

Making Space for People Statement of Consultation

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Making Space for People Vision and Principles document has been prepared to act as a co-ordination tool to align thinking on future street, public space and movement projects between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- 1.2 The document has been prepared following both early stakeholder and general public engagement as well as later public consultation on the draft document. Groups and organisations involved in the preparation of this document include local community and voluntary groups, landowners, educational organisations, young people, disability organisations, business organisations, transport operators and other local interest groups.
- 1.3 This Statement of Consultation summarises the approach and key consultation steps and events undertaken so far in the Making Space for People project. The Vision and Principles document has been finalised to reflect the comments made on it as part of the public consultation which took place between 2 September and 14 October 2019.

2.0 Preparation of the Making Space for People: Vision and Principles document

- 2.1 The preparation of the Vision and Principles document has been informed by the early engagement events detailed elsewhere in this statement of consultation. The Making Space for People project aligns with the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) adopted by Cambridge City Council on 18 October 2018. The document should be read in conjunction with adopted policies in the Local Plan and other relevant material considerations. The document will also support the aims of the local transport bodies (led by the CPCA) who have made a

commitment to reducing congestion through a significant shift to sustainable transport modes.

- 2.2 A Baseline Report has been prepared to inform the Vision and Principles document and initial stakeholder and public engagement has helped inform the report. The extent and scope of engagement is outlined below.

Stakeholder surgeries

- 2.3 One to one stakeholder surgeries, to discuss opportunities and constraints for Central Cambridge, and what approach the document should take, were held in spring 2018. These took place with council officers and Members as well as external stakeholders representing local communities and interest groups, including community groups and service providers. The stakeholders identified a number of issues that the project team needed to consider when preparing the forthcoming workshops, including extending the invitation list to stakeholders beyond those already identified.

Public online survey

- 2.4 An online public engagement was carried out for a five-week period from in June and July 2018. Members of the public were asked to feedback on:
- Open spaces - how could they be improved and what is important to safeguard?
 - Cycling and walking routes – what new routes would you like to see and how can existing routes be improved?
 - Street improvements - where would you like to see new benches, play areas and street furniture?
 - Are there opportunities for creating new spaces?
- 2.5 The engagement platform comprised of:
- An interactive map – allowing members of the public to pin exact locations where they identify issues and opportunities in Central Cambridge

- A survey – asking questions which allowed people to feedback on broad strategic issues and opportunities.

2.6 478 people engaged and provided feedback via the map and/or survey. The web page was visited 2,320 times. The interactive map provided a powerful tool in its ability to spatially plot public opinion. It was particularly useful in identifying small scale issues across the City, where individuals experience the most conflicts. Most of the 832 responses addressed transport challenges. As with the interactive map, the 346 people completed the survey tended to focus on movement conflicts along particular streets.

2.7 Public engagement events were held at key locations and events during the summer of 2018 in the City Centre to promote the Making Space for People project and to direct them to the online engagement platform:

- New Square
- Grand Arcade
- Guildhall
- University of Cambridge Freshers Fair, Parker's Piece

Workshop 1

2.8 On 4th July 2018, 32 stakeholders gathered at Anglia Ruskin University, for a half-day workshop to address movement and public realm proposals for the emerging Making Space for People project. The workshop was the first in a series of three, providing a critical opportunity for local and regional representatives to hear each other's perspectives and collectively problem solve.

2.9 The intention of the first workshop was to review challenges and opportunities identified in the stakeholder surgeries, through roundtable discussions, whilst addressing barriers to change. Attendees were asked to discuss and present their ideas in small groups. These ideas, along with the wider engagement platforms, have informed both the Baseline Report and the direction of the

Vision and Principles document, allowing the consultant team to generate a series of proposals to take forward to Stage 2: Vision and Strategy.

2.10 Through the discussions and presentations many ideas emerged, as potential priorities the City Council and GCP need to explore in order to deliver the brief, these include:

- Public transport improvement
- Enhancement of character and offer in areas outside of the historic core
- Creation of street hierarchy
- Review access restrictions
- Review of parking options

2.11 Those in attendance included:

- Local Ward and County Councillors
- University of Cambridge
- Colleges' Bursars' Committee
- FeCRA
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- COPE
- Smarter Cambridge Transport
- Friends of Midsummer Common/Cambridge SoS
- Cam Sight
- Visit Cambridge
- Cambridge Road Safety Advisory Council
- Anglia Ruskin Student Union
- Stagecoach
- Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cambridge Living Streets
- Cambridge City Council Access Officer / Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cambridge Living Streets
- Cambridge City Council – Streets and Open Spaces
- Cambridge BID
- Anglia Ruskin University – Estates and Facilities

Workshop 2

2.12 On 17th August 2018 a similar group of stakeholders gathered at Anglia Ruskin University, for a second half-day workshop to review the challenges and opportunities within some of Central Cambridge's core streets.

2.13 The stakeholders were initially asked to review areas of the city centre based on best practice principles for quality streets. In the second half of the workshop the group analysed how the identified issues manifest on particular streets.

2.14 Those in attendance included:

- Local Ward and County Councillors
- University of Cambridge
- Colleges' Bursars' Committee
- Anglia Ruskin University – Estates and Facilities
- Anglia Ruskin Student Union
- Cambridge University Student Union
- Smarter Cambridge Transport
- Cambridge Road Safety Advisory Council
- Stagecoach
- Cam Cycle
- Dial-a-Ride
- Sustrans
- FeCRA
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- Cambridge Living Streets
- Cambridge SoS
- Cambridge Ahead
- Cambridge BID
- Cambridge Market Traders Association
- Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce
- Visit Cambridge

- Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cambridge City Council Access Officer / Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cam Sight
- COPE
- Disability Cambridgeshire
- Cambridge Constabulary
- Historic England

Workshop 3

2.15 On 22nd November 2018 a similar group of stakeholders gathered at Gonville and Caius College. This third half-day workshop aimed to assist the project team in developing a vision for the future of the city centre identified by interest groups who represent the local community. Reflecting on the challenges and opportunities, collected from earlier engagement, the workshop began by asking stakeholders to identify the city centre's future potential. The second half of the session asked participants to collectively develop a series of guiding principles and strategies for achieving the proposed vision.

2.16 Those in attendance included:

- Local Ward and County Councillors
- University of Cambridge
- Colleges' Bursars' Committee
- Anglia Ruskin University – Estates and Facilities
- Anglia Ruskin Student Union
- Cambridge University Student Union
- Smarter Cambridge Transport
- Cambridge Road Safety Advisory Council
- Stagecoach
- Cam Cycle
- GCP City Access Cycling Team
- Sustrans
- FeCRA

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- Cambridge Living Streets
- Cambridge SoS
- Cambridge Ahead
- Cambridge BID
- Cambridge Market Traders Association
- Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce
- Visit Cambridge
- Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cambridge City Council Access Officer / Cambridge Disability Panel
- Cam Sight
- COPE
- Cambridge Constabulary
- Historic England

Urban Design Challenge

2.17 'Form the Future' who are a local organisation that help young people to experience and understand future career choices, worked with the Making Space for People Team to hold an event at The Guildhall on 29 September 2018. Students from schools and colleges in and near to Cambridge were invited to work collaboratively to consider issues and solutions to moving in and around Cambridge City Centre. The outputs from the day were judged by experts and an overall winning team selected. A key understanding from the day was the need to make the City Centre relevant to young people and that they were keen to remain involved in decision making about the future of Cambridge and not just limited to the scope of the Making space for People project.

2.18 Overall, the above workshop and the other ones held so far have been successful in identifying relevant themes and issues, generating a collaborative sense of ownership of the project amongst stakeholders, along with the desire

for joint working to ensure delivery. As a result, the project team has become more informed of local opinion, needs and demands.

Consultation on the draft Vision, Principles and Strategies document

2.19 The Making Space for People: Vision, Aims and Objectives and Strategies document was published for public consultation for a period of six weeks between 2 September 2019 and 14 October 2019. Documents made available for consultation included:

- Consultation response forms;
- Public notice;
- Consultation notification letter;
- Statement of Consultation;
- Making Space for People: Vision, Principles and Strategies leaflet;
- Making Space for People: Vision, Principles and Strategies exhibition boards;
- Making Space for People Baseline Report (June 2019).

Consultees

2.20 A number of organisations were directly notified of the consultation on the Making Space for People: Vision, Aims and Objectives and Strategies document in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) via email, or post where no email address was available. The consultees directly notified included those that were invited to the earlier workshop events as well as statutory consultees and individuals and organisations that have opted into the relevant Planning Policy notifications on the Council's consultation system.

2.21 Other methods of notification included:

- a public notice in the Cambridge News;
- information on the Council's webpages, including Homepage;
- information on the Council's social media platforms;

- posters on Cambridge City Council notice boards around the study area;
- Exhibition banners at Central Library, The Guildhall, Mandela House and South Cambridgeshire Hall reception areas;
- staffed public exhibitions held in the local area.

