

Produced by the Cambridgeshire Research Group



Transport Strategy Stakeholder Engagement 2022: Summary report of engagement survey results

'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

For more information about the team phone 01223 715300

Document Details	
Title:	Transport Strategy Stakeholder Engagement 2022: Summary report of engagement survey results
Date Created:	03/08/22
Description:	
Produced by:	Cambridgeshire County Council Business Intelligence Service
On behalf of:	Cambridgeshire County Council
Geographic Coverage:	Cambridgeshire
Format:	PDF
Key Contact	Aaron.Rowinski@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk
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.

Introduction

Between 9 May 2022 and 19 June 2022 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) held an engagement exercise with stakeholders about three draft Strategies: Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire, Fenland Transport Strategy, and Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. This consisted of a survey allowing stakeholders to give their thoughts on one or more of these Strategies in order to help shape and develop them for later consultation.

A number of groups and individuals of interest were contacted to take part, these included:

- County Councillors
- District / Ward Councillors
- Parish / Town Councils
- MPs
- East Midlands Railway
- Network Rail
- Greater Anglia Trains
- Stagecoach East
- Stagecoach East Midlands
- Go Whippet (Tower Transit)
- Care Network
- Local Access Forum
- Cambridgeshire ACRE
- Cross Country Trains
- Cambridge Ahead
- Camsight
- Alzheimer's Society
- Rail Future
- Disability Cambridgeshire
- Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum
- COPE
- Sustrans
- Camcycle
- Logistics UK (formerly Freight Transport Association)
- Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- Cambridge University
- Cambridge Past Present and Future
- Travel Plan Manager, Environment and Energy, University of Cambridge
- British Horse Society County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire
- Campaign for Better Transport
- Cambridge Deaf Association
- Natural England
- Ramblers Association
- Living Streets
- Road Haulage Association (Policy Team)
- Age UK Cambridgeshire
- Confederation of Passenger Transport Users
- Mind in Cambridgeshire
- Voiceability
- Cambridgeshire Walkers
- Headway Cambridgeshire
- National Autistic Society
- The Byways and Bridleways Trust
- CPRE Cambridgeshire & Peterborough
- Motor Neurone Disease Association
- Swavesey and District Bridleway Association
- Cambridge & District Riding Club
- Cambridge Ethnic Communities Forum
- Voluntary & Community Action East Cambs
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- Royal British Legion Royal Naval Association - Hunts district
- Royal Naval Association
- Encompass Network
- Diamonds

- Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Liftshare
- Cambs Youth Panel
- Police
- The Kite Trust
- Fenland Transport and Access Group
- FACT Community Transport
- Chatteris Cycling Club
- Fenland Ramblers
- Golden Age Partnership
- Hereward Community Rail Partnership
- Fenland Bridleways Group
- Hunts Walking and Cycling Group
- Huntingdonshire Ramblers
- St Ives Eco Action
- Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre
- Dews Coaches
- Disability Information Service Huntingdonshire
- Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport
- Huntingdonshire Chamber of Commerce
- Loves Farm Community Association
- Natural Cambridgeshire
- Ramsey Neighbourhood Trust
- Robinson Coaches, Kimbolton
- St Ives Town Initiative
- Urban & Civic
- Civic Society of St Ives
- Ely Cycling Campaign C2C (Cycling UK)
- Walk Cambridge
- Cambridge Ramblers
- Milton Cycling Campaign
- Swavesey and District Bridleway Association
- British Horse Society
- BHS Officer in Girton area
- Zedify/Outspoken Women on Wheels
- Waterbeach Cycling Campaign
- A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign
- Centre 33
- Smarter Cambridge Transport
- Ely Society
- Ely Youth Forum
- A to B1102 Group (Burwell to Lode)


Respondent profile

71 responses were received on the survey. Please note, the low numbers of responses to this survey means that small numbers of respondents can have a large impact on the overall results.

Question 1: Are you responding as (please select all that apply)

All respondents answered question 1, which asked who they were responding as. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.

