

1 LTP Consultation

Background

We take consultation very seriously. Since the production of the first LTP, we have been conducting a series of consultation exercises to develop our transport strategies, particularly in the market towns and through consultation on specific schemes. The experience gained from this has enabled us to achieve a highly successful consultation on this LTP.

Our consultation process on transport schemes is led by our corporate Listening and Involving Strategy. The policy aims for a consistent and co-ordinated approach to consultation across the county.

The following are the key elements of the strategy.

- The Council is committed to consulting users and residents.
- Consultation is a mainstream activity of the Council, not an add-on.
- The consultation techniques used will be appropriate to the people to be consulted, the use to which the consultation will be put and the resources available.
- Findings and how they have influenced decisions will be reported to the people who were consulted, and the wider public.
- Information collected will be shared across the Council to avoid wasting resources and people's time duplicating surveys.
- We will make special efforts to contact groups who, in the past, have not always had their voice heard by the Council – such as people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and young people.

We have adopted the approach set out above, together with government guidance, in our consultation on this LTP.

Our aims and objectives when embarking on the consultation were clear. Building on the experience gained through regular consultation carried out since the first LTP, we set out to ensure that everybody across the entire county was given the opportunity to comment on the proposals laid out in the draft LTP and help shape the final document to ensure ownership throughout the community. We adopted a number of different consultation techniques to ensure a successful and inclusive countywide consultation. The methods we employed were the following.

- Distribution of 280,000 consultation leaflets across the County using Royal Mail, free newspapers and door-to-door deliveries.
- A programme of 19 staffed exhibitions at various locations throughout the county.
- A number of static displays providing information and copies of the consultation leaflet at key location such as hospitals, supermarkets and colleges.
- An internet link to enable completion of the questionnaire online.

- Distribution of the consultation leaflet to every post office, doctors surgery, dentists surgery and library in the county.
- Distribution of the consultation leaflet to all stakeholders, Parish and Town Council Clerks and all County and District Council Members.
- Regular press releases and a prize draw for completion of the leaflet.
- A number of stakeholder workshops with representatives from a variety of key strategy areas such as the voluntary sector, public transport operators and cycling groups.
- A Transport Panel to assist in the development of the LTP.
- Engagement with the Transport and Access groups of the Local Strategic Partnerships to help shape the LTP.
- Tailored consultation for youth engagement, including a separate questionnaire and attendance at Youth Parliament cabinet meetings.

The methods we employed led to a significant number of responses. In total we received over 5400 responses, a large proportion of which came from the harder to reach age group of young people between 16 and 29.

The following sections describe in more detail how we undertook the consultation. They also detail the results that the consultation generated and how this clearly demonstrates support for the LTP and how it has helped shape its contents.

Results of the Consultation

The main consultation leaflet, called 'Transport for the future', contained a description of our proposed strategy and set out draft objectives and the major elements of the proposed programme. It contained a questionnaire within it, with both specific questions on the proposed strategy and objectives and additional space for individual comments. The results of this are summarised below.

Questionnaire Results

- A total of 3197 responses were returned, of the respondents:
- 54% were male
- 46% were female
- 12% had a disability
- 62% made additional comments
- 40% suggested alternative objectives for the LTP, and
- 45% entered the prize draw.

Specific results on the questions were as follows.

Table Q1 shows that we received overall support for the objectives contained within the draft of the LTP. The high level of 'partial support' that we received can be explained by the fact that many respondents felt that, in order to fully support the objectives that we needed to include additional ones relating to the environment and accessibility. This and further feedback from

workshops (reported later in this Appendix) during the consultation led to additional objectives being added.

Table Q2 shows that we received high levels of overall support for each of our objectives.

There was a very high level of overall support for proposals to improve public transport facilities, support bus services and improve safety. The approach detailed within the consultation document of taking a corridor approach to providing high quality public transport was also well received.

High levels of support were also received for improving cycling and walking facilities, although improvements to cycling facilities were not seen to be as important as improvements to public transport, probably because Cambridgeshire already has good cycling facilities and a large number of cyclists.

Table Q4 shows that we received overall support for all the major transport schemes that we are proposing. The highest levels of support we received were for the implementation of Real time bus information, a new ring of Park & Ride sites and the corridor

approach to improving public transport, which are all countywide initiatives.

There was less support at a County level for some of the more localised measures, although in all cases levels of opposition to these schemes were low, reflecting perhaps the fact that many respondents did not feel affected by such proposals. This explains the large percentage of ‘no view’ responses that were returned for the A605 improvements and Ely Bypass. Where more localised consultation has been carried out through the Market Town Strategies, this has shown a high level of support for such schemes: the Ely Market Town Strategy, for example, showed that 80% of the 2000 respondents in the Ely area were in favour of the Ely Southern Bypass. A similar situation exists with the A605 proposals, where letters received indicate a high level of local support.

Similarly, overall support was received for both the Cambridge Southern Link Road and Chesterton Rail Station but because the consultation was countywide a large number of respondents registered a ‘no view’.

Q1 Do you support the overall aims of the plan?

Support	63%	Overall Support	88%
Partially Support	25%		
No View	6.5%		
Don't Support	1.5%		
Didn't Answer	4%		

Questionnaire – Qualitative Comments

The questionnaire allowed for individuals to make any further comments on the proposals that were not covered by some of the more specific questions. A large number of people took the opportunity to comment, with 1975 of the responses containing additional comments. These comments are summarised on the next page, first generally and then broken down specifically into the area they were written about.

Q2 Do you support the four main objectives of the Plan?