Public Exhibitions

2.22 The Council held two staffed public exhibitions for people wishing to talk to council officers on the consultation document. The first exhibition was held at Central Library, Lion Yard on the 18 September 2019 and the second at the Guildhall on 2 October 2019. These events were publicised through direct mailings, on the council's website and through the council's social media platforms.

Consultation Methodology

2.23 A six-week consultation period for the Making Space for People: Vision, Aims and Objectives and Strategies document took place between 9am on 2 September 2019 to 5pm on 14 October 2019.

2.24 The draft documents and supporting documentation were made available for public inspection during the consultation period at the following locations:

- Online on the council's website: www.cambridge.gov.uk
- At the council's Customer Service Centre at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY from 9am-5.15pm Monday to Friday.

2.25 Comments could be made using:

- the online consultation system <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/> or; the printed response form which was made available from Customer Service Centre (details above) or could be downloaded and filled in electronically by visiting www.cambridge.gov.uk

- Completed forms could be returned to: Planning Policy, Cambridge City Council, PO Box 700, Cambridge, CB1 0JH, or emailed to policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk.

2.26 Respondents could also request to be notified of the next stages of the preparation of the document. Contact details for further information were also made available as follows:

- Tel: 01223 457200
- Email: policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

2.27 During the consultation a total of 344 representations were received during the public consultation, with 94 in support and 40 objecting. A significant number of the objections related to the closure of Mill Road which occurred at the time of the consultation.

2.28 All of the representations are available to be read in full on our online consultation system at: <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/>.

2.29 The following amendments are proposed to the document to reflect the representations received:

- Placing greater emphasis on inclusive design and meeting the needs of all public space users;
- Making the role of cycling within Central Cambridge more clearly understood including the role of cycle based last mile delivery;
- Further emphasis on the role of the green network;
- Considering the extent and timing of the pedestrian priority areas in Central Cambridge;
- Emphasising the role of bus stops as mini modal interchanges and linking into e-bikes and e-scooter infrastructure; and
- Making clearer the role of public spaces in terms of creating a more sociable city and supporting well-being.

- 2.30 The document has also been updated to reflect the recent and on-going impact of COVID on Central Cambridge and the subsequent City Centre Recovery work including social distancing measures that have been introduced. It also has been amended to make clearer the role of cycling as a key mode to support the creation of a walkable city centre and respond to guidance in Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design.
- 2.31 The following section sets out the representations received to the consultation, provides a Council assessment of the issues and where necessary what proposed modifications to the Vision and Principles document are required.

Appendix B

Summary table of representations received, Council response and proposed modifications

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Dr. Graham Spelman [8098]	Support	All	<p>Question 1: A reduction in motor traffic and air pollution in the city centre would give the greatest improvement and increase in capacity to the city centre. Reducing private car use into the area and introducing smaller more frequent electric buses for public transport would be the specific short-term targets.</p> <p>Question 2: Yes, however, to achieve this hierarchy in practice it will be necessary to ban private transport from many more streets in the centre, as motorised vehicles immediately dominate in any nominal 'shared-space'.</p> <p>Question 3: Yes</p> <p>Question 4: Again, yes but the principles need some specific targets: A2 Healthy – ban, non-electric motorised vehicles from city centre. A3 Equitable – cycling should be accessible to all ages, not just a small group willing to mix with motorised traffic. The streets should be safe for children cycling, and accessible (have suitably parking) for those on non-standard bikes – like accessibility trikes and e-bikes that might be used by those who are less mobile. etc.</p> <p>Question 5: Yes, a good selection of themes, covering a broad range of targets.</p>	Vehicular access / hierarchy / aims and objectives	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places by providing the right environmental conditions including improved air quality. MSfP will need to align with and help to inform work undertaken by GCP on City Access which will look at ways to reduce the number of motor vehicle trips into Cambridge and prioritise more sustainable modes. In terms of specific target, GCP has made clear the required reduction needed in private motor vehicle trips and MSfP aligns with this ambition.</p> <p>The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design, and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>	No	
Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Gabriella Yeomans, Flood Risk and Biodiversity Assistant) [8242]	Comment	All	Please note this comment covers the entire document.	X	Comments duly noted.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Frank Gawthrop [4151]	Comment	All	During the initial consultation for this document the area indicated included the residential streets of South Petersfield between Mill Road and Station Road. A number of our members submitted comments but in the current document the area has been reduced to exclude our community. There is no explanation as to why this has been done but clearly the views of residents in our area regarding the emerging SPD and the streets of South Petersfield have been ignored. This is very poor and requires an explanation as to why this unilateral change has taken place	Mill Road access	Figure 2 Making Space for People Study Area' identifies the City Centre and Opportunity Areas that radiate out to include Mill Road and Hills Road/Station Road. The boundaries of these areas are consistent with those in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). Consultation on the MSfP document has not been limited to those people living and working within the study area boundaries. The document provides an overall Vision, Aim & Objectives and High Level Strategies that will be used to inform decision making on future schemes to improve the quality of the City Centre. We are aware that GCP undertook a Mill Road specific project that coincided with our consultation on MSfP and it is possible that comments made by residents were targeted at GCP.		
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	All	Not informed of this consultation and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Comments duly noted.	No	
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	All	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended. None	Consultation	Comments duly noted.	No	
Anglian Water Services Limited (Mr Nathan Makwana, Spatial Planning Advisor) [8155]	Support	All	We are supportive of section 2.5 and 2.51 utilising blue infrastructure (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) to provide urban cooling to help lower air temperatures through the process of evaporative cooling. We are overall supportive of the Making Space for People: Central Cambridge Vision, Aims and Objectives and Strategies SPD and we welcome any further opportunity to comment.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Miss Katie Hawks [8199]	Comment	All	Apart from woeful English, no comment.	Scope	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr FARAZ KHAN [8178]	Comment	All	Not corroborated by independent academics - how can we trust there is no corruption>- as per the Montreal square debacle where	Scope	We have cited references to key supporting information in both this document and the	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			councillors had shares in the housing business that controlled the estate...!! Lot of immorality I hear from a reputable source?		Baseline Study to ensure transparency and openness.		
Peter Tribble [6896]	Comment	All	The questions are poorly specified, and the coverage incomplete.	Scope	Comments duly noted.		
Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity, Co-ordinator) [925]	Comment	All	We agree with the importance of all of these things and would further highlight how cycling enhances and complements every single one. The document briefly mentions cycling in connection with walkability, the economy and public health. We would add that cycling is the most obvious mode of transport faster than walking that can bring people and goods from a much wider area into central Cambridge in a peaceful way that conserves the environment, air quality and the historic nature of the city centre. Compared to driving, cycling is much more conducive to social interaction in public spaces.	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets.	Yes	Further emphasis on the benefits of cycling; being faster than walking, while conserving the environment and more conducive to social interaction in public spaces than driving.
