



Sawston Greenway project:-

You said: We did

Summary of actions we have taken from the Public Engagement



Introduction

Following the public engagement exercise on the Sawston 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/sawston-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 – Long Road / Robinson Way junction	
You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users at the junction of Long Road and Robinson Way.	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 indicated your concerns at the perceived complexity of the design proposals for this junction, particularly the crossing arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists and the shared use area.	We will take on board this comment and will develop a junction at preliminary design stage which is less complex for active travel users and more intuitive, whilst retaining key safety features.
You suggested that as more cyclists were likely to be coming from the direction of Sedley Taylor Road, the proposed crossing of Long Road would be better located on this side of the junction. This was particularly relevant given the location of Long Road Sixth Form college,	We note this comment and will develop a design solution that will not disadvantage cyclists and pedestrians approaching the junction from the west, who wish to cross Long Road into Robinson Way. We are particularly mindful of the high volume of cyclists and pedestrians travelling to the Long Road Sixth Form College.

<p>the number of pupils and staff that cycle here and the desire lines to this location.</p>	
<p>You expressed a concern that the proposals might impede the movement of cyclists and pedestrians in an east-west direction along Long Road</p>	<p>This is noted and any updated design proposals will ensure that east-west movement for pedestrians and cyclists along the south side of Long Road is not unduly impeded through the crossing arrangement at Robinson Way.</p>
<p>SECTION 2 – Robinson Way</p>	
<p>You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users along Robinson Way.</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, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March</p>
<p>You suggested relocating the bi-directional path to the western side of carriageway (the opposite side to what was shown in the engagement proposals), which when combined with relocating the crossing at Long Road to west side of the junction provides more effective route to meet demand and will reduce the scale of pedestrians needing to cross on Robinson Way</p>	<p>We believe this suggestion has merit and will be considering this point in more detail as we develop the design for Robinson Way in more detail.</p>
<p>Linked to the above point you suggested your concern about the proposal for a bi-directional cycle path crossing several vehicular entrances on the east side of Robinson Way.</p>	<p>This point is noted and we will be considering this in more detail as we develop the design for Robinson Way in more detail.</p>
<p>You suggested a realignment of the route to avoid use of the school playing fields. It was noted that this will require removal of some of the existing line of trees on the west side of Robinson Way to enable construction of active travel path.</p>	<p>We believe this suggestion has merit and will be considering this point in more detail as we develop the design for Robinson Way in more detail</p>
<p>You suggested the proposed measures for active travel users off the carriageway on Robinson are unnecessary and that it would be better to focus on traffic calming and measures to</p>	<p>We have looked at the concept of a quiet street along Robinson Way where cyclists could safely share the road with other vehicular traffic, but the volumes of traffic counted along Robinson Way make a ‘Quiet Street’ approach unacceptable based on the guidance in LTN 1/20. We believe</p>

allow cyclists to share the road with vehicular traffic. This included the idea of raising the road surface to kerb height.	a shared use path, separate from the carriageway to be a more appropriate solution in this location.
You commented that it was vital to ensure pedestrians were 'looked after' as part of any design with safe footways on both sides of the road and safe crossing points.	This point is noted and is a key principle which will be taken forward into the updated design for Robinson Way.
You suggested that all side roads along Robinson Way would need to provide priority for active travel users in order for this provision to be effective.	We agree that this will be needed if the active travel path is delivered on the east side of the road. This will not be required if the path is delivered on the west side.
You requested that provision be made for equestrians	Given the urban environment in this location and lack of obvious demand we are proposing not to make provision for equestrians on this section.
You expressed concern that there is no detail of how the Robinson Way proposals integrate with what's happening on Francis Crick Way, or indeed what the proposals for an active travel route along Francis Crick Way are.	The active travel route proposals for Francis Crick Way are being delivered as part of the Cambridge South East Transport Strategy Phase 2 (CSET2). We will ensure the active travel route proposals for Robinson Way tie in safely and effectively with Francis Crick Way, taking into account the roundabout between these two roads.
SECTION 3 – Genome Path	
You outlined your broad support for improvements for active travel users along the Genome Path.	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 in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March
You expressed the view that lighting needs to be improved along the whole length of the Genome Path for it to be used at all times during the year. There was a concern that solar studs in the surface would provide inadequate lighting. Equally, some people were concerned about lighting in this rural location.	Lighting and types of lighting will be considered in more detail at the construction design stage, and a lighting strategy developed across the Greenways. Any proposals for lighting will consider the rural setting of this particular route section as well as environmental impacts and user safety.
You requested that the DNA sequence artwork along entire path length be relayed / improved as part of any proposals.	This point is noted. We will include some improvements to the DNA artwork as part of the final scheme but do not propose to relay the artwork.

<p>You suggested segregating cyclists and pedestrians along the length of the Genome Path for safety reasons.</p>	<p>We believe the present shared use path arrangements are acceptable in this location although we note signage may be required to encourage cyclists to note this is a shared use area and to be considerate to other users. Width constraints also mean it is difficult to accommodate a fully segregated route.</p>
<p>Ensure that the grass verges along the Genome Path are regularly mown and maintained for them to be useful for equestrians and soft surface users.</p>	<p>This comment is noted and will be passed onto the body responsible for ongoing maintenance of the Genome Path.</p>
<p>You expressed concern about present arrangement for access onto and across Granhams Road to rejoin the Genome Path. Several respondents said they can't see how our proposals changes or improves the present situation and that a robust proposal that gives equal priority to peds and cyclists over vehicles in this location is required.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and we will take into consideration as part of the ongoing work to update the design arrangements in this location.</p>
<p>SECTION 4 – Shelford Station</p>	
<p>You outlined your broad support for the proposals through this section, especially improved access to Shelford Station.</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, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p>
<p>You suggested that you were unsure of the benefits of taking the proposed route through Mill Court when Chaston Road is already relatively quiet.</p>	<p>We agree with these comments and will take the proposal for routing through Mill Court out of the proposals.</p>
<p>You expressed concern that proposals for a 20mph zone on Chaston Road would be ignored.</p>	<p>The provision of a 20mph zone along Chaston Road would help to make the route safer and more attractive to active travel users. The comments will be taken into account as part of the updated design proposals.</p>
<p>You suggested that Hinton Way was quite busy and that any proposed crossing across Hinton Way needs to be signal controlled or otherwise not as</p>	<p>We will take these comments into consideration as part of the arrangements for the updated design.</p>

