

Produced by the Cambridgeshire Research Group



Fulbourn Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings

V1

March 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

For more information about the team phone 01223 715300

Document Details	
Title:	Fulbourn Greenway: Summary Report of Consultation Findings
Date Created:	25/03/19
Description:	
Produced by:	Cambridgeshire County Council Business Intelligence Service
On behalf of:	Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership
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.

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	8
Introduction	9
Background	9
Consultation and Analysis Methodology	10
Background	10
Consultation Strategy	10
Identification of the Audience	10
Design of Consultation Questions.....	11
Diversity and Protected Characteristics.....	11
Analysis	12
Quality Assurance	13
Data Integrity	13
Survey Findings	14
Respondent Profile	14
Respondent location	14
Respondent interest in project	15
Respondent usual mode of travel in the area	16
Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area	17
Respondent age range	18
Respondent employment status.....	19
Respondent disability status.....	20
Question 1: In general how far do you support the formation of the Greater Cambridge Greenways network?	21
Question 2: How would you intend to primarily travel on the Greenway?	22
Question 3: How far do you agree with the following elements of the proposed Greenway Route?	23
Question 4: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?	30
Question 5: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options?	31

Summary of major themes	31
Question 6: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?.....	36
Summary of major themes	36
Question 7: 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.....	37
Summary of major themes	37
Map comments	38
Stakeholders responses	39
Background	39
Summary of major themes	39
Email, social media and consultation event responses	41
Summary of major themes	41

Executive Summary

Between 15 October and 03 December 2018 the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) held an extensive consultation on a scheme to develop a Greenway route from Fulbourn 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 almost all elements of the proposed Greenway Route, however element 13 was supported by just over half of respondents while two fifths had 'no opinion'.
 - Of the six elements with multiple options, the majority of respondents supported:
 - Carter Bridge Option A – small scale repairs to the existing structure
 - Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road Option B – widened path
 - Both Options for the Tins Path Bridge
 - Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street Option B – new path to Railway Street
 - Path between Cherry Hinton High Street and Yarrow Road Option B – railway path
 - Fulbourn Old Drift/Hinton Road Junction Option A – path improvements
- The majority of respondents supported all three locations for the installation of solar studs.
- A great deal of detailed comments were received. From these it was clear that; there were concerns over the high cost of some of the elements, particularly the new Tins Path Bridge (element 8B) and Option B for the Carter Bridge proposals (element 2B); the improvements to Tins Path Bridge and Snakey Path were a high priority; there were debates about the environmental impact and plausibility of widening Snakey Path; and there were concerns about the width of the paths.
- 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 more than 11,000 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 422 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 422 online and written responses to the consultation survey and the 15 additional written responses received.

Key findings

Support for the Greater Cambridge Greenways network

Quantitative

- 415 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

- 400 respondents answered the question about how far they agreed with the individual elements of the proposed Greenway Route.
 - The majority of respondents supported most of the elements of the proposed Greenway route:
 - Element 6: 'improvements along the Tins Path' (85%)
 - Element 7: 'improvements along Snakey Path' (83%)
 - Element 3: 'changes to Greville Road/Rustat Road connection' (75%)
 - Element 11: 'improvements across Yarrow Road' (75%)
 - Element 1: 'junction reconfiguration on approach to Carter Bridge' (74%)