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	All	Once again unable to open document	X	Comments duly noted.	No	
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	All	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Comments noted. The consultation on the document ran from the 2nd Sept - 14th Oct 2019 and included static displays, staffed exhibitions and web and newspaper-based publicity.	No	
Mr Robert Sansom [102]	Support	All	Support	Vision & objectives	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr Adrian Brasnett [8306]	Comment	All	Concern proposals will not be implemented fully when roads lobby &/or County Council object.		Comments noted. The document is being developed with County Council partners and the GCP to provide a shared vision and approach to guide future decision making regarding streets and spaces in the study area.	No	
Mr Tim Marchant [8122]	Object	All	I believe there should be a commitment to phase out ALL central car parking and Tourist BUS access into the city centre, to		Comment and concern noted. Strategy S6 seeks to re-appraise the location and function of central car parks to minimise	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			run in tandem and alongside improved Park and Ride / Public transport infrastructure. The current MARKET is an eyesore and not a fitting centrepiece for a city such as ours. It needs relocating and the development of a pedestrian plaza created in its stead.		adverse impacts on the enjoyment of the city centre for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys. Strategy S12 seeks to Enhance the Market by encouraging more civic activities while preserving and promoting the market.		
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Comment	All	The first two headings i.e. Green and Healthy should be combined as they have equal weight and are inter-related.		Comment duly noted. The document does not list the aims and objectives in order of importance; all 5 objectives are needed to deliver the Vision for Central Cambridge	no	
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Comment	All	The first two headings i.e. Green and Healthy should be combined as they have equal weight and are inter-related.		Comment duly noted. The document does not list the aims and objectives in order of importance; all 5 objectives are needed to deliver the Vision for Central Cambridge	No	
Rachel Engler [5760]	Comment	N/A	X	X	X	X	
Professor Michael Ellman [8260]	Comment	N/A	Desirability of not having rough sleepers/beggars in Central Cambridge (or elsewhere).	Homelessness	Comments and concerns duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.	No	
Rustat Neighbourhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]	Support	N/A	Sensible section covering the main issues	Vision & objectives	Comments noted.	No	
Arjuna Wholefoods (Mr David Jarvis, Director) [8225]	Comment	N/A	Please see attached document. Many thanks	X	X		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	N/A	Unable to open	Consultation	Comments duly noted.	No	
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	N/A	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Concerns with the consultation process are duly noted.	No	
Miss Amanda Nilsson [8194]	Support	N/A	I support the outline of the content of part 4 - a vision for central Cambridge	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	
Ms Brigit Viney [5230]	Comment	N/A	<p>Places to sit and different routes for pedestrians and cyclists in Central Cambridge sound excellent. However, I don't think more outdoor cafes will make life easier for pedestrians.</p> <p>Buses need to serve the city centre for those people who don't cycle. Public bus routes need to be expanded.</p> <p>The coach stops on Parkside should have toilets and an indoor waiting area.</p> <p>It's not clear to me how this vision will affect Mill Road - the area I live in. Private car owners will still need to use it.</p>	Bus infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The Baseline Report highlighted the variable quality and maintenance of the public realm in the city centre. Policy 10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) identifies the Council's aim of improving the capacity.</p> <p>Strategy S6 seeks to reappraise bus stop location and function. This could be expanded upon to include improvements to public realm at bus stops</p>	Yes	Include public realm improvements at bus stops to the objective.
Cambridge Glenys self [8149]	Comment	N/A	Vision of future market square space	Market square	x	#VALUE!	
Mr Richard Smith [8233]	Comment	N/A	While not disagreeing with the strategies discussed in this document, I am concerned that they risk overlooking the need for better public transport if private vehicular access is to be restricted from certain areas of the city, particularly those on the periphery of the central area. In particular, while many areas are reasonably served by radial bus routes to and from the city centre, there are very few frequent routes circling the city, joining one suburb to another.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to give people a more attractive public transport option compared with the car	No	
Mr Paul Smith [8246]	Object	N/A	I STRONGLY OBJECT WITH ANY INTERFERENCE WITH THE RUNNING AND STRUCTURE OF MILL ROAD	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Mr Ian Cray [8248]	Comment	N/A	As an enabler to S9 - consider greater emphasis on the development of the Car Club		Comment duly noted.	Yes	Include car clubs as a measure to help reduce motor vehicle use.
Michael Ledzion [8250]	Comment	N/A	In 4.1, the section defining Healthy should be clearer about the benefits of creating spaces for walking and cycling, since these are both healthy, and need to not only to be encouraged, but made such that they are the "easy" or "default" option for most people. People always find the easiest way to do something, so without making driving or other modes "hard" making walking and cycling both the easiest and most pleasant will deliver a solution that is politically acceptable.	User hierarchy	Comments duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that deliver the right environmental conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise. This could be expanded on to also highlight the health benefits associated with walking and cycling.	Yes	Additional text to emphasize the health benefits of walking and cycling
Mrs Maria Smith [8251]	Object	N/A	I OBJECT 100% TO MILL ROAD BEING CLOSED TO TRAFFIC OR THROUGH TRAFFIC	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Professor Michael Ellman [8260]	Comment	N/A	You have not written anything about the need to eliminate rough sleeping/begging in Central Cambridge. It is widespread and is a disgrace to the city.	Homelessness	Comments and concerns duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place for all.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Dr Sebastian Wills [2293]	Comment	N/A	I support everything in the document, but would like to see additions/more emphasis on (a) innovative transport solutions (bike hire hubs, shared taxis/minibuses, since the current type of bus service, walking and 'private cycles' do not meet everyone's transport needs), (b) more ambitious reduction or elimination of motorised traffic from the whole zone including e.g. Mill Road. (c) mandated use of zero emissions vehicles for taxis and buses.	Transport innovation	Comments noted.	Yes	Make reference to modal change points within the 'Walkable City' section.
Mrs Anne Bailey [3998]	Support	N/A	I'm supportive of these proposals although I think some could go further. It's important to continue to engage with the younger generation who have very different needs from older residents and will experience the long-term consequences of planning decisions made over the next decade.	Vision & objectives	Comments and concerns duly noted.		
Rustat Neighbourhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]	Support	N/A	<p>1. On cyclist routes, I remove the word 'faster'. Safer yes but unless cyclists are fully segregated (difficult in our narrow streets) speed conflicts with safety</p> <p>2. Reduce the number of buses using the very centre of the city, including Drummer Street. These add to congestion, pollution and ease of pedestrian and cycle movement - for example, Regent St and Hills Road are almost at gridlock at peak times so becoming unattractive for users.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to VERY frequent shuttle buses to bus hubs away from the centre e.g. at the station.</p>	User hierarchy/buses infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Improvements to cycle infrastructure and routes to improve speed on some routes where this appropriate and safety of all routes will ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p> <p>Point S6 strategizes for the re-routing, location and function of bus routes and stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre.</p>	Yes	Remove 'faster'.
Mr Antony Otter [8261]	Comment	N/A	<p>Assuming the aims/objectives were developed through consultation they appear reasonable.</p> <p>Given there maybe conflicts when implementing the objectives of the different aims it may be necessary to identify a hierarchy and 'weight' them accordingly.</p>	Vision & objectives	<p>Comments noted. There was much discussion about the order of the Aims & Objectives, and whilst all have equal weighting, the promotion of a green City Centre aligns with the climate Change emergency declared by the City Council last year (2019). We will consider the ordering</p>	Yes	Consider the ordering of the Aims and Objectives further.