Figure 1: Stakeholder Classification



- Nearly half of respondents indicated they were responding as a “Parish/Town Council”
- Other responses included:
 - A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign Chair
 - Burwell Car Scheme
 - Citizen
 - Hunts Ramblers
 - Parish Meeting
 - LA Officer
 - Liftshare.com Limited
 - Parish Councillor
 - Planning Policy / Local Plan Team Fenland District Council

- Secretary of Swavesey & District Bridleways Association
- Whittlesea Station Adopter

Question 2: Please specify your name and/or organisation / parish / town council. If you do not wish to provide your details please type NA here.

All respondents answered question 2 which asked for them to specify their name and/or organisation/parish/town council. Respondents could enter “NA” if they did not wish to provide details. These responses were:


- Barry Stuart, Tadlow Parish Meeting
- Bartlow Parish Meeting. Joe Baily (Clerk) and Duncan Ogilvy (Chairman)
- Bill Handley
- British Horse Society
- British Horse Society - Lynda Warth
- Burwell Car Scheme
- Burwell Car Scheme Janey Gostlow
- Bythorn and keyston parish council
- Camcycle
- Chris Boden
- Cllr Jeff Clarke Ramsey Town and Huntingdonshire District
- Cllr Lara Davenport-Ray, Huntingdonshire District Council, Environment Lead
- Cllr Nathan Hunt
- Cllr. Mark Inskip, East Cambs District Council
- Conington Parish Council
- David Jones, Stakeholder Manager, CrossCountry Trains
- Dr Adam Bostanci, Meldreth Parish Council
- Elton Parish Council
- Ely Cycling Campaign
- FACT Community Transport
- Fenstanton parish council
- Gabriel Bienzobas - Milton Cycling Campaign
- Gamlingay Parish Council
- Gareth Martin - Planning Policy / Local Plan Team Fenland District Council
- Gavin Booth
- Geoff Howes - volunteer station adopter at Whittlesea (Greater Anglia)
- Great & Little Eversden Parish Council
- Great Staughton Parish Council
- Great Wilbraham Parish Council
- Hail Weston
- Harston Parish Council
- Haslingfield Parish Council
- Houghton & Wyton Parish Council
- Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre - Huntingdon Office
- Hunts Walking & Cycling Group - supporting active travel <http://tinyurl.com/HuntsWalkCycle>
- Hunts Walking and Cycling Group
- Ian Taylor
- John Peal - Yelling Parish Council
- Josh Grantham/ camcycle
- Lee Ginger, Chair Whaddon Parish Council
- Lesley McFarlane, South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- Little Abington Parish Council
- Little Paxton Parish Council
- Martin Hassall – Huntingdonshire District Councillor – Buckden, Diddington and Southoe ward
- Meldreth
- N/A

- Neil Morton Alconbury Weston Parish Council
- Nick Downer, Chairman, Shepreth Parish Council (in a personal capacity)
- Nicola Webster - Clerk to Hilton Parish Council
- Pam Collis Fulbourn Community Car Scheme
- Philippa Hope Bluntisham Parish Council
- Ramsey Neighbourhoods Trust
- Ramsey Town Council
- RHA
- Ros Hathorn, Histon & Impington Division
- S. ASCROFT, YELLING PARISH COUNCIL CHAIRMAN
- Sarah Conboy Ward Cllr Godmanchester, Hemingford Abbots and the Offords
- Stephen Thompson, Haddenham Parish Council
- Steve Count, Cambridgeshire County Council, Fenland District Council
- Steven Rossin (Footpath Officer) Hunts Ramblers
- Sue Rogers, Secretary of Swavesey & District Bridleways Association
- Susan Latham Liftshare.com Limited"
- Susan van de Ven, Cambs County Council, South Cambs District Council, A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign.
- Swaffham Bulbeck Parish Council
- The Eversdens Cycling Campaign
- the Great Ouse Valley Trust
- Tracey Hope - Parish Clerk Bluntisham Parish Council
- Wicken Parish Council
- Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council
- Yelling Parish Council

Question 3: What draft transport strategies are you interested in commenting on? Please tick all that apply.

All respondents answered question 3, which asked what draft transport strategies they were interested in commenting on. Respondents could select multiple answers to this question.

Figure 2: Draft Strategies interested in commenting on




Draft Fenland Transport Strategy

Please note, the low numbers of responses to this survey means that small numbers of respondents can have a large impact on the overall results.