- Element 2: ‘Carter Bridge Option A – small scale repairs to the existing structure’ (74%)
 - Element 5: ‘connection to Perne Road between Natal Road and the Scout Hut’ (72%)
 - Element 10: ‘Path between Cherry Hinton High Street and Yarrow Road Option B – railway path’ (72%)
 - Element 4: ‘Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road Option B – widened path’ (71%)
 - Element 8: ‘Tins Path Bridge Option A – approach improvements’ (71%)
 - Element 8: ‘Tins Path Bridge Option B – new bridge’ (65%)
 - Element 9: ‘Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street Option B – new path to Railway Street’ (65%)
 - Element 12: ‘Fulbourn Old Drift / Hinton Road Option A – path improvements’ (61%)
 - Respondents were not as clear on element 13: ‘use of Hinton Road and Cow Lane’. Although over half of respondents supported it (53%), two fifths indicating they had ‘no opinion’ (40%)
- 403 respondents answered the question about how far they supported the installation of solar studs in three specific locations.
 - The majority of respondents supported all three solar stud locations:
 - ‘Along the Tins path’ (86%)
 - ‘Path parallel to the railway’ (83%)
 - ‘Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road’ (70%)

Qualitative

- Question 5 asked respondents whether they had any additional comments on the proposed route options. 183 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
 - Support for element 8: Tins Path Bridge Option B – new bridge
 - Concerns about the cost of developing element 2: Carter Bridge Option B – replacement of the bridge’s Perspex cover
 - Concerns about the costs involved with the proposals
 - Debate about widening Snakey Path
 - Discussions about the width of the paths
 - Discussions about the need for maintenance
 - Discussions about the current condition of the paths around element 11: improvements along Yarrow Road
 - Support for element 10: Cherry Hinton High Street to Yarrow Road Option B – railway path
 - Discussions about the need for lighting along the route
 - Concerns about the congestion and detour to users for element 10: Cherry Hinton High Street to Yarrow Road Option A – Fulbourn Old Drift

- Debate about the impact on local residents and the direct route from element 9: Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street Option B - new path to Railway Street
 - General positive comments about the proposals
 - Concerns about conflict between users on shared use paths
 - Debate about whether the improvements were needed for element 6: The Tins Path
 - Opposition to element 13: use of Hinton Road and Cow Lane
 - Debate about the need for element 5: connection to Perne Road between Natal Road and the Scout Hut
 - Support for the widening of the path at element 4: Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road Option B – widened path
 - Debate about the impact on nearby roads from element 12: Fulbourn Old Drift / Hinton Road Junction' Option B – junction reconfiguration
 - Discussions about what the junction improvements from element 1: junction reconfiguration on approach to Carter Bridge would entail
- Question 6 asked respondents whether they had any comments about the suggested options for signage and wayfinding. 111 respondents answered this question. The main themes were:
 - Concerns about confusion caused by the suggested abbreviations
 - Discussion about the need for clear and consistent signage
 - General positive comments about the signage and wayfinding proposals
 - Discussion about whether signage was needed
 - Discussions about keeping the amount of signage to a minimum

Other

Qualitative

- 65 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:
 - About the benefits the schemes would have for those with protected characteristics
 - About the negative impact the lack of space on shared use paths and lack of maintenance would have on older/younger users

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 15 October and 03 December 2018 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 5000 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 Fulbourn 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 Fulbourn Greenway route, and how far they supported the installation of solar studs in 4 locations) an eight 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 Waterbeach. 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 Fulbourn 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 Fulbourn 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 'Places' tool on Consult Cambs allowed respondents to place a 'pin' on to a map of the route and leave a comment. The number of map comments received was too small to conduct a thematic analysis, however, a link to the online map where all of the comments can be viewed is included within the report.
- 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, 422 residents responded to the consultation survey.

Respondent location

Respondents were asked for their postcodes during the survey, but were not forced to enter a response. 331 respondents entered recognisable postcodes, while over a fifth did not (91 respondents).