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>To me it seems the order should be 1. welcoming 2. well curated 3. equitable 4. green 5. healthy.</p> <p>If the city is not welcoming this entire project will be a failure, and the city's green or healthy credentials will be worth nothing.</p> <p>The question re themes is confusing, as there is no explanation of the themes</p>		further as the document moves towards its final form.		
Ms Cathy Parker [2549]	Comment	N/A	Very important to reappraise the function and location of central car parks because they draw traffic into the city, directly undermining all your other aims.	Car parking	Comments duly noted. Strategy S5 seeks to re-appraise the location and function of central car parks to minimise adverse impacts on the enjoyment of the city centre for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. The strategy recognises the need to link the city centre and local centres.	No	
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Support	N/A	Agree but will need visible Civil Enforcement Officers to maintain this vision.	Vision & objectives	Comments noted and links to the effective City Centre management objective.	No	
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Comment	N/A	<p>Summary of Strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedestrian only zones with others at times, e.g. 10 - 4 pm seven days a week. Clear signage for cycle free zones. 2. Limit fast food outlets 3. Control and manage tourist with Council's own tourist guides 4. More visible Civil Enforcement Officers 	Vision & objectives	Comments noted.	No	
Mr FARAZ KHAN [8178]	Comment	N/A	lack of trust in selection of "experts " - gut feeling something FISHY		Comment noted.	No	
Gerry Robinson [8298]	Comment	N/A	<p>To encourage walking you must increase number of public seating areas for older residents.</p> <p>To increase variety of use of the city centre we need a modern performance space. How about the old, abandoned cinema?</p>	Public realms / cultural facilities	Comments and concerns duly noted. The Baseline Report highlighted the variable quality and maintenance of the public realm in the city centre. Policy 10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) identifies the Council's aim of improving the capacity and quality of the public realm throughout the city centre.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					The document acknowledges the importance of creating space and opportunities for more cultural activities.		
Dr Tamsin Spelman [8290]	Comment	N/A	The ideas presented are good. There seems to be no mention of improved safety (a perception of safety) from reducing city centre congestion which I think should also be a specific goal. Point S5 and S9 imply it, but a direct aim to reduce car usage in the city centre should be listed specifically. In point S8, the routing of private hire vehicles is mentioned but seems like it was tagged on. I think that should take greater priority too perhaps also with a look at the licencing/evaluating the number operating in the city centre.	Congestion	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. S3 does note that improve cycle routes in the city centre but further emphasis could be placed on safety in other objectives.	Yes	Point S5 and S9 should reference improved safety associated with reducing car use in the city.
Dr Sunit Ghosh [8307]	Object	N/A	Object to section 4.1 subsection A3: 'these proposals are not equitable as they do not give any weight to the needs of local residents who cannot cycle and live too far from the city centre or a bus stop to walk. In view of the fact that the document acknowledges the rising number of ageing residents, allowance needs to be made for elderly residents who are not disabled, but who use a car because it is very hard for them to cycle, use a bus or walk.	User Hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to give people a more attractive public transport option compared with the car	No	
Mrs Nobuko Tollemache [8308]	Object	N/A	Referring specifically to Mill Road, Mill Road is a vital road which links local residents to the centre, Addenbrooke's and all other areas and must not be pedestrianised or changed from its primary function. If it is shops on Mill Road will definitely lose customers, in other words not economically viable, and local residents will be cut off. When Mill Road was closed this summer most shops experienced falling footfalls.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			Furthermore, it caused a lot of congestion in nearby roads resulting in delays and increased air pollution. It was also difficult to go to Addenbrooke's and back.				
Mr Adrian Brasnett [8306]	Comment	N/A	The SPD is too narrow in scope and should include the university area between Grange Rd and The Backs. Grange Rd & Queen's Rd should be in the same SPD to provide opportunities for future innovative traffic management solutions for Queen's Rd.	Vision & objectives	Comment and concern duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge.	No	
Peter Tribble [6896]	Comment	N/A	The aims are too vague and generic.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.		
Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity, Co-ordinator) [925]	Comment	N/A	<p>Yes. Good cycle facilities and promotion of cycling, walking and use of public transport will enable people to move round the city centre much more freely, as the traffic could be reduced significantly with such measures.</p> <p>We would like to highlight that some people with disabilities use cycles as a mobility aid and therefore that cycling facilities should always be suitable for all abilities, and for diverse types of cycles.</p> <p>We need more than 100 words to adequately comment on all three questions being asked in this section. See long form answer.</p>	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to cycle infrastructure will ensure that the needs of disabled people are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Craig Wisniewski [2573]	Support	N/A	The centre of Cambridge is continuing to become more crowded, so I support Part 4.	Congestion	Comment duly noted	No	
Dr Janette Thomas [8316]	Support	N/A	<p>Be bold and creative. Cycle parking must be much more secure as cycle parks CCTV does not work (no-one looks at it and thieves take no notice of it).</p> <p>Perhaps no car parks other than for people with disabilities. Or perhaps car park space should be advance booked so that not too many cars are looking for spaces.</p> <p>Better bus services or small battery-operated vehicles ("trains") taking groups of people</p>	Cycle infrastructure /bus infrastructure / car parking	<p>Comments duly noted. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets and with improved cycle parking in the city centre and local centres although the text could be amended to explicitly reference security of cycle parking.</p> <p>The document aligns with GCPs City Access</p>	Yes	Add 'secure' in front of cycle parking facilities in S4