Objective	Support	Partially Support	No View	Don't Support	Didn't Answer
Make Travel Safer	85%	8%	4%	1%	2%
Promote Integrated and Sustainable Transport	81.5%	10.5%	4.5%	1.5%	2%
Maintain Effective Transport Networks	82%	11%	4%	1%	2%
Create a Transport System Accessible to all	85%	8%	4%	1%	2%

Q3 Do you support our proposals for:

Proposal	Support	Partially Support	No View	Don't Support	Didn't Answer
Improving Public Transport	84.5%	9.5%	3%	1%	2%
Supporting Bus Services	79.5%	12%	4%	2.5%	2%
Improving Walking facilities	73%	14%	8%	2.5%	2.5%
Improving cycling facilities	71%	13.5%	9%	4.5%	2%
Promoting Travel awareness	67%	17%	11%	2.5%	2.5%
Improving roads for cars	58%	23%	6%	11%	2%
Improving Safety	82%	10%	4%	2%	2%

Q4 Do you support the major transport schemes that we are proposing?

Major Scheme	Support	Partially Support	No View	Don't Support	Didn't Answer
Rapid Transit	55%	15%	17.5%	10.5%	2%
Chesterton Rail Station	51%	13%	30%	4%	2%
Real Time Bus Information	74%	11.5%	10%	2%	2.5%
A605 Improvements	35.5%	12%	44.5%	5%	3%
Ely Southern Bypass	34%	13.5%	42%	7.5%	3%
New Ring of Park and Ride Sites	59%	19.5%	14%	5%	2.5%
Package of Schemes for Corridors	53%	23.5%	17.5%	3.5%	2.5%
Cambridge Southern Link Road	44%	18%	25.5%	10%	2.5%

General Reaction

Generally the comments received on the questionnaire were supportive of the LTP. A number of respondents felt that we needed to be more ambitious in our plans to improve transport infrastructure in Cambridgeshire. Many of the respondents commented that they wanted to see the proposals implemented as soon as possible to ensure that Cambridgeshire suffered no detrimental affects of the increasing levels of traffic on our roads.

Specific Comments

Policy Direction

- It was felt that consideration should be given to free OAP travel.
- More consideration should be given to rail options.
- Consideration should be given to horse riders and powered two-wheel transport.
- It was felt that the LTP should plan further into the future.
- Improvements always need to have contingency plans.
- Bus priority measures were felt to be vital for the success of buses, Park and Ride, and Rapid Transit should therefore be more heavily included in the LTP.
- Cross-border issues should be explored more fully.
- Consideration should be given to the impact of education on the transport system.
- Emphasis should be placed on reducing the need to travel.
- It would be good to see the measurements of success quantified where possible and regularly reported on.

Public Transport

- It was felt that interchange facilities between bus/rail should be improved and promoted.
- The LTP needs to indicate where an increase in car parking at rail stations should go.
- Bus information should be provided in a uniform, easy-to-read manner and promoted heavily.
- Services need to be more flexible and the possibility of using smaller vehicles from specific villages during rush-hour times should be explored.
- Improvements made to public transport provision should be focused on improving reliability, frequency, cost effectiveness and cleanliness.
- All buses should be fully accessible.
- School buses, which are adequately supervised, should run at peak times from park and ride sites with adequate frequency.
- The late evening/night and Sunday service buses need to be greatly improved.
- The LTP needs to consider the possible relocation of the bus station in Cambridge to the same site as the railway station with free shuttle service into town.
- There should be an increase in the financial support given to public transport services.

Cycling

- For people to cycle instead of using their cars, separate cycle paths away from the roads should be contained within the LTP.
- A more co-ordinated approach to the development of cycle lanes is needed to ensure continuation of routes.
- It is important to work with Sustrans to ensure that links between towns are improved.
- It is important that the LTP looks to maintain the current cycle paths not just create new ones.
- Better provision is needed for cyclists at major junctions.
- The LTP should consider the potential to integrate cycling and public transport with the possibility of adding cycle racks to the front of buses.
- Better road awareness for all users, including cyclists, should be promoted and encouraged.

Road Condition

- Many pavements are in poor condition and more pedestrian crossings are required.
- The maintenance of rural roads should be a vitally important element of the LTP.
- Widening of the A14 is critical.
- New roads will only encourage further car use.

Road Safety

- The LTP needs to address the problem of 'jaywalking', perhaps with instant fines.
- Legislation needs to prevent lorries from overtaking on the Huntingdon to Cambridge section of the A14.
- Concerns regarding road safety should be taken into consideration earlier in the planning process.
- The county is in need of more safety initiatives implemented through the LTP.
- Upgrading of street and footway lighting should be an integral part of improving road safety.
- Careful consideration should be given to the implementation of traffic calming measures.

Environment

- Concern was raised about the loss of 'greenbelt' around Cambridge City and the impact that schemes have on the quality of life.
- Pressure needs to be applied to ensure that public transport vehicles are non-polluting.
- We must focus on sustainability, conservation of natural resources and combating pollution measures.
- Integral to the LTP should be that any highway improvement must provide trees and traditional hedges and flowers.

The questionnaire also allowed for individuals to specifically comment upon whether they thought there should be any additional objectives to the four main ones listed in the draft LTP. 40% of people completing the questionnaire commented that they felt an additional objective was needed. Table 1.1 summarises the areas that people thought objectives should be added.

