

Appendix K. 2021 supplementary engagement responses

Theme	Comment summary
Location of the active travel route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four respondents commented on the location of elements of the proposed active travel route. • Two respondents queried whether the proposed active travel route would infringe on bordering land parcels. Most of the works undertaken along Newmarket Road for the proposed active travel route east of the A11 would be within the limits of the existing highway boundary. Engagement with any affected landowners and occupiers relating to these proposals is ongoing. • One respondent queried whether the entrance to the proposed A11 travel hub would be via the A1307 or the A505. The proposed A11 travel hub would be accessible via the A1307. • One respondent requested more information due to a number of assets in the area. GCP will continue its engagement with all affected landowners and occupiers to ensure its proposals would not impact on existing assets or provide mitigation where required.
Equestrian route (between the A11 travel hub and A11 footbridge via the A11 underpass)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four respondents commented on the proposed equestrian route between the A11 travel hub and the A11 footbridge via the A11 underpass. • Two respondents stated the equestrian route would be unsafe due to its proximity to the western and eastern sides of the A11 with concerns around the impact of noise from traffic along the A11 on horses. The underpass would link with Newmarket Road via a new active travel path to be delivered east of the A11 that runs behind Bourne Bridge Cottages. This option is considered feasible and the most suitable to meet the equestrian demand for linkage with the wider CSET scheme. • One response stated the scheme would have a negative impact on land to the south of PRoW 12/4 and requested that an alternative equestrian route was delivered in a straight line between the A11 underpass and Newmarket Road instead. This option was evaluated but is unfeasible due to constraints associated with the potential proximity to the River Granta and gradient of the land. Additionally, predicted use of the equestrian route is not proposed to adversely impact this land to a significant extent. • Three respondents advocated that the A11 underpass was not suitable for equestrians. Two respondents stated the underpass is too low for equestrian use when riding. It is acknowledged by GCP that the clear height of the underpass is limited and may restrict access for some equestrian use. Therefore, it is proposed to provide mounting blocks on both sides of the underpass to enable users to dismount and lead their horses. • Two respondents commented that this underpass currently floods and would be unsuitable for equestrian use. Due to the low-lying levels in this location, the underpass is susceptible to flooding and any mitigation would potentially restrict headroom further. The frequency of this

Theme	Comment summary
	<p>underpass flooding is low, and the underpass is considered the most feasible suitable option to provide equestrian access in this location. GCP will continue stakeholder engagement with relevant parties to ensure suitable equestrian provision.</p>
Equestrian route not needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three respondents considered that an equestrian route was not required. It was suggested that there would be limited use of the proposed equestrian route. Following consultation and wider stakeholder engagement, GCP considers there to be a demand for a suitable route, connecting to existing Public Rights of Way, to enable equestrians to cross the A11. This element of the proposed active travel route between the A11 travel hub and Granta Park for equestrians has been developed following consultation with The British Horse Society.
A11 footbridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three respondents commented on the proposals for enhanced A11 footbridge access. Two respondents stated that access ramps were required to support increased use of the footbridge by Non-Motorised Users (NMUs). As part of the proposals, the construction of new access ramps on the eastern and western sides of the A11 footbridge is proposed to improve access for cyclists and pedestrians to the existing A11 footbridge. Replacement of the A11 footbridge is outside of the scope of the scheme. One respondent requested that the A11 footbridge should be widened to support shared use of the link by all NMUs. It was stated that the existing width (1.8m) is insufficient for multiple modes at the same time (i.e. cyclists and pedestrians). The A11 footbridge is no longer proposed for widening within the Scheme.
Proposed cycle route extension/Linton Greenway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two respondents raised comments regarding wider cycle route links. One respondent requested the provision of additional cycling facilities along Pampisford Road to deliver cycling provision extending to the south of Granta Park. The proposed active travel route currently starts/ends at the Granta Park roundabout. Any potential cycle route beyond the Granta Park roundabout is beyond the scope of the CSET Phase 2 scheme. A cycle route between Newmarket Road and the Hildersham junction via Great Abington is being developed by GCP as part of the Linton Greenway and will be delivered by the CSET Phase 1 project. One respondent referred to the Linton Greenway cycling scheme and noted that the section between Babraham and Newmarket Road (Section 3) was within CSET Phase 2 and may not be delivered until 2024. The respondent outlined concern that the extension of this section of the Babraham cycle route; bridleway enhancements and proposed cycle lane along Newmarket Road would be delayed. The Linton Greenway Section 3 (between Babraham and Newmarket Road, via the A11 footbridge) enhancements are due to be delivered in conjunction with the link to Granta Park as part of the CSET Phase 2 scheme. This was previously planned and communicated during the 2020 EIA public consultation for CSET Phase 2. The proposed timeline for delivering this