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			around the city could reduce the need for taxis. Bring back the cycle rickshaw taxis. These could be used to take people to outlying taxi ranks.		Project which is working to give people a more attractive public transport option compared with the car		
Dr Paul Gilliland [8321]	Comment	N/A	Sufficient coverage of Vision in Objectives? Obj A3 needs to be bolder Refine strategies vs themes	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	Yes	Be bolder in the text of objective A3.
Neil Shailer [8318]	Support	N/A	Mostly pedestrianize Mill Road in. Allow as much access to the shops as possible, this might mean continuing to allow car usage for the purpose of access and locals. Pedestrians and cyclists should have priority but emergency services, and public transport should be allowed to use the street. Use of along street shuttle busses should be explored. More community space for people to live and play and interact along the street. Please more cycle racks, sitting places, parklets, trees and plants and more room to walk and cycle on Mill Road. Mill Road Summer was absolutely wonderful!	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	N/A	Support. Cycle access through the Pedestrian Priority Zone must be retained. A review of cycle parking should aim to increase levels of provision, which remain short, e.g. by creating a third cycle park, but on-street cycle parking must also remain. It is fair to review cycle parking spots where obstruction to disabled access occurs - only the spots in Market Square (by the church) and on Jesus Lane (opposite Pizza Express) need review on these grounds.	User Hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets and with improved cycle parking in the city centre and local centres following a review of cycle facilities and demand.	No	
Mr Neil Spenley [8231]	Support	N/A	I suggest these principles: 1. Car parking to be placed at the edges of central area to avoid heavy traffic flows through central streets. 2. Cycling access throughout the centre, but there should be high-quality cycling through routes around the periphery to minimize	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Strategy S4 seeks to create facilities for cyclists who want to pass through the city centre, so they have a choice to use faster,	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>cycle-pedestrian conflict.</p> <p>3. Pedestrian surfaces must be of high quality - sufficiently wide, smooth, not blocked by parked cars or other obstacles. Consider continuous footways.</p> <p>4. Consider ways to connect the central area to other key locations, e.g. Mill Road, Retail Park</p>		<p>safer routes that avoid the busiest streets but with pedestrians at the top of the user hierarchy.</p> <p>Strategy S6 seeks to re-appraise the location and function of central car parks to minimise adverse impacts on the enjoyment of the city centre for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.</p> <p>The strategy recognises the need to link the city centre and local centres.</p>		
Abigail Wills [5028]	Support	N/A	<p>I agree but would like to see more radical proposals surrounding public transport. A return to town (a distance of barely over a mile) for 5 people from Mill Road Broadway costs over 20 pounds, making it a nonsensical transport option compared to car and car park costs. This needs to change for there to be a reasonable hope of cutting car use in the city and making the centre more liveable.</p>	Bus infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to give people a more attractive public transport option compared with the car</p>	No	
Mrs Judith Cheney [8310]	Comment	N/A	<p>Prioritise needs of residents over those of visitors.</p> <p>Restrict the number of tourists.</p> <p>Fresh local produce in the market as part of sustainable lifestyle and response to climate change.</p> <p>Horticultural displays.</p>	Users hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The Baseline Report found that tourist congestion hotspots discourage locals visiting the historic core. The document seeks to address this by creating a tourist circuit to reduce congestion in hotspots in the city centre.</p> <p>Strategy S12 seeks to promote and preserve the Market.</p>	No	
Mrs Judith Cheney [8310]	Comment	N/A	<p>Civic historic features of central Cambridge should be retained and cared for. Much of this has been lost over the past 60 years.</p> <p>The granite setts in the marketplace should be cleaned and retained.</p>	Heritage and conservation	<p>Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the need to understand and maintain the unique character of the city whilst accommodating pressures of growth and change.</p>	No	
Diana Smith [8313]	Object	N/A	<p>DO NOT CLOSE MILL ROAD OR RESTRICT TRAFFIC IN ANY WAY WHATSOEVER</p>	Mill Road access	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Diana Smith [8313]	Object	N/A	I have already written my comments, but I forgot to add one more point. Why don't you provide a financial incentive for people to switch to electric cars to help prevent pollution? This would solve many problems.	Transport innovation	Comments noted. Central Government already provides financial incentives to people wishing to purchase electric vehicles https://www.gov.uk/plug-in-car-van-grants	No	
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	N/A	Unable to open	Consultation	X		
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	N/A	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Comment duly noted.		
Diana Smith [8313]	Object	N/A	I have already written my comments, but I also forgot to add this second point. A friend of mine who owns a shop on Mill Road did not receive a copy of the survey carried out by Greater Cambridge Partnership. Many other people did not receive it either and the survey has now closed. Therefore, the results of the survey will be wrong and should be carried out again correctly.	Consultation	Concerns about the GCP consultation duly noted.	No	
M Winchcomb [8336]	Comment	N/A	Regarding 'A3 - Equitable': I would like to highlight that some people with disabilities use cycles as a mobility aid and therefore that cycling facilities should always be suitable for all abilities, and for diverse types of cycles.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to cycling facilities will ensure that the needs of disabled people are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
M Winchcomb [8336]	Comment	N/A	We propose the following strategies to be added: - Repairing existing facilities, for safe and comfortable walking and cycling, and ensuring that everything is up to modern accessibility standards. - In order to make the streets more welcoming and accessible, please consider	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The Baseline Report highlighted the variable quality and maintenance of the public realm in the city centre. Policy 10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) identifies the Council's aim	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			removing the excessive amount of street clutter which blocks pedestrians flow. - The temporary parklet in Mill Road demonstrated how a relatively simple provision can make for a far more welcoming place. I would like to see more parklets, in Mill Road and elsewhere. Improvements beyond the tourist hotspots could spread the load, helping those hotspots too.		of improving the capacity and quality of the public realm throughout the city centre. Strategy S9 seeks to create opportunities to reallocate space freed up by the reduction in motor vehicles to create new public spaces.		
Mr Charles Berthon [8105]	Comment	N/A	Proposals are too vague and lack ambition. Ban private cars from the city centre completely. Make park and ride compulsory for visitors. Provide very cheap/free public transport to city centre.	Vision & objectives	MSfP intends to provide a shared vision for the type of City Centre Cambridge should become and achieve buy in from all those with a responsibility for thinking how it should operate. Detailed strategies and proposals will come later and separately to this document but will be expected to align with the Vision, User Hierarchy etc.	No	
Ms Tina Bollerslev [8130]	Support	N/A	Looks good. Please ask cyclists about ramps, kerbs etc.	Consultation	Comments are duly noted		
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Comment	N/A	Whereas the chance to have an input is welcome, there is always the danger that the public consultation process is so prolonged that the impact of the exercise can be self-defeating. I would urge officers to do all they can to speed up the implementation of the SPD so that real improvements can begin within a reasonable time frame.	Consultation	Comment is duly noted.		
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Comment	N/A	Please keep asking us what we want for central Cambridge and keep plans green and regenerative.	Consultation	Comment is duly noted.		
Rosemary Rodd [8176]	Comment	N/A	If the vision is rolled out to the more residential areas outside the city centre there needs to be consideration of the value of retaining local shops as a way to encourage shoppers to walk or cycle rather than use a vehicle to travel to an out of town supermarket. If this is to be achieved the shops need to be able to receive deliveries of stock.	Mix of uses	Comment and concern duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge.	No	
Mr David Ellingham [8202]	Comment	N/A	Don't pedestrianise or restrict traffic on Mill Rd. Better, real provision for cyclists is	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			necessary. Unenforced and Unenforceable 20 mph speed limits are a total waste of public money.		will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Miss Amanda Nilsson [8194]	Comment	N/A	I look forward to seeing the outcome of engagement and the next steps		Comment is duly noted.		
Ms Brigit Viney [5230]	Comment	N/A	The consultation period seems rather short for such a far-reaching plan.	Consultation	Comment and concerns about the consultation period are noted.		
Professor Michael Ellman [8260]	Support	N/A	Seems sensible to me.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	
Ms Tess Jones [3282]	Support	N/A	Be more radical.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	
Seoul Plaza (Mrs Hyekyoung Kong, Manager) [8275]	Comment	N/A	The closure of Mill Road to traffic would be significantly detrimental to the retail community on Mill road. This was already experienced during the summer, when the bridge was closed.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Rustat Neighbourhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]	Object	N/A	This seems an excessively long timescale. We should get the SPD stage in well under a year. This is an urgent matter, please put the resources behind it for quicker delivery of plans and in particular, actions	Vision & objectives	Comments noted. The timescale identified was considered realistic given the resources available and the formal process planning documents such as SPDs are legally required to go through to reach adoption.	Yes	Amend timeline
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Support	N/A	OK	x	X	No	
Mr FARAZ KHAN [8178]	Comment	N/A	Not enough gathering of opinion or surveys...incompetence?	Consultation	Comment noted.	No	
Gerry Robinson [8298]	Support	N/A	To get me and others out of our cars you must Prioritise good, frequent, affordable public transport, seating and shelters at bus	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The document related to central Cambridge rather than areas of new housing growth.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>stops and more public seating.</p> <p>The new housing areas need their own high streets with large number of shops. They should not need to come into Cambridge city as they come by car.</p>		<p>The need to provide services were housing is located to minimise trips is noted. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to give people a more attractive public transport option compared with the car</p>		
Dr Paul Gilliland [8321]	Support	N/A	Well set out documents and consultation.	Consultation	X	No	