Table 1.1 Additional objectives suggested

<i>Suggested objective area</i>	<i>LTP Objective</i>
Environment and Pollution Economy Improvements for Public Transport and Cycling Attention for rural areas	To protect and enhance the built and natural environment To provide a transport system that meets the needs of the economy To promote public transport, walking, cycling and other sustainable forms of transport To create a transport system that is accessible to all

Roadshows

During May 2003, we held 19 staffed exhibitions or ‘roadshows’ across the County where both County Council and District Council officers were available to answer questions and provide additional information on the proposals outlined in the draft version of the LTP. At these roadshows we had comment cards available for members of the public to write down any comments, questions or information requests for us to follow up at a later date. Below is a summary of the main points that came from these cards at each of the roadshows.

Roadshow Comment Cards

St Neots

- St Neots desperately needs a bus station.
- The single carriageway bypass needs dualling.
- Interchanges in St Neots need improving.
- Improvements on the A428 should be of primary importance.
- The footbridge and the cycle bridge in St Neots could be made into a car bridge which would make the whole of St Neots one-way.
- Long stay parking in the town needs to be reviewed.
- Traffic lights needs to be phased using UTC (Urban Traffic Control systems).
- The rail route between St Neots and Cambridge needs to be explored.
- There needs to be greater promotion of bus services.
- Bus and train services need to coincide.
- More direct services between Market Towns are needed, for example St Neots and Huntingdon.
- Mill Road HGV traffic should be restricted.
- Bus service maps need to be made clearer.

St Ives

- A St Ives Market Town Strategy is needed.
- Support for Rapid Transit as it will speed up journey time between St Ives and Science Park.
- More details on Rapid Transit are wanted.

Huntingdon

- Cycle lanes need improving as cyclists are vulnerable on the road.
- More cycling initiatives are needed in the area.
- New traffic signals are needed near Ramsey.
- Huntingdon and District services need to be expanded to include weekend and evening services.

Cambridge

- More frequent bus services are needed.
- Buses need to go to a wider variety of places.
- A14 Park and Ride sites are not signposted very well, clearer signs are needed.
- Links between residential, employment and retail areas need improving.
- Stagecoach need to improve reliability of their services.
- More evening and weekend services are needed.
- A higher number of segregated cycle paths are required.
- Park and Ride services could be usefully expanded to include evenings/weekends.
- Better links are needed between the bus and rail stations.
- Links between new developments and transport need to be more clearly explained.

Bassingbourn

- Community Transport needs to be publicised more heavily to increase usage.

Comberton

- The Cambridge to Hardwick cycle route needs improving.
- Need to reduce the volume of traffic and speed of traffic through villages.
- Cycle lanes connecting Comberton to the cycle improvements on the A428.
- Public Transport links need improving if people are going to use the services.
- Concern over Cambourne and how it will affect traffic on the A428 and other local roads.

Impington

- Concerns over Rapid Transit proposals.
- Widening the A14 will affect the noise and air pollution levels in Impington.
- Cycling into Cambridge from Impington is difficult as crossing the A14 roundabout is dangerous.
- Increased pedestrian safety on routes to schools is required.

Cottenham

- There is a problem of freight traffic going through villages.

Sawston

- LTP needs to include more mention of horse riders as they are a vulnerable group.
- More bridleways are needed.

- Cross-boundary issues are essential as not everyone commutes towards Cambridge.
- Reliability and frequency of public transport services need to be improved.

Soham

- Students travelling from Soham to Cambridge Regional College need bus facilities.
- Cycle routes in Soham need improving.
- There needs to be an upgrading of footpaths to cater for the needs of horse riders.
- There needs to be a link to Burwell Drovers.
- The Soham to Wicken cycle way needs upgrading.

Littleport

- The LTP is too Cambridge focused.
- Cambridge car parks are too expensive so people are going elsewhere to shop.
- Public Transport buses are too old and not safe which is why people take their children to school in cars.
- Joined up thinking is required.
- More 'vehicle too high' flashing lights are needed at Ely Bridge.

Ely

- More spaces to hold bikes in Ely centre, specifically around Waitrose, are needed.
- All of East Cambridgeshire should have horse friendly paths.
- The role of taxis in the area needs to be examined further.
- Improved safety is needed for public transport and taxi users.

Whittlesey

- Pavements in the town need improving for electric scooter use.
- The A605 King's Dyke improvements are needed soon as trains are causing congestion.
- Better links are needed to Peterborough so cross-boundary issues need to be looked at more closely.

March

- Bus information needs to be made available at March Railway Station.
- An interchange facility connecting bus and rail users is necessary.
- A roundabout at the A141/A605 junction is required.
- Traffic needs to be slowed down on rural roads.
- Traffic lights in town centre need to be looked at.
- The Sainsbury's junction needs improving.

Wisbech

- Concern over HGV traffic using residential and rural roads.
- Wisbech Market Place should be opened up to vehicles.
- The Market Place should be totally pedestrianised as it is unsafe in its current state.
- Rural bus links need to be improved and the frequency of public transport increased.

Chatteris

- Bus service to Huntingdon is out of sync with trains.
- Bus timetables should be put into the free newspapers like the Fenland Citizen.
- A high quality public transport corridor between Chatteris and Cambridge is needed.

Transport Panel

A transport panel was set up to assist in the development of the LTP. Key representatives from the following areas were enlisted:

- economy
- health
- education
- accessibility, disability, minority groups, community transport, voluntary sector
- police
- cycling
- walking
- car
- bus
- freight
- rail
- environment.

The panel were used to explore ideas for developing the LTP, in particular a strategic framework for each area/objective/transport mode, seeking views across a broad range of interested groups and stakeholders. The panel were used throughout the process of producing the LTP to shape the strategy and comment on its proposed contents until it reached its final form.

Responses From Organisations

The LTP follows the approach taken within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan embedding health into transport policies for the county. We therefore consult and work with the health service to ensure that the policies and targets contained within the LTP reflect those of the Health Authority. In preparing this LTP, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Public Health Network carried out a Health Review of our first LTP to ensure that we better integrate health assessment areas for improvement in the production of this LTP.

