated they were a 'resident elsewhere' supported a speed limit reduction at location 4 (50%)
- 
- This location was supported by less than half of respondents who were:
  - Located in Melbourn (49%)
  - Located outside of Cambridgeshire (48%)
  - Were aged '25-34' (46%)

## Question 5: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?

1437 respondents answered the question about how far they supported the installation of solar studs in two specific locations.

**Figure 15: Support for the installation of solar studs**



*N.B Figures in the graph may not exactly match the text in the report due to rounding*

The majority of respondents supported both solar stud locations:

- Location a: 'Between Royston and Melbourn' (83%)
- Location b: 'Between Harston and Trumpington' (80%)

27 stakeholders answered this question.

- Location a: 'Between Royston and Melbourn' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 22 stakeholders (81%)
  - 5 stakeholders had 'no opinion'
- Location b: 'Between Harston and Trumpington' was 'strongly supported' or 'supported' by 21 stakeholders (78%)
  - 6 stakeholders had 'no opinion'

## Question 6: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options?

731 respondents left comments on question 6, which asked if they had any additional comments on the proposed route options.

### Summary of major themes

Comment Theme	Respondent comments
<b>Element 1: A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported this element (along with 'element 2: A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn') and felt it was a high priority for the route. These respondents felt that access between Royston and Melbourn was currently unsafe due to the lack of safe areas to cross the A505 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents indicated they would commute by walking or cycling rather than by motorised vehicle if this proposal was implemented</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated there was an existing bridge over the A505 that was currently unused and felt this should be developed instead</li> </ul>
<b>Element 2: A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported this element (along with 'element 1: A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston') and felt it was a high priority for the route. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents indicated they would commute by walking or cycling rather than by motorised vehicle if this proposal was implemented</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Connecting to villages and other key areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the Greenway should make further connections to nearby villages and employment centres along the route <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most of these respondents made particular mention of the possible connection to Meldreth and its station for 'element 5: Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn', feeling this was important for many commuters in the area</li> <li>○ Other areas mentioned included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shepreth</li> <li>▪ Bassingbourn</li> <li>▪ Newton</li> <li>▪ Fowlmere</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hauxton</li> <li>▪ Barrington</li> <li>▪ Harston</li> <li>▪ Grantchester</li> </ul>
<b>Equestrian access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access should be included in all areas of the route</li> </ul>
<b>Element 13a: Route towards Trumpington: Option a: Country Park and village route</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme were opposed to this route option, as they felt it would have a negative impact on the environment of Trumpington Meadows Wildlife Park, on local residents, and on current users of the park</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that both 'Option A: Country Park and village route' and Option B: 'via Trumpington Park &amp; Ride' for 'element 13: Route towards Trumpington' were needed, as this was an area where commuters would need to go towards different areas.</li> <li>• A few of the respondents felt the speed limit reduction on Grantchester Road would not be adhered to by motorised vehicles without enforcement and so wouldn't improve safety in the area</li> </ul>
<b>Cycle/pedestrian priority over side roads</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that pedestrians and cyclists should have priority over side roads and driveways on shared use paths, to ensure the route was safe for non-motorised users and travel was uninterrupted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents felt that without this cyclists would choose to use the road instead of the path</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Element 5: Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the possible improvements to the path towards Meldreth should be included, as it was an important link for commuters</li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt the 20mph area would not be adhered to without some form of enforcement, such as traffic cameras or speed bumps</li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that cycle traffic would be at risk as it would not be segregated from motorised traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents discussed the current high levels of motorised traffic along Melbourn</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>High Street and issues around the number of cars parked on-road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the 20mph reduction should be extended to cover all entrances to Melbourn and streets connected to Melbourn High Street</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the removal of the centre line as they felt this could increase collisions</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated that existing trees and other vegetation should not be removed</li> </ul>
<b>General positive comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme left comments indicating they supported the overall proposals, feeling they would improve safety, access, and increase active travel</li> </ul>
<b>Element 10a: Route through Harston Option a: Through the fields west of Harston</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option as they felt it would be safer for non-motorised users as it was away from motorised traffic and avoided driveways and business entries</li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this route option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that 'Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston' was a more direct route and had recently been improved, so would save on development costs</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents were concerned about the environmental impact of Option a's improvements</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents were concerned the isolated nature of the route could make 'Option a' dangerous for users, particularly at night</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that both 'Option a' and 'Option b' should be implemented, as 'Option a' was felt to be better for non-motorised users seeking a safe, quiet route, while 'Option b' offered a quicker, more direct route for others</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the area around 'Option a' could be used as a bypass for motorised vehicles</li> </ul>
<b>Usage of cycle paths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they opposed to overall proposals as they felt</li> </ul>