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	N/A	Unable to open	Consultation	X		
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	N/A	Unable to open	Consultation	X		
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	N/A	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Comments noted. The consultation on the document ran from the 2nd Sept - 14th Oct 2019 and included static displays, staffed exhibitions and web and newspaper-based publicity.	No	
Cambridge Discount Electrical (Mrs Letizia Surbey, Director) [8182]	Object	N/A	TERRIBLE IDEA AND WOULD KILL MILLROAD AND ALOT OF THE TRADERS IN MILL ROAD	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Mrs Clare Collinson [8264]	Object	N/A	I object to mill road been closed to traffic. I have lived off mill road for 25 years. I work in a small village outside of Cambridge which does not have a bus. I am a social worker and I need my car for work. I am so upset about all of the new buildings that are been built without a thought to the local roads or schools. How can carers nurses and doctors and disabled people get around without the use of a car? Especially if they cover a large area for work. For once think about local people.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Comment	N/A	No comment	x	X		
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	N/A	Unable to open	Consultation	X		
Mr S Agar [8332]	Object	N/A	Not informed and not enough time to respond after finding out last week. Period for responses must be extended.	Consultation	Comments noted. The consultation on the document ran from the 2nd Sept - 14th Oct 2019 and included static displays, staffed exhibitions and web and newspaper-based publicity.	No	
Anna Davanzo	Comment	N/A	<p>I have been made aware within the last couple of days that there are plans to change accessibility to Cambridge city. Being a resident of St Philips Road (CB1 3AQ) I am disappointed at how little firm information has been provided to residents by the council and how little time has been allowed for locals to fully review the proposal. Having read through the documentation online at https://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=203 I am still none the wiser as to what this actually means, in particular, for the Mill Road area and for Mill Road residents, such as myself. The proposal itself is vague, at best, and does not indicate the works that are proposed for Mill Road (listed as area 24 in the referenced proposal). Please can you provide further information on the impact that this proposed work will have to Mill Road.</p> <p>I should note that whilst the Mill Road railway bridge was closed for maintenance work during the summer (2019), there was a much greater sense of community along Mill Road, with numerous events taking place and bringing the community together. It also enabled pedestrians and cyclists much safer access with the near removal of motorised vehicles. It should be proposed that the Mill Road bridge be permanently closed to general traffic (it is currently used as a thoroughfare to the city centre, creating</p>	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			noise and air pollution as well as a very unsafe cycling environment) and only open to busses and taxis – again allowing for a far safer area for pedestrians and cyclists, with the ability for access to the city centre using public transport. This will have the additional advantage of greatly reducing noise and air pollution in the city centre and Mill Road and will encourage people entering Cambridge from elsewhere to use existing facilities and infrastructure such as the numerous park and rides or the train. It will not impede service vehicles such as delivery lorries as they can use alternative routes to access either side of Mill Road (as when the bridge was closed previously).				
Michael Surbey	Comment	N/A	It has come to my attention that we believe there are plans to close Mill road to vehicle traffic. If this is the case, there will be a significant impact on my business. Please can you advise me of the council's current policy.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Graeme Hodgson	Comment	N/A	Please could you pass-on to those collecting citizen input on the SPD, that 90% of the objectives for Mill Road (Petersfield/Romsey) would be achieved if motor vehicle traffic was limited (possibly to a one way system initially, then emergency vehicles and public transport shuttles etc. only, subsequently). With this, urgently needed CYCLE LANES could be put in down the length of Mill Road, on both sides, and, where necessary, pavements widened or improved.	Mill Road access	Comments noted. It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Comment	Q1	For Q1: Making it better for pedestrians should NOT be at the expense of cycling access. Specifically, cyclists tend to be locals who live here all the time and are forced to put up with huge numbers of tourists who are mostly only here for 1 day. Cycling is by far	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to pedestrian access will not	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>the most efficient way for locals to get around and is healthy and environmentally friendly.</p> <p>I agree with supporting access for those with limited mobility.</p>		adversely impact cyclists or those with limited mobility.		
Miss Mary Reid [8100]	Comment	Q1	<p>With any plans to make changes in the city centre bear mind what works and cost will be required to achieve the vision - as a daily cyclist I am not convinced that the disruption caused by current development of cycling infrastructure elsewhere in the city is worth the improvements which result. I would much rather that the roads and cycle paths which exist were suitably maintained - a large number of Cambridge road surfaces are dangerous and/or cause injury to cyclists and in my opinion, money would be far better spent maintaining road surfaces than making unnecessary changes.</p>	Cycle infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The overall approach set out is to improve the overall quality of both pedestrian and cycle routes and spaces I into the City Centre. Cambridge already has a 33% cycle modal share and so these form a significant proportion of trips. It is noted that some existing facilities require upgrading and improvement and MSfP advocates a whole journey approach to considering how cycle infrastructure will be provided which is about integrating new and old and being aware that any route is only as good as its weakest link. Increased cycle movements will place further pressure on the City Centre, and it is appropriate that further schemes will need to be considered to help manage this demand.</p>	No	
Mrs Jessica O'Donoghue [3080]	Support	Q1	<p>Please go ahead with pedestrianising as many streets in central Cambridge as possible but mainly around schools such as St Matthew's Primary school in Norfolk Street where traffic congestion during morning and afternoon school run has reached dangerous levels (due to the size of the school: 650 students!).</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>	No	
Mr Alan Ackroyd [8148]	Support	Q1	<p>Public transport and cycle access to the city centre needs improvement alongside improvements in the central area. The current 10am to 4pm pedestrianised area should be radically extended.</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					<p>centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel. The extent and hours of operation of pedestrian priority areas in the City Centre is part of thinking about how streets and spaces can deliver improved pedestrian and cyclist user experiences. However, the need to maintain servicing and access to support businesses is also important. Future approaches will need to ensure that the latter can still work whilst delivering a better City Centre for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>		
<p>Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Q1</p>	<p>Change is needed, the city centre is appallingly crowded in times in the summer especially.</p>	<p>User hierarchy / congestion</p>	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>J V Neal [8163]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Q1</p>	<p>Any future changes to the Market Square must benefit first and foremost its two unique, precious and historic roles in (a) supporting local employment and trade as well as (b) for public democratic assembly and protest. And remember that bicycles need to be able to move from peoples' homes in to and out of central Cambridge - currently very difficult to achieve (legally).</p>	<p>Market square</p>	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge including the Market Square to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Mr James Travers [8193]</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Q1</p>	<p>Do not make mill road one way or pedestrianised. Businesses will fail. Deliveries will not be made, the other roads in Cambridge, like two months ago, will be grid locked and buses won't be able to travel. How will older, less mobile people or carers get around? The unique Mill Road</p>	<p>Mill Road access</p>	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to</p>		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			atmosphere would be destroyed forever if you get rid of the car access. Who is even pushing this idea? It's ridiculous.		current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Miss Katie Hawks [8199]	Comment	Q1	<p>1) Are there thorough studies about vehicle usage?</p> <p>2) Double- and single-deckers are too big for historic, narrow, city streets.</p> <p>3) Landscaping must take into account hard surfaces and water; global sand shortage; carbon of concrete, plastic, metal and builders' diesel etc. 'Net carbon zero' is greenwash.</p> <p>4) What about public transport to outlying villages? Park-and-ride, apparently to be expanded on green fields, doesn't make up for unreliable, expensive rural public transport.</p> <p>5) Independent traders need priority: high rents mean they're on a knife-edge. Stats on trade and vehicles elsewhere may not be relevant.</p>	Vision & objectives	Comments noted. GCP have detailed traffic counts and other data that will be used to inform future strategies including bus movements into and around the City Centre. It is beyond the scope of MSfP to extend out to outlying villages and P&R sites, but overall public transport planning requires a comprehensive whole route approach to be taken. MSfP sets out a clear vision for the type of City Centre that will help to deliver a better place for people to use and which future strategies for all modes will be expected to align to.		
Ms Benedicte Antoniou [8211]	Object	Q1	We strongly disagree with the projects and future visions for Mill Road. It will kill local businesses as the street will not be accessible to vehicles. Mill Road is one of the most vibrant streets in Cambridge, we do not want to see it fade away and become a ghost street. Mill Road is known for its liveliness, it would be a shame to destroy this image. To conclude, we urge you to rethink this project as we are not the only ones who object to this.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Ben Stoll [8213]	Support	Q1	The Baseline Report Key Findings are a fair and accurate summary of the traffic and congestion-related challenges that face Cambridge. In order create a healthy, liveable and vibrant city centre, it is essential that car traffic be reduced, pedestrians and cyclists re-prioritised, and urban streets and pavements be reconfigured away from accommodating cars to serving broader social needs, especially those of the elderly and the young, who are especially vulnerable	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			to pollution and would most benefit from pedestrian-friendly streetscapes.				