A key element in developing the LTP has been the Local Strategic Partnerships. One aspect common to all of these partnerships is that each has or is in the process of setting up a transport and access group, with representatives from the County, the District, the health service, education providers, housing groups, voluntary sector, the police and transport operators. We have consulted with these groups during the development of the LTP and they have helped shape the final document.

Engagement With Elected Members

A series of meetings were held with both County Council and District Council members to discuss the draft LTP and help shape the final strategy. Each session adopted a similar approach with a presentation about the contents of the draft LTP and then a question and answer session involving members and a panel

comprising of Transport Strategy staff, the Assistant Director or Director of Environment and Transport and in some cases the Lead Member for Environment and Transport in Cambridgeshire.

Cambridgeshire County Council Members

- Expressed concern that Section 106 agreements have historically been unspecific and not linked well and felt the LTP should ensure that all new development contributes to the infrastructure.
- Felt that we should now adopt an approach which doesn't allow development to go ahead without contributions.
- Expressed concern that rail seem to be neglected in the draft LTP.
- Believe that rail travel has to come back and therefore the LTP needs to ensure that it preserves areas where rail could be developed in the future.
- Were keen that the LTP explains how cross-boundary issues will be dealt with.
- Expect consistency in terms of what is in the LTPs of neighbouring counties.
- Felt that sufficient flexibility was needed in the LTP to ensure that any future changes, in terms of development or work/leisure patterns in the county can be acted upon quickly.
- Felt that it was vital our schemes contained detail to ensure that government see them as the priority.
- Felt that the provision of real-time bus information is essential for modal shift.
- Felt that schemes like 'Travel to Work' and 'Walk to School' need to be made more attractive to organisations and educational establishments.
- Suggested an additional objective which stated that 'the design and delivery of infrastructure should be delivered with sensitivity to the living environment'.
- Feel that money needs to be factored in for increased costs and additional public transport services.
- The infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists needs to be improved before people will view them as realistic alternatives for journeys.
- Felt that there is scope for further work with headteachers through the 'walk to school' initiative to reduce the number of children being driven to school.
- Feel that we need to address the issues of noise mitigation along the A14 as improvements to this trunk road are only proposed in the long term.

Cambridge City Members

- Asked whether we had a long term structural policy in terms of congestion hotspots as it is a fundamental thrust of the LTP to promote sustainable alternatives.
- Suggested that reference should be made to the possibility of a station at Addenbrooke's Hospital that would be complimentary to South Cambridgeshire in the same way as the station at Chesterton is complimentary to North Cambridgeshire.
- Supported proposals to improve the A14 but were anxious to ensure that it did not have detrimental effect on the Ditton Lane area.

- Supported proposals for Chesterton Station but were anxious that any congestion issues surrounding it would be mitigated with its development.
- Suggested that a package of measures is needed to get people off the A14.
- Suggested that land use and transport planning still need to be brought closer together.
- Asked whether the LTP was looking at the possibility of work place parking charges and road user charging and suggested that a feasibility study into congestion charging should be undertaken given the level of development that is currently planned for the county.
- Suggested an additional objective for the LTP which would reflect the environmental issues.
- Sought clarification over how the prioritisation of schemes and funding within the LTP process works.

Huntingdonshire District Council Members

- Sought confirmations that the schemes contained within the LTP were realistic not just aspirational.
- Felt that it was vital that the LTP addressed issues of how public transport in rural areas, away from the main corridors, would be developed.
- Felt that there was a good network of cycle and walking routes emerging through Market Town Strategies but this needed to expand and create new routes such as the southern bridge in St Neots.
- Felt the LTP could include more to assist the Ramsey area in terms of jobs, roads and economic prosperity.
- Sought clarification about 2 key issues for the district. Firstly, the current position of Rapid Transit and secondly, the current position of Earith Bridges.
- Felt that more needed to be done to address walking and cycling issues in the Yaxley/Farcet and Hampton areas as well as wider road safety issues on fen roads.
- Felt the LTP needed more on the future for community transport.
- Believe that the LTP needs to include more on rail, particularly freight, issues.
- Believe that whilst they agree that bus corridors are a key issue, feeding them is a vital element for success.

South Cambridgeshire District Council Members

- Expressed the wish that rail services be properly integrated with the LTP.
- Suggested that routes covered by Park and Ride buses should be expanded to include local rail stations.
- Pointed out that it was vital that infrastructure either preceded or accompanied development.
- Suggested that a possible solution might be to improve transport interchanges, perhaps running school and company buses from Park and Ride sites.
- Asked about the potential for revising the criteria for installing speed cameras as part of the wider need for traffic calming in villages.

- Welcomed the proposal to develop the A10 as a transport corridor but stressed the importance of making corresponding road junction improvements as well.
- Wanted to see the provision for a cycle bridge over the A14 contained within the LTP.
- Felt that it was important that the LTP provided funding to improve the standard of cycle paths across the County.
- Asked whether there was anything the County Council could do better to co-ordinate bus services available in the County.
- Raised the issues of car parking at railway stations and asked whether we could work with train companies and neighbouring authorities to ensure sufficient parking spaces are available.
- Noted that the education system will need to play a leading role in promoting modal shift and that the Safer Routes to School initiative should be more widely promoted and encouraged.