	<p>that cyclists don't use existing cycle paths and cycle on road instead, so would not use these improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents felt that, if these proposals were implemented, it should be mandatory for cyclists to use them</li> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated that they, as cyclists, would use the road instead of cycle paths, if there was no priority over side roads/driveways as on-path would result in slower travel and greater risk of collision</li> </ul>
<b>Lighting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were supportive of the solar light studs as they felt they were an important inclusion to ensure the route was safe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that solar lamps would also need to be included, particularly in rural areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the more isolated, off-road, parts of the proposed route would be unsafe without adequate lighting</li> </ul>
<b>Element 13b: Route towards Trumpington Option b: via Trumpington Park &amp; Ride</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option, as it would result in the Greenway linking with the Busway, giving non-motorised users more options for getting into and out of Cambridge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that both 'Option b' and 'Option a: Country Park and village route' were needed as this was an area where commuters would need to go towards different areas</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents indicated they preferred 'Option b' as 'Option a' would result in a negative impact on the environment and local residents</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents indicated the existing route to Trumpington Park &amp; Ride was unusable due to poor path surfaces and maintenance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about how the route would be maintained in the long term, as they felt this was important to attracting more users</li> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that money should be spent on maintaining existing roads and paths around the proposed route, particularly in the villages along the route, rather than new routes being developed</li> </ul>

<p><b>Element 9: Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they supported the improvements to the Foxton Level Crossing, feeling this was currently a difficult area for non-motorised users to navigate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents were concerned about the reduction in speed limit, as they felt there was no consistency in speed limits along the A10</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the longer term improvements of a railway bridge/underpass were needed alongside the proposals</li> </ul>
<p><b>Environment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that more greenery planting, particularly hedgerows, were needed where the Greenway went alongside main roads, both to improve air quality and reduce glare from oncoming motorised vehicle headlights</li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the environmental impact of the proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents were concerned about the negative impact on the environment from element 13a 'Route towards Trumpington: Option a: Country Park and village route'</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents were concerned about the negative impact on the environment from element 10a 'Route through Harston Option a: Through the fields west of Harston'</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents were concerned about the negative impact on the environment from element 3 'New surfacing along existing track London Way'</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents were concerned about the loss of trees and vegetation from element 5 'Improvements to junctions in Melbourn – High Street and Station road junction, Melbourn'</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 3: New surfacing along existing track 'London Way'</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they opposed this element <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that the area would be unsafe due to the number of heavy goods vehicles accessing businesses nearby</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt the route was too isolated to be safe at night</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that better use could be made of the path along Royston Road</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents were concerned about the negative impact this element would have on the area's environment</li> <li>● A few of these respondents indicated they supported this element, as it would allow safer connectivity to Royston away from the A10</li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 10b: Route through Harston</b>  <b>Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt this route option was unsuitable due to the width of the paths and the number of driveways</li> <li>● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt this route option was better than 'Option a: Through the fields west of Harston' as recent improvements made the route suitable and more direct, and so would reduce the cost involved with developing the proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents also felt that this route option had less of an environmental impact than 'Option a'</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that both 'Option a' and 'Option b' should be implemented, as 'Option a' was felt to be better for non-motorised users seeking a safe, quiet route, while 'Option b' offered a quicker, more direct route for others</li> </ul>
<p><b>Shared use paths</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the shared use paths, as they felt non-motorised users could come into conflict with each other if enough room was not provided or some form of segregation between users could not be achieved</li> </ul>

## Question 7: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?

424 respondents left comments about suggested options for signage and wayfinding.