Question 4: Do you agree with the Fenland Transport Strategy Vision? To prioritise and develop a connected and inclusive transport network in Fenland. A network that will enable more people to access employment, education, healthcare and everyday services by a range of transport modes. There is a key focus on active or sustainable travel to improve opportunities, the health and wellbeing of Fenland residents and the environment they live in, now and for future generations.

12 respondents answered question 4, which asked if they agreed with the Fenland Transport Strategy Vision.

Figure 3: Agreement with the Fenland Transport Strategy Vision



- The majority of respondents indicated they 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the Fenland Transport Strategy Vision (9 respondents)

Question 5: Please provide any comments on the draft vision for the Fenland Transport Strategy.


11 respondents left comments on question 5, which asked for comments on the draft vision for the Fenland Transport Strategy. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed included:

- Concerns the vision was not specific to Fenland and didn't take into consideration some of the specific geographical challenges the rurality of Fenland faced
- That there is a lack of public transport across Fenland, particularly around villages
- That private car use will likely dominate other modes of transport across Fenland due to its geography, so usage shouldn't be punished and lift sharing schemes promoted
- Concerns about the safety of the roads due to the use of open drains and high vehicle speeds
- That improvements needed greater focus on village accessibility
- That improvements should focus on multi-modal transport options and improving connectivity between services
- That signage to active travel routes should be improved
- That train services should stop at towns they pass through and that there should be more rail services
- That equestrian access, particularly to cycle routes, should be included
- That freight and coach services should also be prioritised
- That community transport initiatives and services should be prioritised

Question 6: Do you agree with the Fenland Transport Strategy Objectives?
Enable residents to live fit and healthy lifestyles, as they are able, by developing and promoting a connected, safe and viable active travel network and improving wellbeing Support the needs of the local economy by developing better connectivity to places of education, retail, employment and healthcare Reduce the impact of rural isolation on the day-to-day life and future prospects of Fenland residents by developing better access solutions to key services and facilities Meet the challenge of climate change and enhance the natural environment by encouraging people to travel more sustainably

12 respondents answered question 6, which asked if they agreed with the Fenland Transport Strategy Objectives.

Figure 4: Agreement with the Fenland Transport Strategy Objectives



- The majority of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the Fenland Transport Strategy Objectives (9 respondents)

Question 7: Please provide any comments on the draft objectives for the Fenland Transport Strategy.


11 respondents left comments on question 7, which asked for comments on the draft objectives for the Fenland Transport Strategy. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed were similar to those for question 5 with the additions of:

- The need for the objectives to prioritise transport not health
- That provision for electric vehicles should be included
- That there should be more active travel routes, particularly between villages, and existing ones should have better maintenance
- That there should be a Park & Ride service to Peterborough

Question 8: Which of the following do you / your organisation consider to be the most important three (3) transport related issues in Fenland.

12 respondents answered question 8, which asked what they/their organisation considered to be the three most important transport related issues in Fenland. Respondents could select up to three answers.

Figure 5: Most important transport related issues in Fenland




- The top three responses for the most important transport issues in Fenland were: 'lack of public transport' (9 respondents), 'lack of connectivity and accessibility' (7 respondents) and 'road safety' (5 respondents)

Question 9: Do you agree the policies in the Fenland Transport Strategy are the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives?

12 respondents answered question 9, which asked if they agreed the policies in the Fenland Transport Strategy are the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives.

Figure 6: Agreement with the Fenland Transport Strategy policies



- The majority of respondents 'agreed' the policies in Fenland were the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives (7 respondents)
 - No respondents 'strongly agreed' to this

Question 10: Please provide any other comments on the draft policies. If there are any topics/issues not covered where a policy would be useful please include this below. Please refer to policy numbers or page numbers where applicable.