East Cambridgeshire District Council Members

- Felt that the Witcham Toll roundabout should be a priority.
- Felt the LTP should recognise the importance of the Ely Southern Bypass.
- Noted that the LTP needed to look to improve the A10 north of Littleport as it is in a poor state.
- Questioned why the Fordham 'gate' to Soham roundabout was not a 40mph speed limit.
- Expressed their disappointment at how short the line of Fordham Bypass was.
- Stressed the importance of the development of rural public transport to compliment what is already contained within the LTP.
- Asked whether there was an automatic relationship between Government monies and development.

Fenland District Council Members

- Identified that there is a need for a roundabout at the A605/A141 Goosetree junction.
- Asked that the LTP address speeding traffic on rural/village roads.
- Commented that there is a need for better public transport in the evenings between Peterborough and March.
- Identified that there is a need for better public transport between Chatteris and Wisbech.
- The LTP needs to contain a mechanism by which Community Transport Schemes are promoted.
- Expressed concern that the new rail freight depot in March might lead to more HCVs on town roads.
- Made a general request that road maintenance needs to be maintained/improved.
- Believe that the LTP should include a southern bypass for Chatteris.
- Supported the Market Town initiatives as a way of improving the situation locally.
- Support the LTP A605 King's Dyke improvements.

Responses By Individual Letter

This section summarises the responses received from individuals who have written letters separately from the questionnaires on specific topics. The general comments written are encouraging and supportive towards the draft proposals and outline suggestions for improvements to the majority of areas contained within the LTP. The main criticism was that people wanted further information about specific schemes and where possible we responded to these requests.

The following comments were made on modes of transport.

Buses

- The greatest emphasis in the LTP should be on improving public transport (buses and rail).
- Public Transport (staff buses) should be used to transport employers to and from large organisations, for example, the Addenbrooke's site.
- Bus and rail services need to be much better integrated.
- Service frequencies need improving to at least half hourly.
- The A1198 northwards from Royston should be considered as an additional high quality transport corridor.
- There is a very limited evening and Sunday service which forces car use.
- The priority in the LTP should be to make public transport run reliably and then introduce real time bus information.
- Bus information should be more easily accessible.

Community Transport

- Dial-a-ride initiatives received overall support but it was felt that they should be promoted more.

Rail

- There was recognition that the County Council is limited as to rail projects under LTP funding, but it was suggested that we should include the following.
 - Support for the Thames link 2000/East-West Rail/West Anglia route upgrade/Hourly train service linking major regional centres/protection for future rail freight facilities including the Wisbech routes.
 - Oppose rural train services being replaced by buses.
- Major improvements to interchange facilities at railway stations and better co-operation between bus and train operators is needed.
- A new rail/bus link would be good between St Neots and Cambourne.
- Concern was expressed over the perceived dependence on the road network contained within the LTP.

Road Network

- There are no reasonable or adequate barriers in place between the A14 and large areas of housing.
- The LTP should meet the diverse needs of Cambridgeshire communities and local traffic should be separated from national trunk network traffic.
- It was felt that the County Council must urge Government to accept that improvements to Cambridgeshire infrastructure

must precede both building of houses and industrial/commercial developments.

- It is important that inter-village routes, which are often single-tracked, have passing places.

Cycling

- Improve cycling facilities by allowing them onboard trains in both the AM and PM rush hours.

Market Towns

- The LTP needs to recognise some Market Towns (e.g. Haverhill) that are outside the administrative boundaries of Cambridgeshire but which are integral for the development of sustainable transport networks across the County.
- The basic concept of express bus links in from the ring of market towns is good but frequency needs to be 15minutes as 30 minutes is still too long.

Policy

- A long-term framework for the LTP is necessary due to the long-term nature of infrastructure planning. Therefore, the period up to 2016 should be considered as well as to 2011.
- Journeys that involve changing modes must be promoted.
- Transport needs to be environmentally friendly, safe, cheap, accessible and well integrated.
- It was felt that more input from the beginning would have been preferable.
- The rural bus service should be accepted to make use of new infrastructure like Rapid Transit and interchange facilities.
- The older generation needs to be considered more fully throughout the LTP.
- Something needs to be done to protect against flooding.
- Traffic reduction is an important objective that is not fully outlined in the LTP.
- Question was raised as to why the possibility of introducing a workplace parking tax has been dropped.
- A sensible transport system has places of work at both ends of the journey.

Parking

- Lion Yard (Cambridge) car park fees have been too steeply increased.

Car/Private Vehicles

- LTP should focus on reducing the number of 1 person to a car commuters.

Economic Viability

- It has been suggested that Government should charge employers who employ someone who lives more than 5 miles from workplace, rising incrementally by distance travelled to work to make it uneconomic to employ someone travelling more than 25 miles.
- There should be a better countywide perspective used. The LTP should plan to link North Cambridgeshire/Peterborough with Cambridge Sub-Region to share economic prosperity.

Pollution

- Concerns that plans to widen the A14 at the B1049 junction will increase noise and air pollution.

Horses

- The LTP needs to include a section for horse riders as they are vulnerable road users.
- The LTP needs to include an increased number of bridleways.

The following comments were made on specific schemes.

Rapid Transit

- It would be better to re-open the St Ives to Cambridge railway line than to use a guided bus.
- It is about time Cambridge had high-quality, reliable Public Transport.
- There should be a station at Addenbrooke's Hospital where the train could terminate, having been through Hills and Long Road Bridges.
- Buses and Rapid Transit services need to be coordinated.
- Should be a route along the A14 which would be more direct and not impinge on a rail line.

Chesterton Rail Station

- It was commented that a station at Long Road/Addenbrooke's would be more useful and help alleviate Trumpington congestion.

M11 to Addenbrooke's link road

- The link road needs to serve the residential development as well as the research facilities on the Addenbrooke's site.