Summary of major themes

<b>Wayfinding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that wayfinding signage would be important along the route             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most of these respondents felt that indication of distance to destinations would be useful</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt that average cycling/walking times to destinations would be useful</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt existing signage was poor, making wayfinding difficult and decreasing safety</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents felt that maps, with indication of current location, would be useful</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Clarity &amp; Visibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt the signs needed to be understandable by all users, including both local users and visitors             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt the signs needed to be clearly visible to all path users, including being kept clear of foliage and visible at night</li> <li>○ Some of these respondents felt the shared nature of the paths should be made clear on signage to avoid conflict</li> <li>○ A few of these respondents felt the font and colours used should be appropriate for those travelling at speed and those with visual difficulties including, colour blindness, to see</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>General positive comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme left general positive comments about the signage, wayfinding, and lighting choices</li> </ul>
<b>Not needed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the suggested options for signage and wayfinding were not needed</li> </ul>
<b>Minimal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that signage should be kept to a minimum to avoid confusing users</li> </ul>
<b>Lighting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that solar light studs would be beneficial to the route</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the solar light studs would not provide sufficient lighting, particularly during adverse weather</li> </ul>
<b>Equestrians</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that signage should include equestrian wayfinding</li> </ul>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the abbreviations of place names could be confusing for those not familiar to the area or confused for other locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these respondents felt that full places names would be more suitable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Question 8: Please comment if you feel any of these proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s**

289 respondents left comments about whether they felt the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any person/s or group/s that fall under the Equality Act 2010.

Summary of major themes

<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would be beneficial to those with disabilities, particularly element 1 'A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston' and element 2 'A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn'             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these users felt that access to the bridge for element 1 needed to be accessible by those with mobility aids and adapted cycles</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the width of shared use paths and the frequency and locations of dropped kerbs needed to take into consideration those using mobility aids and adapted cycles</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access should be included along the whole route to improve accessibility for disabled riders</li> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the shared use paths, feeling cyclists travelling at speed could put disabled users at risk</li> </ul>
<p><b>Positive</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt the proposals would have a positive impact on those with protected characteristics</li> </ul>
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would be beneficial to younger and older residents, particularly element 1 'A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston' and element 2 'A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn'             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these users felt that access to the bridge for element 1 needed to be accessible by older residents with mobility aids, younger residents needing pushchairs, and adapted cycles</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the width of shared use paths and the frequency and locations of dropped kerbs needed to take into consideration older</li> </ul>

	<p>residents using mobility aids, younger residents needing pushchairs, and adapted cycles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the shared use paths, feeling cyclists travelling at speed could put older/younger users at risk</li> </ul>
<b>Equestrians</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access needed to be included along the whole route</li> </ul>

## Stakeholders responses

### Background

38 responses were received on behalf of a number of different groups or organisations.

A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign	Junior Travel Ambassadors AND Year 5 students at Meldreth Primary School
Barton & District Bridleways Group	Melbourn County Councillor
Bhs access Cambs	Meldreth Primary School
British Horse Society	Meldreth Shepreth and Foxton Rail User Group
Cam Valley Forum	Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Community Rail Partnership
Cambridshire LAF	Natural England
Cambridge Biomedical Campus	North Hertfordshire District Council
Cambridge PPF	North Herts District Council - Royston and District Committee
Cambridge University Hospital	Pegasus Group
Cambridgeshire Wildlife Trust	Royston Cycling Club
Camcycle	Royston Town Council
Cycle Club Ashwell	Sartorius-Stedim Biotech
FeCRA	Shelford and District Bridleways Group
Foxton Parish Council	Swavesey & District Bridleways Association
Greener Sawston	Trumpington Residents Association
Harston Parish Council	TTP Labtech
Heidi Allen MP	Wildlife Trust
Hertfordshire County Council	
Hertfordshire County Councillor - Royston East and Ermine	
Highways England	
Johnson Matthey	

All of the responses from these groups have been made available to board members in full and will be published alongside the results of the public consultation survey. The following is a brief summary of the common themes expressed through this correspondence; it should be noted that stakeholder responses can contradict each other therefore we've made no reference to the relative merit or otherwise of the information received.