Theme	Comment summary
	<p>section of the proposed active travel route east of the A11 is unconfirmed at this stage.</p>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two respondents raised concern about parking in relation to a reduced carriageway width on Newmarket Road if the active travel route is delivered. One respondent stated that with an active travel path, a section of the carriageway may be reduced to single lane and this could increase safety concerns with on-street parking. Further consideration will be given to traffic management at the detailed design stage. One respondent requested that HGV parking provision was included within the A11 travel hub. The A11 travel hub is proposed to provide 1,250 car parking spaces. At present there are no plans to provide HGV parking facilities within the scope of the scheme.
Traffic management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two respondents supported the proposals for traffic management. It was noted that there are existing safety concerns with the speed of vehicles along Newmarket Road and support was expressed for reducing a section of the carriageway to single-lane and reducing the speed limit. Further consideration will be given to traffic management at the detailed design stage. Two additional respondents queried the safety of the Newmarket Road/Bourn Bridge Road junction for NMUs if there is an increase in crossing movements at this junction due to the delivery of this scheme. It was commented that there are safety concerns with this junction due to limited visibility for drivers and risk for cyclists. One respondent requested that a signalised crossing is considered. Further consideration will be given to crossing facilities at the detailed design stage.
Newmarket Road active travel path design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three respondents regarded the width of the proposed active travel path along Newmarket Road to be insufficient. Two respondents raised concern with the provision for equestrians within the proposed active travel path. Concern was expressed about the impact of cyclists in close proximity to horses. Sufficient space would be provided for shared use in line with relevant standards. The existing available width within the carriageway is a limiting factor. One respondent raised concern with the proposed horse-riding facility being limited to extending along a section of Newmarket Road. The respondent stated the horse-riding facility would be enhanced if extended along all of Newmarket Road. The proposed path is within the highway boundary. Where possible, a separate active travel equestrian section of the active travel path is proposed. Where this is not possible, equestrians would be required to use the shared use section of the active travel path. Widening of the bridge on Newmarket Road is not within the scope of the CSET Phase 2 project. One respondent stated that a cycling lane should be provided on both sides of Newmarket Road to improve two-way accessibility for cyclists. One active travel path is proposed on the eastern side of Newmarket Road. The existing highway arrangement (i.e. available verge width) supports the design solution of a bi-directional cycling lane on the eastern side of Newmarket Road. This solution is also consistent with the design of other sections of the Linton Greenway.

Theme	Comment summary
Surfacing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two respondents queried the surfacing proposed within the active travel path along Newmarket Road. Options for surfacing along the active travel route are being explored. This includes ensuring the most suitable surface for equestrians in this location where possible.
Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three respondents raised concern regarding the possible replacement of trees along the proposed active travel route. Where possible, GCP would seek to limit the impact on local trees in delivering the proposed active travel route.
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One respondent sought clarification regarding the provision of lighting along the active travel route. It is proposed that lighting of the active travel route would be limited to surface level solar powered lighting to minimise environmental impact.