8 respondents left comments on question 10, which asked for any other comments on the draft policies. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed included:

- That there is a lack of public transport across Fenland, particularly around villages and more reliable rail/bus services were needed
- Concerns about road safety, particularly due to the high speed of motorised vehicles
- Concerns that the policies were too generalised and that they needed greater ambition to address Fenland's issues
- That more improvements were needed to public transport and active travel routes for villages
- That support was needed for hydrogen powered vehicles and autonomous vehicles
- That equestrian access, particularly to cycle routes, should be included and surface changes should consider equestrian user needs
- That Local Highway Improvement bids should be improved to consider the areas covered
- That policies discussing Biodiversity Net Gain should make it clear that Fenland's commitment is different to Cambridgeshire County Council's

Question 11: General Comments: We welcome your views. If you have any comments on any part of the draft strategy, please add them in the space available below. Please refer to page numbers or specific sections where applicable.

9 respondents left comments on question 11, which asked for general comments.

Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed included:

- That there is a lack of public transport across Fenland, particularly around villages and more reliable rail/bus services were needed
- That there were geographical issues with Fenland as it is very rural and this needed taking into consideration with the delivery of policies
- That objectives needed to be clearly deliverable and not “left on the shelf”
- That car sharing should be explored as a possible solution
- That support was needed for hydrogen powered vehicles and autonomous vehicles
- That support was needed for e-bikes/e-scooters etc as a possible solution to the long distance of active travel routes
- That equestrian access, particularly to cycle routes, should be included and surface changes should consider equestrian user needs
- That major interventions were needed to improve transport around Fenland
- That improvements should focus on multi-modal transport options and improving connectivity between services
- That there needed to be more enforcement of speed limits across Fenland

Question 12: Are there any aspects of the transport system in Fenland which do not work well?

8 respondents left comments on question 12, which asked if there were any aspects of the transport system in Fenland that did not work well.

- Most respondents felt that the **public transport system** did not work well, as it had a lack of connectivity between villages/towns, did not run late/early enough, lacked connectivity between modes (particularly rail and buses), and lacked capacity
- Some respondents felt that **active travel** did not work well enough, as there was a lack of safe (mainly due to motor vehicle speeds), well maintained routes between villages and towns.
 - One respondent also felt there was a need for improved bridleway routes in rural areas
- Some respondents felt that **congestion** was becoming progressively more of an issue, particularly in towns such as March and Whittlesey. These respondents felt there needed to be more resilience in the road network and ways of re-routing traffic away from town centres. There was also concerns about the general standard and maintenance of the roads.

Question 13: Walking and Cycling: Please let us know where in Fenland you think walking and/or cycling improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

6 respondents left comments on question 13, which asked if there were any walking and/or cycling improvements that were needed in Fenland. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Most respondents felt there needed to be more active travel **connectivity between villages and towns**, highlighting that where there was provision it was on roads where motor vehicles speeds were high
- Other comments highlighted the need for better maintenance, lighting/CCTV, and signage of routes as well as more crossing points and dropped curbs

Question 14: Public Transport: Please let us know where in Fenland you think public transport improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

7 respondents left comments on question 14, which asked if there were any public transport improvements that were needed in Fenland. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Most respondents felt there was a need for public transport services **connecting villages with towns and public transport services to other areas**
- A few respondents felt there was a need for a **circular public transport service around towns in Fenland**
- Other comments highlighted the need for better running hours and whether the services could be tied in with other public transport initiatives, such as those transporting children to school

Question 15: Safety Improvements: Please let us know where in Fenland you think safety improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

8 respondents left comments on question 15, which asked if there were any safety improvements that were needed in Fenland. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Some respondents felt that **speed limits** needed to be reduced and enforced, particularly in populated areas
- A few respondents felt there needed to be more safety improvements **around schools**, particularly discouraging parking outside entrances and improving crossing points
- Other comments highlighted the need for junction improvements, safety improvements on active travel routes, more lighting/CCTV, better maintenance of roads/active travel routes, and equestrian access. There was also confirmation a safety partnership would be beneficial

Question 16: Other Transport Improvement: Please let us know where in Fenland you think other improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

7 respondents left comments on question 16, which asked if there were any other transport improvements that were needed in Fenland. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams. Comments mostly reiterated points made in the previous questions. Exceptions were:

- Introducing a busway with segregated cycleway for Cambridge to Chatteris and, if the rail connection couldn't be confirmed, Wisbech to March
- That the Local Highway Improvement system needed to be overhauled
- That the A47 needed to be dualled


Draft Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy

Please note, the low numbers of responses to this survey means that small numbers of respondents can have a large impact on the overall results.