Based on the postcode data provided most respondents resided in:

- Cherry Hinton (25%)
- Fulbourn (21%)

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

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




- The majority of respondents indicated they
 - Were a 'resident in Cambridge' (68%)
 - 'Regularly travel in the area' (55%)
- Under two fifths indicated they
 - 'work in the area' (36%)
 - were a 'resident in South Cambridgeshire' (36%)
- Few respondents indicated they:
 - 'Occasionally travel in the area' (5%)
 - 'Study in the area' (4%)
 - had an 'other' interest (3%)
 - Were a 'local business owner/employer' (2%)
 - Or were a 'resident elsewhere' (2%)

Respondent usual mode of travel in the area

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

Figure 3: Usual mode of travel




- The majority of respondents indicated:
 - They usually travelled by 'bicycle' (83%)
 - They usually travelled 'on foot' (60%)
 - They were a 'car driver' (59%)
- Over a quarter of respondents indicated they were a 'bus user' (27%)
- Over a fifth indicated they were a 'car passenger' (21%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual mode of travel was:
 - 'Other' (2%)
 - A 'powered two-wheeler' (1%) or a 'van or lorry driver' (1%)
 - 'Not applicable' (<1%)
- No respondents indicated they usually travelled as a 'horse rider' (0%)

Respondent usual workplace if commuting in the area

145 respondents answered the question on their usual workplace destination if they commuted in the area.

Figure 4: Usual workplace destination




- Over a quarter of respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was:
 - 'Cambridge City Centre' (29%)
- Over a fifth indicated it was 'Cambridge Railway Station' (23%)
- Under a fifth indicated their usual workplace destination was:
 - 'ARM' (15%)
 - 'Other' (14%)
 - 'Addenbrooke's/Biomedical Campus' (12%)
- Few respondents indicated their usual workplace destination was:
 - 'University of Cambridge' (8%)
 - 'Capita Park' (3%)
 - 'Babraham Research Campus' (3%)

8 respondents who indicated their usual workplace destination was 'other' left information indicating their destination. These locations included: Sawston, Royston, Cambourne, Cambridge City Centre, Great Shelford, London, Babraham.

Respondent age range

411 respondents answered the question on their age range.




- Average working ages from '25-34' to '55-64' were well represented
- Working ages from '15-24' were slightly under represented

Respondent employment status

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


Figure 6: Employment status



- Over three fifths of respondents indicated they were 'employed' (72%)
- Just under a fifth indicated they were 'retired' (19%)
- Few respondents indicated:
 - They were 'self-employed' (6%)
 - They were in 'education' (4%) or 'a home-based worker' (4%)
 - They were 'a stay at home parent, carer or similar' (3%)
 - That they would 'prefer not to say' (2%)
 - They were 'unemployed' (1%)
 - Or that they were 'other' (<1%)

Respondent disability status

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




- 6% of respondents indicating that they did.

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

415 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




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

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

422 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 (83%)
- Under two fifths indicated they would be 'walking' on the Greenway (38%)
- Few respondents indicated they would be 'running' (9%) or using 'other' means to travel on the Greenway (1%)
 - Respondents who indicated they used 'other' means to travel on the Greenway were asked to specify. 3 of the 6 respondents left an answer to this question. These included using motorised wheelchairs and issues with accessing property along the 'quiet road' section of the Greenway.
- No respondents indicated they would be 'horse riding' on the Greenway (0%)
- Few respondents indicated they 'did not intend to travel on the Greenway' (6%)

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

400 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



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


- Element 6: ‘improvements along the Tins Path’ (85%)
- Element 7: ‘improvements along Snakey Path’ (83%)
- Element 3: ‘changes to Greville Road/Rustat Road connection’ (75%)
- Element 11: ‘improvements across Yarrow Road’ (75%)
- Element 1: ‘junction reconfiguration on approach to Carter Bridge (74%)
- Element 5: ‘connection to Perne Road between Natal Road and the Scout Hut (72%)

Respondents were not as clear on element 13: ‘use of Hinton Road and Cow Lane’. Although over half of respondents supported it (53%), two fifths indicating they had ‘no opinion’ (40%)

- A cross-tabulation, based on answers to demographic questions, showed no significant difference in responses

6 elements had multiple options available.