New Ring of Park and Ride Sites

- Support for these received, especially if they are supported by the upgrading of the roads they will be located on, for example the A1307 and A10.
- Park and Ride sites are a success and they should be developed further.
- The need for new Park and Ride sites is not made clear enough.
- A new park and ride site is needed near Foxton Station and at Duxford.

Youth Engagement

In formulating the LTP, we were particularly anxious to ensure that those in the age group 16-21 were fully involved in the consultation, as previous consultations had shown that response rates were lowest amongst this group. Therefore we sought to address this through a specifically targeted young persons questionnaire for which we received 2222 responses.

A number of different initiatives were employed to ensure that young people across the county were all given the opportunity to comment of the future of transport in Cambridgeshire.

Presentations

During March and April 2003, transport strategy officers visited six of the sixth form colleges across the County to give a presentation detailing why we are writing a replacement Local Transport Plan and the role they had in shaping the final document. On a number of occasions we ran workgroup sessions which gave students the opportunity to identify specific transport problems and solutions in their area before reporting back to officers who were able to demonstrate the constraints that surround Local authorities when looking to improve the transport infrastructure in an area.

The school presentations elicited the most responses and the highest response rate.

School Packs

During March and April 2003 school packs were sent out to all 30 secondary schools in the County as well as those sixth form colleges who were unable to allocate us time for a presentation. The school packs contained a detailed letter explaining what we were doing, 100 copies of the questionnaire, 1 copy of the Annual Progress Report 2001-2002 and 2 CD-Roms containing the current Local Transport Plan. This information was designed to be used as the basis for a classroom discussion prior to the completion of the questionnaires. In total, we received information back from 11 secondary schools and 2 sixth form colleges.

Youth Parliament

During the consultation period, officers spoke to members of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament that hold seats within Cambridgeshire. The East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Cabinet had recently completed their own transport questionnaire which gave a valuable insight into the feelings of young people in their constituency regarding public transport provision. The findings suggested that 79% of those surveyed were concerned about the state of the public transport systems in their area. Of those surveyed 45% said that they did not feel safe using buses as their method of travel, whilst 65% did not feel safe using trains. The survey done by the Youth Member of Parliament had similar findings to the youth questionnaire distributed for the LTP, discussed below.

Findings suggested that increases in public transport usage amongst young people would most likely occur if costs were reduced and the reliability and frequency of services was to be increased. Provision in the LTP for Real Time Bus Information and the overall corridor approach should lead to improvements both in terms of reliability and frequency. Members wanted to see subsidised fares extended on buses and trains for youths up to the age of 18, instead of the current age 16.

Youth Parliament also raised concerns over the provision of school buses and felt that in some cases the standard of the vehicles used could be improved. It was also generally felt that services providing links between residential and leisure facilities in the evenings needed to be provided to reduce young people's reliance upon their parents for social activities.

Text Messages

Our aim to open up the consultation to as many people as possible meant that we looked at a number of different methods that could be used by the public to express their views. The use of mobile phone text messaging as a way for the public to express their views on transport was a brand new initiative undertaken by the County Council for this consultation. It was

effective in making the LTP more accessible to young people as they were asked to comment using a tool they are familiar with. The number of people with a mobile telephone is considerable so it seemed a sensible way of reaching people. Our mobile number was publicised using press releases and was also documented in the young person's questionnaire distributed through education establishments.

Summary of Responses to the Youth Questionnaire

- A total of 2222 responses were received. Of the respondents:
- 46% were male
- 54% were female
- 24% were under 16
- 76% were over 16.

Table Q1 indicates that across the County the majority of students get to college using a bus (both specific school buses and general public transport). There were good levels of walking and cycling, which was encouraging but high levels of private car use, which, it is hoped, will be reduced through initiatives contained within the LTP and the Safer Routes to School programme.

Table Q2 shows that the majority of young people get to leisure and social activities using a private car. The majority of leisure and social activities are in the evenings or at the weekend so, this may be because of the convenience the private car offers. However, after considering the qualitative comments that came out of the workgroups and the Youth Parliament session, it is because often no viable alternative exists. One of the most regularly made points concerned the lack of public transport to access leisure and social activities in the evenings.

Q1 How do you usually get to college?

Bus	36%
Rail	8%
Cycle	14%
Walking	21%
Private Car	21%

Q2 How do you usually get to leisure and social activities?

Bus	23%
Rail	8%
Cycle	13%
Walking	18%
Private Car	38%

Q3 How many times a week do you use the following transport modes?

	<i>Average (mean) times used per week</i>
Bus	3.5
Rail	1.1
Cycle	2.0
Walking	3.8
Private Car	3.8

Q4 How would you rate your journey by the following?

Mode	Good	Above Average	Average	Below average	Poor
Bus	23%	32%	30.5%	11%	3.5%
Rail	20%	18%	37%	20%	5%
Cycle	17%	14%	29%	25%	15%
Walking	6%	11%	30%	31%	22%
Roads	8%	17%	35%	26%	14%

Q5a Do you think your area is adequately served by public transport (bus/rail)?

Yes	42%	No	58%
-----	-----	----	-----

Q5b If not, how would you like to see services improved?

Improvement	Bus	Rail
Improved Reliability	27.5%	26%
Greater Frequency	25.5%	20%
More Choices in Routes	17%	16%
Reduced Fares	25%	33%
Other	5%	5%

Q6a Are walking and cycling facilities adequately provided for within your area?

Yes	65%	No	35%
-----	-----	----	-----

Q6b If not, how could they be improved?