Question 17: Do you agree with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Vision? To help tackle climate change and support growth within Huntingdonshire, allowing the economy to thrive, while promoting and enhancing active travel and tackling existing congestion.

35 respondents answered question 17, which asked if they agreed with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Vision.

Figure 7: Agreement with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Vision



- The majority of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Vision (29 respondents)

Question 18: Please provide any comments on the draft vision for the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy.


17 respondents left comments on question 18, which asked for comments on the draft vision for the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed included:

- That they couldn't comment as there was no link to the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy
- That more focus was needed on improvements to active travel to achieve the vision
- Discussions about the wording, specifically a positive comment on the use of "thrive" rather than "grow", a comment on whether the strategy should focus on "green growth" as this needed to take precedent, and a comment on how growth was defined (whether in terms of economic, population, housing, GVA per capita, etc)
- That more focus was needed on connecting rural communities
- That tackling congestion was important, but with some concerns about the methods of doing so and whether this would result in congestion moving elsewhere
- The need to focus on improving public transport
- Discussions about what was needed to enable the vision to tackle climate change (active travel improvements, alternative transport methods, etc) or whether climate change should be addressed
- Concerns about the growth stemming from Peterborough and how this was being managed for Huntingdonshire
- The need for more lift sharing initiatives
- The need for affordable, equal access to transport
- The need to maintain public rights of way

Question 19: Do you agree with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Objectives? Enhancing the natural environment, tackling the challenges of climate change by meeting Cambridgeshire County Council’s carbon targets, and supporting Huntingdonshire District Council’s commitment of net zero carbon by 2040. Enabling residents to access the services they need to enjoy a good quality of life. Enabling residents to live a safe, fit and active lifestyle by supporting and investing in active travel infrastructure. Supporting the needs of the local economy and potential growth and tackling existing traffic congestion.

35 respondents answered question 19, which asked if they agreed with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Objectives.

Figure 8: Agreement with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Objectives



- The majority of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ with the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy Objectives (27 respondents)

Question 20: Please provide any comments on the draft objectives for the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy.


17 respondents left comments on question 20, which asked for comments on the draft objectives for the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed were similar to those for question 5 with the additions of:

- The need for more ambitious and clear objectives to achieve the net zero target ahead of time
 - Two respondents indicated that they felt carbon and climate initiatives were not important
- The need for better maintenance of routes, particularly active travel routes
- The need for equestrian access on all active travel routes
- Debate about adding in provision for electric vehicles, namely charging points, and whether a focus on this would actually be of long-term benefit as it would not reduce congestion
- The need to also consider the transport accessibility of leisure services

Question 21: Which of the following do you / your organisation consider to be the most important three (3) transport related issues in Huntingdonshire.

34 respondents answered question 21, which asked what they/their organisation considered to be the three most important transport related issues in Huntingdonshire. Respondents could select up to three answers.

Figure 9: Most important transport related issues in Huntingdonshire



- Over half of respondents felt that 'lack of public transport' was one of the three most important transport related issues in Huntingdonshire (18 respondents)
 - Over two fifths felt 'road safety' was one of the three most important issues (15 respondents)
 - Just over two fifth felt it was 'increasing volumes of traffic' (14 respondents)
 - Just under two fifths felt it was 'lack of cycling infrastructure' (13 respondents) or 'lack of connectivity and accessibility' (13 respondents)

Question 22: General Comments: We welcome your views. If you have any comments on any part of the draft strategy, please add them in the space available below. Please refer to page numbers or specific sections where applicable.

16 respondents left comments on question 22, which asked for general comments.

- Some respondents felt there needed to be more **active travel improvements**, particularly making more routes (namely to/between rural locations and towns), better maintaining of surfaces, more lighting/CCTV, and more signage
- Some respondents felt there needed to be **better transport provision to/from rural locations**, particularly active travel and public transport
- Some respondents felt that **housing provision and applications needed to show more consideration of existing pressures on the transport network and provide public transport/active travel access as part of their development**
- Other comments highlighted the need for more safety improvements, lowered and enforced speed limits, ways of reducing congestion (particularly HGV traffic in villages), consideration of noise pollution, provision for lift share services, more crossing points, equestrian access, transport access to leisure services, junction improvements, consideration/protection of public rights of way, and that more detailed information was needed

Question 23: Are there any aspects of the transport system in Huntingdonshire which do not work well?