Figure 11: Support for element 2: 'Carter Bridge' Options



For the element 2: 'Carter Bridge' Options:

- The majority of respondents supported 'Option A – small scale repairs to the existing structure' (74%)
- Over two fifths supported 'Option B – replacement of the bridge's Perspex cover' (45%)
- 'Option B' was opposed by more respondents (28%) than 'Option A' (10%)


Figure 12: Support for element 4: ‘Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road’ Options’



For the element 4: ‘Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported ‘Option B – widened path’ (71%)
- Over two fifths supported ‘Option A – management around existing wall’ (45%)
- ‘Option A’ was opposed by more respondents (19%) than ‘Option B’ (8%)


Figure 13: Support for element 8 ‘Tins Path Bridge’ Options



For the element 8: ‘Tins Path Bridge’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported both
 - ‘Option A – approach improvements’ (71%) and
 - ‘Option B – new bridge’ (65%)
- ‘Option B’ was opposed by slightly more respondents (20%) than ‘Option A’ (12%)
- A cross-tabulation, based on answers to demographic questions, showed no significant difference in responses


Figure 14: Support for element 9: ‘Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street’ Options



For the element 9: ‘Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported ‘Option B – new path to Railway Street’ (65%)
- Over half of respondents supported ‘Option A – across Orchard Estate’ (53%)
- Respondents were nearly equally opposed to ‘Option A’ (14%) and ‘Option B’ (11%)


Figure 15: Support for element 10: ‘Path between Cherry Hinton High Street and Yarrow Road’ Options



For the element 10: ‘Path between Cherry Hinton High Street and Yarrow Road’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported ‘Option B – railway path’ (72%)
- Over half of respondents supported ‘Option A – Fulbourn Old Drift’ (51%)
- More respondents were opposed to ‘Option A’ (23%) than ‘Option B’ (11%)

Figure 16: Support for element 12: ‘Fulbourn Old Drift / Hinton Road Junction’ Options




For the element 12: ‘Fulbourn Old Drift / Hinton Road Junction’ Options:

- The majority of respondents supported ‘Option A – path improvements’ (61%)
- Over two fifths of respondents supported ‘Option B – junction reconfiguration’ (46%)
- Respondents were more opposed to ‘Option B’ (18%) than ‘Option A’ (9%)

Question 4: How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?

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

Figure 17: Support for the installation of solar studs



The majority of respondents supported all three solar stud locations:

- 'Along the Tins path' (86%)
- 'Path parallel to the railway' (83%)
- 'Connection between Coleridge Road and Marmora Road' (70%)

Question 5: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options?

183 respondents left comments on question 5, which asked if they had any additional comments on the proposed route options.

Summary of major themes

Comment Theme	Respondent comments
Element 8B: Tins Path Bridge Option B – New Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the development of a new bridge on the Tins Path was a high priority, as the current bridge; was too narrow to accommodate shared use; had limited accessibility due to the high gradient; and the approach was dangerous due to limited visibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents discussed the high costs involved with this element • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the costs involved with this element were too high and the funding should be used elsewhere along the route
Element 2B: Carter Bridge – Proposals to refresh Carter Bridge Option B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the costs involved in the development of this element were too high with limited benefit to users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents indicated they would support this if the improvements would reduce ongoing maintenance costs • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that there were issues with ventilation along Carter Bridge, particularly during hotter weather, that were exasperated due to the Perspex cover. These respondents felt this needed addressing to improve travel here. • A few of these respondents felt there were issues with anti-social behaviour along Carter Bridge and that this needed addressing with vandal proofing and improved lighting
Cost of development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme had concerns about the costs involved with the proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of these respondents were concerned with the costs involved with the new Tins Path Bridge (element 8B) and Option B for the Carter Bridge Proposals (element 2B). These respondents felt that there was little benefit to these elements