Ben Stoll [8213]	Support	Q1	The Baseline Report Key Findings are a fair and accurate summary of the traffic and congestion-related challenges that face Cambridge. In order create a healthy, liveable and vibrant city centre, it is essential that car traffic is reduced, pedestrians and cyclists re-prioritised, and urban streets and pavements reconfigured away from accommodating cars to serving broader social needs, especially for the elderly and the young, who suffer the most from the loss of liveable public spaces.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Gerry Robinson [8298]	Support	Q1	It is impossible for my 80 yr. old mum to go much further than the local co-op as public transport is so poor. Newnham is hugely under serviced. I would use buses to get around the city if they went where I needed them to. From Newnham you have to go to Drummer Street and change to get where you want to e.g. Addenbrookes, beehive, The Junction. We can't all cycle. You used Amsterdam as an example city, well their public transport is amazing! No need to drive anywhere.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Dr Sunit Ghosh [8307]	Object	Q1	Figures being quoted in support of the proposal fail to represent a true picture of road usage in Cambridge; Cambridge has the UK's second highest Student to resident population so the 33% figure fails to represent the true use of cycles by actual residents rather than students. Cambridge has one of the highest ratios (52.1%) of incoming commuter traffic to resident population in Europe; the impact of prohibiting car access in view of this is not considered. Impact of school drop off and pick up traffic as a major factor in congestion in Cambridge is not considered in this document.	Scope	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of all City Centre users (including students) is planned into future decision making about how streets and other spaces can function so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. MSfP aligns with and will help to inform GCP City Access planning and ensure that sustainable transport modes including those that support healthy and active travel choices are	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					prioritized to help reduce and manage private motor vehicle trips.		
Mrs Nobuko Tollemache [8308]	Comment	Q1	If the very centre of Cambridge becomes a car free zone (except for public transport) cyclists should dismount and walk. This will safeguard pedestrians, in particular those with limited mobility.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed.	No	
Dr Janette Thomas [8316]	Support	Q1	I agree with the aims of Part 1. I see the importance of making Cambridge a great space all people and this means sharing the space more equally and not being so car centric. It is important to be bold and make Cambridge a great place to live, work and socialise.	Vision & objectives	Comments noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Mr Alexander Doust [8322]	Comment	Q1	Agree that cyclists and pedestrians should be at the heart of any hierarchy and decisions being made. Reducing traffic should be the number 1 consideration when building new homes and giving planning permission. Also think that the consultation document does not make for an easy read.	Cycling infrastructure	Comments noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed.	No	
Mr Mike Bleazard [2349]	Support	Q1	I am keen that we do all we can to encourage pedestrians and cyclists in *all* of Cambridge. We need to make cycling safe - keeping other vehicles separate from cyclists. We need to provide convenient and secure cycle parking.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. We will ensure that provision of secure cycle parking is conveniently located whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided.	No	
Melvyn Tucker [8235]	Comment	Q1	Access Egress	User hierarchy	Comments duly noted.	No	
B Nicolson [5745]	Comment	Q1	I notice that there is mention of traffic reduction and improving public transport. These need to come together in clear plans	Congestion	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>and policies. Councillors will need to be brave about the decisions they make, particularly in reallocating road space. Walkability must include easy to read signposting and information (i.e. maps) for people visiting.</p> <p>Public art tends to be a box ticking exercise too much of the time. Let us have art that is good, not art that simply meets an outcomes policy.</p>		<p>and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p> <p>On Public Art, embedding art as part of proposals is a key aim and should not be a tick box exercise. The Council has a Public Art Panel to review schemes as well as a Public Art Officer to help ensure that proposals have integrity and are well considered.</p>		
Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Comment	Q1	<p>I support what is in Part 2, but I think you have missed out on making spaces for children to play, explore and move safely. This is an important part of a vibrant city. We are lucky in Cambridge to have several playgrounds, but I feel like much more can be done. Personally, I feel like this is more important than public art.</p>	Children / Art	<p>Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit. All users should be able to enjoy the City safely and lower vehicle speeds along with roads cape reallocation are part of how more inclusive streets and spaces can be created.</p>	No	
Ben Stoll [8213]	Support	Q1	<p>Responding to Question 1, What will make central Cambridge a great place to be in? I would suggest a swift move away from giving so much street space to cars with a shift towards walking, cycling and public transport. Only by making central Cambridge a restricted zone for cars, whether petrol, diesel or electric, and creating more space on the streets for people, will it be possible to achieve the goals set out in the SPD, especially those of walkability, adaptation for climate change and biodiversity, health</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			benefits from more vibrant public spaces, and enhanced air quality.				
Miss Amanda Nilsson [8194]	Comment	Q1	A significant reduction in traffic would make central Cambridge a great place to live in. the public art is a great part of Cambridge which would be enhanced further by clear signage, details and even a map so there is greater understanding	Congestion / art	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. The document recognises the important role that public art plays in place making	No	
Rustat Neighbourhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]	Support	Q1	1. More central streets need to ban traffic and severely limit times for delivery vehicles 2. There needs to be a much stronger focus on pedestrians, including those with limited mobility in the central core of the city. Cyclists make it much less comfortable to walk in these streets. More central streets should be pedestrianised banning cyclists	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	Yes	Document to be amended to make clearer that the needs of disabled people will be taken into account as part of an inclusive approach to street and space design.
Mrs Edwina Swann [8305]	Comment	Q1	Please consider reduction of heavy traffic on Mill Road to improve air quality, pollution and congestion.	Mill Road access	The document identifies strategies that can help to rebalance the function of streets and other key spaces. It is beyond the scope of the document to propose specific measures for particular streets, but future decisions will be expected to align with the Vision, Aim & Objectives and Strategies that have been identified.		
Mrs Nobuko Tollemache [8308]	Comment	Q1	More people will use public transport if bus companies increase frequency of their services and use low carbon emission vehicles and keep fares low. In order to improve air quality taxis should turn off engines while stationary, i.e. Station area, Drummer Street.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns noted. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that delivery the right environmental	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise		
Mr Craig Wisniewski [2573]	Support	Q1	In addition to health, I would like to see some emphasis placed on safety, particularly regarding traffic rules. Recently, I've seen much more running of red lights at pedestrian crossings (around Parker's Piece during traffic queues), very high-level speeding on Mill Road and on-pavement parking on Mill Road. I would also like to say that as a pedestrian, I find the area around Microsoft building and the new traffic flow around the rail station to be particularly difficult - along with the bottom of the Carter cycle bridge. Perhaps this can be addressed even earlier than the current plan.	Health and wellbeing / Mill Road access	The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	Yes	Point S5 and S9 should reference improved safety associated with reducing car use in the city.
Dr Paul Gilliland [8321]	Comment	Q1	<p>Maintain (repair) existing cycle infrastructure, e.g. surface of path/lane on Parker's Piece, as well as enhanced provision of cycling infrastructure including better or more cycle lanes. But needs to include more effective separation of pedestrians and cyclists, e.g. see Parker's Piece again.</p> <p>Emphasise further the need for more cycle parking facilities.</p>	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. We will ensure that provision of secure cycle parking is conveniently located whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided.	No	
Mrs Judith Cheney [8310]	Comment	Q1	<p>I understand the need for places for cyclists to leave their bikes, central Cambridge has become cluttered with cycle racks, preventing easy walking for pedestrians - especially in the marketplace (some of the seats in front of the Guildhall have been replaced by cycle racks; there is hardly any room for pedestrians in Pease Hill).</p> <p>There are far too many tables and chairs and barriers outside cafes in central streets - especially along Trinity Street, King's Parade</p>	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. Encouraging café culture is part of the place making strategy and will be balanced with the reallocation of space in the city of centre. Strategy S4 seeks to enhance cycle routes and parking facilities in the city centre.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			and around the edges of the market. This impedes easy walking for pedestrians.				
M Winchcomb [8336]	Support	Q1	Question 1: I agree with the importance of all of these things and would further highlight how cycling enhances and complements every single one. Cycling is the most obvious mode of transport, faster than walking, that can bring people and goods from a much wider area into central Cambridge in a peaceful way that conserves the environment, air quality and the historic nature of the city centre. Compared to driving, cycling is much more conducive to social interaction, people cycling engage more with their surroundings, have more opportunity to appreciate things like public art and enjoy the health benefits too.	Cycle infrastructure	Comments noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that deliver the right environmental conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise. The space focused strategies are being revised to reflect greater emphasis on reducing air and noise pollution. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets.	No	
Dr Cara Eldridge [8106]	Object	Q1	Consider bikes before any new designs.	Cycle infrastructure	Comment duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Manjit Singh [2479]	Comment	Q1	The historic nature of Cambridge Market is intrinsic to the character of the city and should be preserved, the cobbles should be retained for aesthetic reasons. The market is a source of living for many small traders who could otherwise not have access to a high street shop because of the financial commitment and cost. The market is more environmentally friendly than shops which require a lot of energy for heating and cooling systems.	Heritage and conservation	Comments duly noted. Strategy S12 seeks to Enhance the Market by encouraging more civic activities while preserving and promoting the market.	No	
Christine knight [8169]	Comment	Q1	To help promote non-cars as users, it would be good if traffic lights and crossing lights	User hierarchy	Comments and suggestions noted. Some cities have utilised 'green wave' technology	Yes	A4 - Welcoming.