### Summary of major themes

<b>Element 1: A bridge over the A505 to connect the route to Royston &amp; Element 2: A new shared use path between Royston and Melbourn</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported these elements of the proposals, feeling it was an important area of improvement that would allow active travel users to access key areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Equestrian access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access was needed along all areas of the route</li> </ul>

<p><b>Element 10a: Route through Harston</b>  <b>Option a: Through the fields west of Harston</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option, feeling it offered a safe route away from main roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these stakeholders felt ‘Option b’ should also be implemented, as it was well used and offered connectivity to other areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this route option as they felt it would have a negative impact on the nearby environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Connecting to villages and other key areas</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that the Greenway should connect to other villages and key areas near to the route. Particular mention was made of the possible improvements to the route towards Meldreth and its train station, as they felt this was a key area for commuters</li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 10b: Route through Harston</b>  <b>Option b: Existing cycle route following A10 through Harston</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some of these stakeholders supported this route option as they felt it improved non-motorised user access for Harston residents. These stakeholders also felt that ‘Option a’ should be implemented as it offered a safe route away from main roads</li> <li>○ Some of these stakeholders supported this route option as it had less of an environmental impact on the area than ‘Option a’</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Environment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders who discussed this theme were concerned about the negative environmental impact of the off-road route elements (‘Element 10a: Route through Harston Option a: Through the fields west of Harston’ and ‘Element 13a: Route towards Trumpington: Option a: Country Park and village route’)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt the proposals would have a positive impact on those with disabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these stakeholders indicated equestrian access would be required in all areas to ensure it would have a positive impact on disabled riders</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 9: Shared use path and junction changes at Foxton Level Crossing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this element, feeling it would improve safety and access</li> </ul>

<p><b>Element 13a: Route towards Trumpington: Option a: Country Park and village route</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option as they felt it would provide safe off-road access to all non-motorised users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A few of these stakeholders felt the reduction in speed limit on Grantchester Road would not deter motorised vehicles from speeding in the area</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they opposed this route option as they felt the route through the Country Park would have a negative impact on the environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 8: Route through Foxton Options</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported 'Option a: Beside Foxton bypass', as this was currently a well-used route for cyclists</li> <li>• Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported 'Option b: Through Foxton Village' as this would improve access for Foxton residents and offered a quieter route away from the A10</li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 12: Resurface access bridge and improve approach ramps</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this element, feeling improved access for non-motorised users was needed here</li> <li>• Some of the stakeholders who discussed this theme queried if this was being proposed in parallel to the Cambridge South West Park &amp; Ride proposals or if one would supersede the other</li> </ul>
<p><b>Element 13b: Route towards Trumpington Option b: via Trumpington Park &amp; Ride</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported this route option as it would link with existing infrastructure and key areas</li> <li>• A few of the stakeholders who discussed this theme had concerns over the safety around the Busway for non-motorised users</li> </ul>



## Email, social media and consultation event responses

33 responses were received regarding the consultation through email and social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter. Following a thematic analysis of these responses the following themes have been noted.

### Summary of major themes

<b>Negative</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Respondents who discussed this theme left negative comments about the proposals, feeling they were not worth the cost involved with development<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Some of these respondents felt that cyclists would not use the cycle paths, instead using the main roads</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>Maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that maintenance of the route was of high importance<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Most of these respondents felt that existing routes and roads needed more maintenance</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>Equestrian access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Respondents who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access needed to be included along the whole route</li></ul>