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents felt that the overall costs for development were too high for the amount of use the Fulbourn Greenway would have
Element 7: Snakey Path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that Snakey Path needed to be widened in order to accommodate the shared use nature of the path <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents were concerned about the impact this could have on the local environment and felt the widening needed to take this into consideration ● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that maintenance of the path and adequate lighting were needed to improve safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents felt that CCTV was also needed due to the isolated nature of the route ● A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the winding nature of Snakey Path and limitations to widening, from nearby allotments and the natural environment, meant that improvements here would not be worthwhile.
Width of the paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the Greenway paths needed to be wide enough to accommodate larger style bikes, such as cargo bikes, passing each other and other path users safely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of these respondents discussed this in relation to the Tins Path Bridge and Snakey Path, which were felt to need the widening proposed ○ Some of these respondents discussed other areas, such as Yarrow Road which was felt to currently be too narrow
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The respondents who discussed this theme felt that maintenance needed to be done on the roads and paths along the proposed route, particularly damage from tree routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents discussed the path condition along Snakey Path and the Tins Path ○ Some of these respondents discussed the route along Yarrow Road
Element 11: Yarrow Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most of the respondents who discussed this theme discussed the current condition of the paths in this area, particularly near to Tesco, and felt these needed improving ● Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated there could be issues relating to the new

	crossing point, due to its proximity to existing crossings on Yarrow Road
Element 10B: Cherry Hinton High Street to Yarrow Road Option B – Railway Path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, as they felt this route would be the most direct and would avoid mixing with motorised traffic • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this element as they felt element 10A (Fulbourn Old Drift) would adequately serve the Greenway, that the money could be better spent elsewhere, and were concerned about the impact the improvements would have on nearby residents
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that lighting was needed along the whole route to improve safety and visibility. Particular mention was made of Snakey Path and the Tins Path <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of these respondents discussed the proposals for solar lighting and indicated their support for them <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A few of these respondents felt that some overhead lighting would also be needed where there was no other forms of lighting other than the solar studs ▪ A few of these respondents felt that overhead lighting should be limited due to the effect on the environment
Element 10A: Cherry Hinton High Street to Yarrow Road Option A – Fulbourn Old Drift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they were opposed to this element, as they felt the route would be too much of a detour for many users and that Fulbourn Old Drift could be heavily congested, particularly with pedestrian traffic around the nearby school • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this element would adequately serve Greenway users and that the money could be better spent elsewhere

<p>Element 9B: Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street Option B – New path to Railway Street</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element as they felt it was more direct than 9A (Across Orchard Estate) and would be away from motorised traffic • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme were concerned about the routes proximity and crossing of private property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents were also concerned about the impact on the environment
<p>Positive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents indicated that they felt the improvements to Snakey Path (element 7) and the Tins Path Bridge (element 8) were of the highest priority to them
<p>Shared use paths</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme were concerned that pedestrians would be negatively affected by shared use paths, particularly if they were not made wide enough. These respondents felt that properly segregated paths would be more suitable
<p>Element 6: The Tins Path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the improvements were needed here, particularly maintenance of tree roots damaging the path and resurfacing for poor conditions • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that further improvements were not needed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some were concerned widening the path would have a negative impact on the environment ○ A few indicated improvements had already been done here
<p>Element 13: Hinton Road & Cow Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that Cow Lane was a longer route and connected to less places than Pierce Lane, which these respondents felt cyclists would use instead • Some respondents who discussed this theme felt that speed reduction methods were needed on Cow Lane but there was debate on whether enough road users would adhere to the 20mph limit • A few respondents who discussed this theme were concerned the increased signage from this element would have a detrimental impact on the rural feel of the area

<p>Element 5: Connection to Perne Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that this element was not needed as the existing route was suitable and just needed improved maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents indicated there were issues with anti-social behaviour in the alleyway along the cycle path between Montreal Square and Hobart Road • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element
<p>Element 4B: Coleridge Road to Mamora Road Option B – Widened path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the path widening was needed here <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that moving the crossing would be worse for users as they felt those waiting to cross would block the alleyway and it would become located too close to another crossing
<p>Element 12B: Fulbourn Old Drift/Hinton Road junction Option B – Junction reconfiguration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated their support for this element, as they felt it gave more priority to cyclists and buses which would make it safer • Some of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they opposed this element, as they felt it would increase congestion and rat running on other nearby roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents indicated they were opposed to both Options for element 12, as they felt they were unnecessary
<p>Element 1: Carter Bridge approach from Devonshire Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt they needed more information on what the junction improvements would entail

Question 6: Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?