complex as the arrangements in the current proposal.	
You suggested that the proposal for a raised table at the junction at the junction of Hinton Way / Station Road and Leeway Road was a good idea. However, a few respondents also thought it was unnecessary as the level crossing slows down vehicles adequately.	On balance we think the proposal for a raised table at this junction is a good one and will help with the creation of an uncontrolled crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists which will improve safety for these users.
SECTION 5 – Stapleford village	
You outlined your broad support for the proposed improvements for active travel users through this section.	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 in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.
You suggested increasing / enhancing the proposed level of measures for pedestrians and cyclists along Mingle Lane and Church Street due to the high vehicle speeds recorded along these roads.	We will consider whether there is scope for enhancing the level of traffic calming measures as part of the design update.
You stated that the road surface along Mingle Lane is currently very poor and that this would need to be improved for cyclists.	Resurfacing of Mingle Lane falls outside of the scope of the Sawston greenway. However, GCP are working closely with the Highway Authority at Cambridgeshire County Council who are aware of this issue. Any future repairs to the existing road surface along Mingle Lane will be coordinated with GCP to ensure a safe and collaborative approach.
You suggested revising the proposed layout at the junction of Church Street and London Road (A1301) to reduce risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians outside the shop entrance	We agree this would be a sensible thing to consider so we will look at this in more detail as part of the next stage of design.
You suggested relocating the proposals to widen the shared use path from the southern side of the road to the northern side of carriageway on London Road (A1301) between the junctions of Church Street and Bury	This will be considered as part of the preliminary design proposals once we know more information about utilities buried in the footway and verge at this location.

Road, as it appears that there is more space to accommodate on this side of the road	
You suggested the need to make provision for equestrians along this section, particularly along the off-road section of path parallel to the Cambridge Road.	We agree that provision for equestrians should be made on the off-road section of path parallel to the Cambridge Road
SECTION 6 – Dernford Reservoir	
There was a good level of support for the proposals generally, particularly the section of the route adjacent to the railway line towards the reservoir, although it was felt this should ideally be wider than the 3m path currently shown.	<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, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p> <p>The exact widths of the shared use path at specific locations will be determined as part of preliminary design. However, it is noted that a width of greater than 3m is unlikely to be achieved for the entire length of the railway alignment due to a number of key width constraints.</p>
You provided comments suggesting that this section represents a long way around compared to using the London Rd A1301 and consequently some doubt over whether people will actually use it.	These comments are noted. We feel that there is merit in providing an off-road connection for active travel users along the railway alignment and past Dernford Reservoir.
There was some concern about the cost of the proposals to build an active travel path adjacent to the railway and whether approval could actually be secured from Network Rail.	These comments are noted and will be considered as part of design development and discussions with stakeholders.
Some respondents were concerned that the path to the north of Dernford Reservoir area is quiet and doesn't have active frontages so they suggested better to keep cyclists and peds through the urban area.	These comments are noted. We feel that there is merit in providing an off-road connection for active travel users along the railway alignment and past Dernford Reservoir.
You suggested the need to make provision for equestrians along this section	We will consider this and review existing and likely future demand for equestrian use through this section as part of the next round of design.

<p>You suggested considering another access point through the Wedd joinery estate</p>	<p>An additional alignment via Wedds joinery will not be considered as part of preliminary design, as this is private land and falls outside the scope.</p>
<p>SECTION 7 – A1301 / Cambridge Road junction</p>	
<p>You were broadly supportive of the proposals for active travel users at the junction of A1301 and Cambridge Road and a new shared path alongside the A1301 south of the junction with Cambridge Road.</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, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p>
<p>You suggested creating a less complicated crossing arrangement here. The current proposal shows 3 controlled crossings which was deemed to be excessive and over-complex.</p>	<p>We will revisit the proposals for this junction as part of the preliminary design development.</p>
<p>You provided some comments requesting that provision be made for equestrians alongside the A1301.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and will be considered as part of design development.</p>
<p>You supported a speed reduction through this section</p>	<p>These comments are noted</p>
<p>SECTION 8 – A1301 Shared Use Path</p>	
<p>You indicated your general support for the proposals in this section</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, outlined in more detail in this document. A summary of public and stakeholder feedback will go to our Executive Board in March.</p>
<p>You wanted to make sure a buffer between the new proposed shared use path and general traffic is sufficiently wide.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and we will ensure a buffer which meets the design standards for the A1301 is provided.</p>
<p>You suggested that ideally a new shared use path along this section would be wider than 3m.</p>	<p>We propose that a 3m wide path along this section, plus potentially a soft surface strip (grass) is adequate.</p>
<p>You suggested that ideally you would like to see the path extended down to the junction with the A505 / Whittlesford Parkway station</p>	<p>This proposal is out of the Sawston Greenway scope and has not been budgeted for. The Sawston Greenway will terminate to the west of the existing A1301/ Mill Lane junction, nearest the old Spicers site. From here, there is an existing connection to Whittlesford via National Cycle Route 11.</p>