Improvement	Cycling	Walking
Improved Safety Features	17%	14%
More Footpaths	8%	25%
More Cycle-ways	27%	5%
Better Surfacing	19%	16%
Better Lighting	19%	25%
Better Environment	9%	14%
Other	1%	1%

Q7 Do you think there is a problem with congestion in your area?

Yes	54%	No	46%
-----	-----	----	-----

Table Q3 shows that in a week young people do more journeys by private car or by walking than by any other mode. The average number of times they use a bus is also high but this may be because trips to and from school by bus were counted.

Table Q4 indicates that young people are on average satisfied with the journeys that they make by bus and rail but less satisfied with journeys they make by bicycle or by foot. Road condition was not generally perceived to be very good which may indicate why cycling and walking journeys received lower ratings.

Table Q5a shows that the majority of young people believe that where they live is not adequately served by public transport. This could largely reflect the expressed desire for more evening and weekend services.

Table Q5b shows that the main improvements young people would like to see regarding public transport involve reduced fares, improved reliability and greater frequency. These results are the same to those collected by the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Youth Parliament Cabinet questionnaire. The corridor approach contained within the LTP will improve both the reliability and frequency of public transport across the County and the rural linkages into corridors should result in increased accessibility to public transport for young people.

Table Q6a shows that on the whole young people were happy with the provision of walking and cycling facilities in their area. The LTP looks to provide improvement to cycling and walking facilities locally through the Market Town initiatives and at a County level via the expansion of routes to link market town together.

Table Q6b indicates that young people would like to see an increase in the number of cycleways and footpaths across the county which will come through the LTP directly and as part of the numerous Market Town Strategies. Also high in the priorities for improvements was the provision of better lighting which again ties in with the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Youth Parliament cabinet findings that safety was a concern amongst young people.

Table Q7 shows that just over half of all respondents believe that there is a problem with congestion in their area. The LTP contains a number of measures all designed to reduce congestion and improve the ease which people can travel around.

Summary Of Interest Group Meetings

An integral part the development of the LTP were the stakeholder workshops as they provided us with the opportunity to discuss, and get feedback, on our proposals. Each workshop shared a common agenda, which involved a presentation by a transport strategy officer about the LTP and its proposed contents followed by a specific section on the strategy relevant to the discussion group. Finally there was time for questions and feedback from attendees on what was still needed. In total we held 7 workshops which sought to address the issues in the following strategy areas:

- passenger transport
- freight
- cycling
- businesses
- rail
- taxis
- voluntary sector.

Passenger transport workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape the bus strategy that is contained within the LTP:

- Stagecoach East
- Burtons Coaches Ltd
- Go West Travel Ltd (Norfolk Green)
- Sovereign Bus and Coach Co. Ltd.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

The discussion focussed on the need to:

- develop business cases for all the corridors, looking at the potential patronage and benefits to bus operators of each route
 - continue to work with the bus companies to improve services and coordinate improvements, both as a group through our Strategic Bus Partnership and individually
 - introduce legal bus quality partnerships along corridors in agreement with the bus companies and where the business case shows this necessary
 - continue to introduce ‘informal’ bus quality partnerships so as to coordinate infrastructure improvements with the introduction of new high quality services
 - develop improvements to bus services in specific areas through the market town and area strategies.
- The bus operators agreed that the partnership approach is the best way forward, and welcomed the County Council proposals to develop business cases for routes, and to invest in infrastructure through the LTP.
- The operators confirmed that this type of approach could be successful in developing the bus market to the extent that they would consider making investment in service development.
- There was detailed discussion of the information strategy and the operators were particularly keen to see the introduction of real time information.
- It was agreed that further meetings would be held with individual operators to discuss putting detail on the way forward.

Freight Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape the freight strategy that is contained within the LTP:

- English, Welsh and Scottish railways
- Freight Transport Association Ltd
- Network Rail
- Road Haulage Association.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- There was agreement on all sides that an expansion in rail freight would be desirable but difficult to achieve.

Specifically Road Freight representatives:

- Wanted to see proper recognition within the LTP and the provision of more resting places for drivers.
- Expressed concern about the lack of enforcement of loading/unloading depots in Cambridge.
- Supported the provision of better information and designated routes and would assist in its distribution.

- Are happy to work in partnership with us and happy to come to an agreement about loading times in the market towns.
- Felt that the Freight Quality Partnership worked well.

Specifically Rail Freight representatives:

- Wanted the LTP to support a new depot in March.
- Wanted the LTP to continue to provide the infrastructure that would be required for potential future growth.
- Wanted access for freight to the new interchange at Chesterton.
- Would like the LTP to protect future or disused rail freight sites.

Cycling Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape the cycling strategy that is contained within the LTP:

- Cambridge Cycling Campaign
- Cambridge University EMBS
- Marshall of Cambridge Aerospace Ltd
- St Ives Cycling Club
- Sustrans
- Travel for Work, and
- Wisbech Cycle Forum.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- The group felt that the vision for cycling in Cambridgeshire needed to be clearer and more actively promoted alongside the targets for increased cycling.
- The maintenance of the road environment needs to fully appreciate the needs of cyclists.
- Significant off-road routes are required in Cambridge.
- The groups felt that it was important that any new cycle routes identified in the LTP were joined up and connected to existing routes.
- The question about whether the LTP would look at introducing multi-purpose routes was raised.
- It was felt that improvements need to be made in relation to the availability and quality of cycle parking.
- It was agreed that more needed to be invested in education and cycle awareness training.

Business Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape all strategy areas that are contained within the LTP:

- Addenbrooke’s NHS Trust
- Huntingdon Life Sciences Ltd
- Nokia telecommunications Ltd
- Learning and Skills Council
- University of Cambridge, and
- Cambridgeshire Strategic Business Forum.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- It was stated by the group that it was essential that the LTP tied in with the development strategy for the county.