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

Summary of major themes

Abbreviations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that full places names would be more suitable
Clear signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the signage needed to be as clear and consistent along the route as possible to help users of the Greenway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of these respondents felt that the signs should be consistent with national cycle route signs
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the signage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A few of these respondents felt that current signage was difficult to follow without already having an awareness of the route
Not needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the signage was not needed.
Minimal signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the amount of signs placed should be kept to a minimum

Question 7: 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

65 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

Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would be beneficial to those with disabilities, particularly due to the increased width of paths and adjustments to the Tins Path Bridge • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated that the current approach and space available on the Tins Path Bridge was not suitable for those with disabilities. These respondents felt that element 8B (Tins Path Bridge Option B – New Bridge) was needed
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would have a positive impact on person/s or group/s with protected characteristics as they improved access to the surrounding areas
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the respondents who discussed this theme felt that the proposals would be beneficial to those with disabilities, particularly due to the increased width of paths • A few of the respondents who discussed this theme indicated they had concerns about the speed and number of cyclists that would be travelling along the Greenway

Map comments

Eight respondents left a total of 27 comments on the 'places' interactive map. The map comments received were too singular to be grouped together for analytical purposes but can be viewed at: <https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/Greenways/maps/fulbourn-map>

Stakeholders responses

Background

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

Anderson O & U Limited
 British Horse Society
 Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum
 Camcycle

Fulbourn Forum for Community Action
 Fulbourn Primary School

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

Element 11: Yarrow Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders had concerns around the crossing improvements, feeling they needed more information, particularly around access for different non-motorised users • Most of the stakeholders indicated their support for the path widening and lighting improvements
Element 13: Hinton Road & Cow Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders debated various parts of this element, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The need for physical measures to ensure the 20mph speed limit is adhered to ○ Ensuring the amount of signage is in keeping with the character of Fulbourn ○ That Pierce Lane should be improved instead ○ That the improvements should extend along School Lane to St Vigor's
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated they supported the proposals, so long as they were accessible for those with disabilities, different age groups, and all forms of non-motorised road user

<p>Element 9: Tins to Cherry Hinton High Street</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was debate about which of the two Options for this element would be most suitable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stakeholders who indicated their support for Option B felt it would offer a more direct and wider route for users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was also discussion of implementing Option A while Option B was in development ○ Stakeholders who indicated their support for Option A felt that there would not be enough land available to expand Option B
<p>Element 8B: Tins Path Bridge Option B – New Bridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme indicated their support for element 8B, feeling the current bridge was a key issue for users due to its positioning and width
<p>Equestrian</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders who discussed this theme felt that equestrian access should be considered where possible. Particular concern was raised around element 8 (The Tins Path Bridge)

Email, social media and consultation event responses

15 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

Shared use paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that there could be conflict between users on shared use paths. Suggestions for mitigating this included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of signage to inform users of the shared nature of the path ○ Use of grade separated paths ○ Segregating cycle paths from footpaths
Cycle lane usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that cyclists do not make use of cycle lanes, instead using the road. These respondents felt that there should be no further investment in cycle lanes
Cost of development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt that investment should be used on other improvements than the proposals, such as road maintenance
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme felt there needed to be more maintenance on current pathways and roads
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents who discussed this theme left positive comments about the proposals, feeling they would improve travel for non-motorised users between Fulbourn and Cambridge