22 respondents left comments on question 23, which asked if there were any aspects of the transport system in Huntingdonshire that did not work well.

- Most respondents felt that there was a lack of safe, connected, active travel routes in Huntingdonshire, particularly between villages/towns, leaving users to travel on roads with high vehicle speeds. These respondents also highlighted that there was a lack of ongoing maintenance of existing paths, making journeys dangerous and less accessible
 - A few of these respondents highlighted the need for pedestrian routes that were segregated from cyclists due to safety concerns
- Most respondents felt that there was a lack of bus services connecting towns/villages and that they did not operate for long enough hours. The Ting service was mentioned by a few respondents who, although felt it had helped, highlighted the limited running hours and service area
- Some respondents highlighted specific areas where congestion was a concern. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.
- Other comments highlighted the need for additional crossing points, more cycle parking, reduction/rerouting of HGV traffic, for reduced speed limits and increased enforcement, improvements to junction safety (particularly visibility and crossings), more multimodal connectivity, and consideration of the rural isolation of areas of Huntingdonshire for transport improvements and economic developments

Question 24: Walking and Cycling: Please let us know where in Huntingdonshire you think walking and/or cycling improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

24 respondents left comments on question 24, which asked if there were any walking and/or cycling improvements that were needed in Huntingdonshire. The majority of respondents discussed individual areas and were too disparate to form any themes. These specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Other comments highlighted the need for better maintenance of vegetation and surface repair, more crossing points and dropped curbs, the need to be careful active travel infrastructure didn't negatively impact on public transport or congestion, for more cycle parking, trial of the e-bikes/scooters as Cambridge had, wider paths, and segregation of cyclists and pedestrians

Question 25: Public Transport: Please let us know where in Huntingdonshire you think public transport improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

20 respondents left comments on question 25, which asked if there were any public transport improvements that were needed in Huntingdonshire. The majority of respondents discussed individual areas and were too disparate to form any themes. These specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Other comments discussed the Ting service and whether they felt it was positive or negative as well as ways it could be improved, the need for buses to have extended running hours, the need for integrated ticketing, the need for the bus stock to be updated to electric, and the need for the school bus service to be timetabled better to avoid children arriving late for school

Question 26: Safety Improvements: Please let us know where in Huntingdonshire you think safety improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

25 respondents left comments on question 26, which asked if there were any safety improvements that were needed in Huntingdonshire. The majority of respondents discussed individual areas where junctions, general maintenance of surfaces and paths, and crossing points needed safety improvements and were too disparate to form any themes. 2 respondents mentioned the Wheatsheaf Crossroads. These specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

- Other comments highlighted the need for equestrian access to active travel routes, the need to enforce speed limits and parking restrictions, and that they felt more bus usage would improve safety

Question 27: Other Transport Improvement: Please let us know where in Huntingdonshire you think other improvements are needed. If you could use a street name or postcode this would be of great help.

17 respondents left comments on question 27, which asked if there were any other transport improvements that were needed in Huntingdonshire. Specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams. Comments reiterated points made in the previous questions.


Draft Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire

Please note, the low numbers of responses to this survey means that small numbers of respondents can have a large impact on the overall results.

Question 28: Vision and Objectives: Do you agree with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Vision? Active travel will be embraced in all transport policies, projects, investment and development in Cambridgeshire, prioritising cycling and walking and associated travel modes. We will create a well-connected, safe and inclusive active travel network that will become the 'go-to' travel option for many local journeys.

51 respondents answered question 28, which asked if they agreed with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Vision.

Figure 10: Agreement with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Vision



- The majority of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Vision (41 respondents)

Question 29: Please provide any comments on the draft vision for the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire.


31 respondents left comments on question 29, which asked for comments on the draft vision for the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire.