- Interest was expressed in congestion relief/possible dualling of the A10 north of Cambridge.
- Demand Management measures such as the Cambridge Core scheme were seen as potentially useful, but only in conjunction with other measures to provide alternative transport capacity.
- It was felt that statutory undertakers work on the highway should be much better managed.
- Perception of quality (or lack of) in public transport provision was seen as a barrier to its fuller utilisation as an alternative to the private car.
- Interest was expressed in the concept of rural Park and Ride sites serving Cambridge and the Market Towns on radial corridors.
- It was felt that cycling and walking were not seen as viable alternatives to the private car in many areas because of a lack of high quality facilities and severance caused by major transport arteries.
- The group expressed a desire for the Travel to Work Partnership to get mainstream funding rather than annual capital support, to enable longer-term contracts and initiatives to be put in place.

Rail Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape the rail strategy that is contained within the LTP:

- Anglia Railways
- Fen Users Association
- Peterborough – Norwich Rail Users Association
- Rail Passengers' Committee for Eastern England;
- Railfuture, and
- WAGN.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- The group raised issues about how the LTP fund rail initiatives in respect of what the money could be used for and how they could make a bid.
- Concerns were also raised regarding Chesterton station and how it was to be publicised – it was stated that if Chesterton was promoted heavily then this could detract from other good rail work that is being carried out in the region.
- It was felt that the LTP was a good mechanism by which bus and rail interchanges could be promoted.
- It was also felt that there was further scope for the development of through ticketing between bus and rail services and that where this currently existed there was a need for increased promotion.

Taxi Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape the taxi strategy that is contained within the LTP:

- Cambridge Licensed Drivers Association
- East Cambridgeshire Taxi Association
- Taxi Association
- TWGU – Cab section 2

- TWGU – Cab section 46, and
- Cambridge Licensed Taxi Association.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- There is a need to take forward the provision of taxis beyond main urban areas.
- Need to look at the possibility of widening/implementing taxi-card schemes.
- Could explore potential links with Park and Ride schemes.
- There need to be broader operating standards which are adhered to across the County by all operators.
- Accessibility, especially for wheelchair users, needs careful consideration.
- The questions was raised about whether, through subsidies, taxis could provide evening support as part of Public Transport provision.
- Transponder issue.
- Support was received for electronic hailing as long as it supplemented existing ranks.
- The groups felt that cameras/CCTV at ranks would increase the safety of both passengers and drivers.
- The groups felt that the scope exists for liaison with individuals, for example nightclub owners, to facilitate partnerships.
- The groups felt that the promotions of taxis could be increased and the idea of a one-stop travel shop or comprehensive information leaflet would be beneficial.

Voluntary Sector Workshop

Representatives from the following organisations attended the workshop and helped shape all strategy areas that are contained within the LTP:

- Accessible Designs
- Age Concern
- Cambridge Dial-a-Ride
- CAMSIGHT
- Cambridge Urban Forum
- Cambridgeshire ACRE
- Cambridgeshire British Horse Society
- CSTF
- Directions Plus
- East Anglian Ambulance Trust
- East Cambridgeshire Access Group
- Fenland Bridleways Association
- Huntingdonshire PCT
- Ouse Valley Dial-a-Ride
- Peterborough Dial-a-Ride
- Ramblers Association
- South Cambridgeshire PCT
- St Ives Volunteer Bureau
- Thrapston Area Community Transport
- Three County Transport, and
- Wildlife Trust for Cambridgeshire.

The main points raised during the session are outlined below.

- The issues of education transport was raised and the question of whether Park and Ride sites or mini-buses could be utilised by parents and children.
- The issues of safety on public transport was raised and whether the LTP contained initiatives to improve both safety and the perception of safety for public transport users.
- The fundamental issues raised concerning public transport were that people felt that increases in patronage would only come about if public transport was reliable, accessible, cheap, convenient and clean.
- It was felt that the walking and cycling strategy was out-dated and needed to be expanded to include all non-motorised forms of transport including horse riders.
- The issues of personal safety was highlighted again when talking about walking and cycling and it was felt that information on safer and well lit routes would encourage modal shifts towards walking and cycling.
- It was suggested that the removal of freight from roads onto rail or waterways should be considered as part of the LTP.
- There was an express desire for a one-stop information centre that provides information in a number of ways and covers all forms of transport, so that it is fully integrated.
- Inconsistencies in funding for Community Transport schemes need to be looked at.

Future Consultation

Consultation is a mainstream activity of the council and therefore we undertake consultation every year on the Annual Progress Report and on any scheme that we are looking to implement. We are continually learning from each consultation we undertake and therefore future consultations will benefit from the work we have done on the LTP.

We will continue to do consultation on the Market Town Strategies and engage with the health authority, police, education authority and others through the Local Strategic Partnerships. We regularly take update reports on schemes we are looking to implement to Area Joint Committee's and engage with Councillors fully.

Our summary document for the LTP and the Annual Progress Report will be made readily available to members of the public and we will continue to do this in the future. We have produced an LTP with public ownership and will continue to keep the public aware of our progress, achievements and plans.

Conclusion

The LTP consultation has been a tremendous success. We received a considerably higher number of responses to this consultation than for the first LTP, which reflects the increasing importance of transport in the county. We have raised the profile of the LTP and the work that it undertakes and have received a variety of responses as a result. We have received overall support for our document and the number of people that took the time to visit the exhibitions or comment to us in letters shows that the people in Cambridgeshire are passionate about transport.