- Some respondents discussed the need for more consideration to the rural nature of Cambridgeshire, with more focus on supporting villages to become connected to active travel routes or removing the need for longer journeys
- Some respondents felt the needs of those unable to walk or cycle (due to age or disability) weren't addressed within the strategy
- Other comments included:
 - statements of agreement
 - concerns about cyclist safety (particularly around motorised vehicles and their speeds, junctions, and the width of roads)
 - the need for equestrian access
 - concerns about surfaces suitable for equestrians conflicting with safe cycling surfaces
 - that active travel is weather dependent
 - the need for more public transport improvements
 - specific wording suggestions
 - the need for clear wording
 - concerns about the vulnerability of pedestrians from cyclists and need for segregated paths
 - the need for more maintenance of routes
 - the need to reallocate space from motorised vehicles to active travel
 - the need for more investment
 - the need for improvements to be implemented quickly
 - the need for more cycle parking (including for homes) and repair facilities
 - the need for bike space on other modes of transport
 - the need for lift sharing
 - the need for local members to be educated on the benefits of active travel
 - the need to include rights of way access
 - and the need to encourage school travel to be primarily active travel

Question 30: Do you agree with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Objectives? 1. Embrace a clear deliverable vision for a high quality, safe and connected active travel network across Cambridgeshire that will enable and encourage journeys currently being made by car to be taken by foot or cycle. This will support achieving Net Zero Carbon by 2045, and a healthier, more active Cambridgeshire. 2. Focus on shorter local journeys, as well as capturing the increased potential for longer journeys to be taken by active or sustainable travel modes alongside e-bikes and public transport. An integrated network will better connect both urban and rural communities to local facilities, improving social inclusion, physical and mental health, and wellbeing. 3. Deliver significant step-change in active travel provision across the county, by improving internal processes and collaborative working with key partners and developers. We will ensure active travel is embedded and prioritised in all future decision-making, projects, schemes, and policies at all levels. 4. Ensure the existing and future Active Travel network is fit for purpose by; a) Ensuring active travel is considered as part of all transport schemes and developments at the outset; and b) Exploring new ways to prioritise maintenance of active travel infrastructure, addressing the importance that well maintained routes have on sustained use; and c) Embedding a 'whole life cycle' approach to scheme development, ensuring all schemes are designed and funded to minimise the ongoing maintenance cost. 5. Explore new ways to promote and encourage active travel and support initiatives that create behaviour change and modal shift to active travel modes, including the issue of 'knowing what's out there'. Look holistically at the shared experience and influences that make walking or cycling an attractive option as a form of travel.

50 respondents answered question 30, which asked if they agreed with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Objectives.

Figure 11: Agreement with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Objectives



- The majority of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire Objectives (42 respondents)

Question 31: Please provide any comments on the draft objectives for the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire.


32 respondents left comments on question 31, which asked for comments on the draft objectives for the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire. Most comments reiterated points made in question 29, comments where these differed included:

- Concerns there was a lack of clear targets as part of the objectives
- The need to consider leisure journeys as part of the objectives
- The need for a focus on Fenland due to the current limited provision available there
- The need for language in the documentation to be clear for general members of the public to understand
- The need for cyclists to be taxed and insured as other road users
- The need to have continuous routes developed
- The need highlight the other environmental benefits, such as reduced noise and air pollution, from increased active travel

Question 32: Do you agree the policies in the Active Travel Strategy are the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives?

50 respondents answered question 32, which asked if they agreed the policies in the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire are the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives.

Figure 12: Agreement with the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire policies



- The majority of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ the policies in the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire are the right ones to deliver its vision and objectives (34 respondents)

Question 33: Please provide any other comments on the draft policies. If there are any topics/issues not covered where a policy would be useful please include this below. Please refer to policy numbers or page numbers where applicable.

27 respondents left comments on question 33, which asked for any other comments on the draft policies for the Active Travel Strategy for Cambridgeshire. Most comments reiterated points made in question 29 and 31, comments where these differed included:

- The need for clear follow through of the policies and their objectives
- The need for more lighting on active travel routes
- Concerns that new developments had not “baked in” active travel and nearby amenities

Question 34: General Comments: We welcome your views. If you have any comments on any part of the draft strategy, please add them in the space available below. Please refer to page numbers or specific sections where applicable.

27 respondents left comments on question 34, which asked for general comments. Most of the comments reiterated points made in the previous questions, comments where these differed included:

- The need for the Local Highway Improvement bids to be rethought out, as it was felt to “pit villages against each other”
- The need for more Low Traffic Neighbourhoods
- The need for clear maps of active travel routes
- The need to look at places that have been missed in previous active travel schemes
- The need to look at and possibly incorporate Travel Management Plans held by local businesses and business parks
- The need for the Road Classification Scheme to be extended out across Cambridgeshire

Question 35: Suggestions for improvements to the Active Travel network in Cambridgeshire: What aspect(s) of the active travel network in Cambridgeshire does not work well?

31 respondents left comments on question 35, which asked what aspect(s) of the active travel network in Cambridgeshire do not work well. Other than comments discussing specific areas (which have been passed onto the development teams), other comments reiterated points made in the previous questions. Comments included:

- There was a lack of rural connectivity, particularly around Huntingdonshire and Fenland
- There was also a need for improvements to the public transport network to help disincentivise car use
- There were safety concerns around active travel routes near main roads due to HGVs and vehicles speeds, with there also being a need for better enforcement
- There was a need for better maintenance of routes
- There was a need to take equestrian users into consideration with route and path designs
- There was a need to consider potential conflicts between active travel modes and ensure there was suitable segregation
- There was a need to consider those unable to walk or cycle and ensure they were not being excluded
- There was a need to improve junction designs to improve active travel safety
- There was a need to ensure routes were all well connected and residents could access local services/amenities, including those cross boundary
- There was a need for better consultation and involvement of local parishes and residents
- There was a need to ensure the best value was being made for the money spent

Question 36: Please let us know of any walking improvements or cycling improvements that are not already included in the Transport Investment Plan (including LCWIP schemes), within district owned strategies, or raised in past consultations (see list above) that would help achieve the vision and objectives of this Strategy. Please be specific, including locations where applicable.

31 respondents left comments on question 36, which asked if there were any walking or cycling improvements that would help achieve the vision and objectives of the Strategy. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis, however, specific areas mentioned have been passed onto the development teams.

Question 37: Please let us know of any schemes or initiatives that you feel would encourage more people to leave their car at home and travel by active modes in Cambridgeshire. If you know of good examples whether locally or elsewhere, please provide details below.

32 respondents left comments on question 37, which asked if there were any schemes or initiatives that would encourage people to leave their car at home and travel by active travel modes in Cambridgeshire. Responses were too disparate for thematic analysis but areas discussed included:

- Suggestions for locations relevant to the respondent for walking/cycling improvements
- Suggestions for locations relevant to the respondent for public transport routes as well as general improvements to the service running times and ticket costs
- Improvements to the running times and cost of the Park & Ride services, citing the changes to timetables and pricing as the reason they felt the service was now less well used, as well as requests for more locations
- Suggestions for locations road closures could work well or general suggestions for more Low Traffic Neighbourhoods
- The need for more cycle parking
- The need for public transport to be more accessible to taking cycles on board
- The need for reduced speed limits, particularly where active travel routes are
- A bus service to aid residents aged 60+ with grocery shopping
- That it was taken into consideration that not everyone can walk, cycle, or access public transport
- That some events for those using active travel methods to help explore routes would be beneficial
- That Addenbrookes needed its own rail station or closely sited Park and Ride
- That promoting car/lift sharing would be beneficial
- That circumstances, such as fuel prices and Covid lockdowns, had reduced car usage the most
- That congestion charging should be introduced
- The need for cycling service and training centres

- The need for e-bike/e-scooter hire
- The need for improved bridleways
- The need for a “parking hub” at Linton
- The need for better maintenance of active travel routes
- To link up with Meldreth Community Rail Partnership
- To look at how other cities worldwide, such as Paris, have encouraged active travel
- The need for workplace parking levies
- The need for more parking “near urban centres”
- The need for more pedestrianised areas
- The need for Shepreth to be included in the Royston Bus Corridor
- The need for schools to reward children walking to school
- The Ting bus service
- The need for the X5 bus service or similar to be reintroduced