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>could be adjusted so that, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buses get green asap when they approach. I often see guided buses at the CRC junction waiting whilst cars go over the crossing. 2. Pedestrian crossings are set so that if there hasn't been a crossing recently (e.g. in last 3mins) lights change quickly to allow the people to cross. Many crossings seem to wait until a break in traffic which can take many minutes - I can cross then anyway without the lights! <p>Thank you</p>		to allow cycle users to continue along key cycle routes without needing to stop. 'Smart; pedestrian crossings can be installed that detect levels of usage/nos. of people waiting etc. MSfP highlights the need to effectively manage public space and this could be extended t think about how smart technology can aid this.		Add wording about utilising smart technology to help manage streets for all users
Dr Steven Pope [8229]	Support	Q1	<p>I use all modes of transport in the city.</p> <p>As a cyclist the number of near misses with speeding cars and aggressive drivers is ever increasing</p> <p>As a walker there isn't space on the heaving busy pavements to walk.</p> <p>For example recently when cycling over Mill Road bridge I was caught by a pedestrian's bag strap, throwing me into the side of a car which was illegally overtaking ! Luckily, I was not injured.</p>	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Gerry Robinson [8298]	Support	Q1	Public transport is pitiful. Everything must go in to the centre to come out again. I lived in London and didn't need a car. Now it is vital as trying to get anywhere by bus is pointless if you live in Newnham. It would take hours, be expensive and stressful. To encourage people to walk more especially older residents, we MUST have more public seating for rests. Also need seating at all bus stops and proper shelters.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The document aligns with the GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys Strategy S6 seeks to reappraise bus stop location and function. This could be expanded upon to include improvement to public realm at bus stops	Yes	Include public realm improvements at bus stops to the objective.
Ms Isabelle de Wouters [8302]	Support	Q1	I'm a Romsey resident and cycle to work off Madingley Road. The current provisions for cyclists are inadequate including those routes designed to separate cyclists from cars. The volume of traffic on Brookfields and Mill Road means that I tend to avoid my	Cycle Infrastructure	Comments noted.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			local shops. From a safety perspective I would prefer to be able to cycle safely down Mill Road when cycling later in the evening rather than using the Carter Bridge and weaving down various side streets. However, this is not an option because of inadequate provision for cyclists down Mill Road / Brookfields Road.				
Dr Janette Thomas [8316]	Support	Q1	Accessibility is crucial for both pedestrians and cyclists and considerations for people with disabilities must be included when designing facilities for walking or cycling. Cycle parking facilities should include spaces for people who use recumbents, handcycles or other forms of adapted cycles that provide a mobility aid. Cycle routes should make be easy to use and not be too narrow at junctions and parking should not be so tight and difficult to use that you risk getting dirty or injured due to congestion. Lower priority vehicles should be made to be considerate of all the higher priority users.		Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to access will ensure that the needs of disabled people and those with limited mobility are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
M Huria [8303]	Object	Q1	Better public transport with more easily accessible information. No priority to cyclists or better control of them... as there are many offenders and they have to be proper road users.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys.	No	
Mrs ROSE LE DOUX [8124]	Support	Q1	We are a family of 4 (2 adults, 2 children of primary school age). We live in Sawston. I would like to use the bus more to go into Cambridge but don't because it takes twice as long as driving and is more expensive. There are also infrequent buses home at night. If you could improve the public transport going into Cambridge in terms of frequency and affordability, I think that would encourage people to use it more and support your objectives to reduce both pollution and conflict between cars / pedestrians / bikes.	Bus infrastructure	Comments noted. The need to make public transport a viable option for as many people as possible is clearly important. MSfP is about how City Centre streets and spaces can better accommodate users and make a more pleasant place for people to live in, visit and work. Part of this is about how private motor vehicle access is managed and links into work being undertaken by GCP on City Access.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Ms Tina Bollerslev [8130]	Support	Q1	YES! Please make more space for cyclists and pedestrians. Please make it safe for children to cycle into the city centre. PLEASE make the buses MUCH, MUCH cheaper. Please CHARGE a fortune to park and limit parking everywhere else. This is the only way the city will change like Copenhagen. People are selfish and lazy by nature and very reluctant to change. It MUST come from above.	User hierarchy	Comments noted. Strategy S5 highlights the need to think about the future role of City Centre car parks,	No	
Dr Matthew Butler [8136]	Support	Q1	I welcome the review of inner-city car parks. These only serve to pull traffic into the centre. With over half of journeys being under 5 miles think of the change that would come about by utilising these spaces for green infrastructure such as hydrogen filling for buses, electric car charging, cafes and green spaces.	Car parking	Comments and concerns duly noted.		
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Comment	Q1	Please ensure the traditional market is kept as the heart of Cambridge city, and please find a way to ensure local small businesses can have a space in the city centre...otherwise it's just like everywhere else. Eating places outside are good, more rest places outside are important, benches please. Make it a People's place with distinctive facilities rather than a multinational business opportunity. This will make residents and tourists happier!	Character and sense of place	Comments and concerns duly noted. Strategy S12 seeks to Enhance the Market by encouraging more civic activities while preserving and promoting the market.	No	
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Comment	Q1	Please ensure the traditional market is kept as the heart of Cambridge city, and please find a way to ensure local small businesses can have a space in the city centre...otherwise it's just like everywhere else. Eating places outside are good, more rest places outside are important, benches please. Make it a People's place with distinctive facilities rather than a multinational business opportunity. This will make residents and tourists happier!	Character and sense of place	Comments and concerns duly noted. Strategy S12 seeks to Enhance the Market by encouraging more civic activities while preserving and promoting the market.	No	
B Nicolson [5745]	Comment	Q1	We need to think seriously about reallocating space away from car parks. There will need to be some car parking, and most certainly	Car parking	Comment and concern duly noted. Strategy S6 seeks to re-appraise the location and function of central car parks to minimise	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			there must be a decent allocation for those with blue badges, but if we are to grasp the nettle of traffic reduction, we need to be bold about this. That could mean increasing the amount of cycle parking by taking over a level of a city centre car park.		adverse impacts on the enjoyment of the city centre for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Strategy S4 notes the need to provide cycle routes and parking in the city centre and at local centres.		
1931 Moran Stacey [8165]	Comment	Q1	I support the aim of making the centre more traffic free, but the report misses one of the best ways of doing this. A recent visit to Ghent amazed me - plenty of trams and buses, no private cars, twice as many bicycles as in Cambridge (and no traffic lights). Best of all, a free electric mini-bus-taxi which circulated all day until 10 p.m., taking in almost the whole city, and ran regularly every 15 minutes. To someone with limited mobility, such as myself, it was especially useful. We kept saying 'If only we had these in Cambridge'.	Bus infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys.	No	
Mr Chris Cunningham [8168]	Comment	Q1	Address major traffic issues by flowing traffic around a one-way inner ring road, reduce allowed vehicle sizes into the centre, separate foot/cycle and motor traffic to make a quicker and more pleasant experience for all users. Re-prioritise so that vehicles have lower priority/presence in the centre but get the priority they need in journeys around its periphery.	User hierarchy / congestion	Comment and concern duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Alan Ackroyd [8148]	Support	Q1	If climate change is to be averted, personal transport must be transformed to include less vehicle movements and more walking, cycling and public transport encouraged. These aims and objectives are good but only if all planning decisions really are measured by them. Many fine words are spoken about	Active transport	Comment and concern duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge to influence decision making.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			planning and most of them are ignored or contradicted in practice.				
Rosemary Rodd [8176]	Comment	Q1	Green could potentially sometimes conflict with equitable - for example if trees are making the pavement uneven or if hedges are removed to create wider cycle tracks.		Comment and concern duly noted. Green is one of five objectives listed and would need to be balanced against the other visions including equitable and welcoming.	No	
Miss Katie Hawks [8199]	Comment	Q1	Although many shoppers do walk, cycle or take the bus, some items are not transportable on any of those. This necessitates either private motor vehicles or a complete re-design of buses, or an after-hours public delivery system.	Bulky goods	Comments noted. Agree that sometimes it is not practical to use a bus or a bicycle and this is where 'last mile delivery strategies' and essential access to the City Centre need to be factored into future access strategies.	No	
Harriet Kelsall Jewellery Design Ltd (Miss Indira Bir) [8157]	Comment	Q1	Smaller streets within Cambridge City Centre need more signage for tourists. I work in Green Street and we used to have an 'A board' which helped a lot of our customers drive more people down our street. With these gone we need more signage to drive footfall down these smaller streets at both ends to keep shops alive and not closing up. Even a lamppost at the end near Sainsburys to navigate FF, sign posting other shops within this lane.	Signage	Comments and concerns noted. Point S1 seeks to provide better signage and improve legibility.	No	
Mr Robert Sansom [102]	Support	Q1	<p>The centre of Cambridge should be given over to people not motor vehicles. The council should be actively closing down car parking in the centre of Cambridge except for provision for disabled users.</p> <p>More space should be given over to cafes on the pavements/streets.</p> <p>Bus and taxi traffic should be removed from St Andrews Street outside the Lion Yard during the middle of the day. The area from the drummer street corner to King Street should be pedestrianised. There should be bus stops around the inner ring road instead of the centre of the city.</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists.</p> <p>Point S15 seeks to work to change the balance of space for activities such as outdoor eating and drinking to develop a café culture approach creating street activity and interest.</p> <p>Point S6 strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus routes and stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Gerry Robinson [8298]	Support	Q1/Q3	The city is congested with people. The outer areas have lovely green spaces which must be protected i.e. Paradise Walk, Lamas land etc but even these are now congested at times. We must stop the constant high-volume housing projects which seem to be mostly students who live here a few years and move on. You avoid congestion shopping centres, need jobs built in Cambourne and other areas to avoid the need for constant shopping trips into the city.	Congestion / green space	Comments and concerns duly noted. The document recognises the impact of congestion (including tourist congestion) in the city centre and seeks to create opportunities to reduce this through the user hierarchy and the creation of a tourist circuit. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge.	No	
Mr Alan Ackroyd [8148]	Support	Q1/Q3	The centre of Cambridge was originally laid out primarily for pedestrians and horse-drawn transport. Attempts to adapt it for motor vehicles have only largely taken place in the last 50 years and are now largely recognised as spoiling a people-centred city. Recognising the priority of people over vehicles is entirely correct.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Alexander Nix [8338]	Object	Q1/Q3	Disappointed by no reference yet again in a transport consultation to PTWs (Powered Two Wheelers) in the preferred road hierarchy.	PTWs	The user hierarchy identifies EAPC (Electrically Powered Pedal Cycles) and this extends to cover other scooters etc. that conform to particular design specifications. Motorcycles are included as 'other motor vehicles'.	Yes	Clarify that this includes motorcycles/ PTWs.
Tam Parry [7076]	Object	Q1/Q3	I think that the document should be stronger about the conflict between fast cyclists and pedestrians. This is a cultural issue, but it can be helped by providing cyclists with better routes that cross the city in all directions. For instance a new route along the backs could take them off St. John street and kings' parade. I think the document needs to be stronger on the need to provide additional segregated routes for cyclists across the city to help	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Strategy S4 seeks to create facilities for cyclists who want to pass through the city centre, so they have a choice to use faster, safer routes that avoid the busiest streets but with pedestrians at the top of the user hierarchy.	no	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			them avoid the city centre where most conflict with pedestrians occurs.				
Co-op (Mr Simon cross, Store Manager) [8237]	Comment	Q1/Q4	I have been informed that there is a proposal to close Mill Road to traffic. Recent closure of the Rail Bridge gave us a good indication of the impact this will have on our Colleagues and Business. 15% reduction in trade (150k in profit) resulting in less employment to local People. Approximately 2 fte Jobs would be lost to adjust for the trade reduction.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Q1/Q4	I strongly agree with the overall approach. It is long overdue for the Councils to take a much stronger line on reallocation of space away from motor vehicles, which cause overcrowding and domination of our spaces. Areas are shabby, unwelcoming, and polluted. Mill Road is in particular need of overhaul - the amount of through-traffic has reached completely unacceptable levels. The bridge should be shut to through-traffic for private cars, and a quality bus corridor and safe cycling space be created instead, with 24/7 access for traders and significant streetscape improvements. Cycling access must be retained, and cycle parking increased.	Mill Road access	Comments noted.		
Mr Ian Collinson [8334]	Comment	Q1/Q4	Mill Road Bridge. Mill Road traffic access. Schooling and Childcare provisions.	Mill Road access	Comments noted.		
Mr Paul Lythgoe [8328]	Comment	Q1/Q4	Agree with Vision & Aims Agree with set prioritisation Suggest alternative to the large buses Open up the Market space & create flexible space Have a green & commercially viable plan for Mill Road	Vision & objectives	Comments noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Mrs Katie Lucas [8203]	Comment	Q1/Q4	<p>Cambridge acts as a central hub for the wider surrounding area. The villages are mentioned only once in this plan, and nothing is said about how villagers will access the facilities in Cambridge if they can't drive there. It's too far for most people to cycle, public transport does not run in the evenings or on Sundays.</p> <p>Removing car access without ADEQUATE replacements will cut off Cambridgeshire from the facilities it needs.</p>	Bus infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The document clearly identifies the extent of the study area in Figure 2. However, transport routes and open spaces etc. form networks and quite correctly, what happens in the city Centre has the potential to impact upon areas further out, including surrounding villages. The Making Space for People document highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre.</p>	No	
Mrs Katie Lucas [8203]	Comment	Q1/Q4	<p>"making-space-for-people-spd-central-cambridge-vision.pdf"</p> <p>Disabled people are mentioned only once in this document.</p> <p>Cycling and cyclists are mentioned 22 times.</p> <p>People who can't cycle or walk long distances are increasingly being denied access to Cambridge due to poor and inaccessible public transport and the council's strategies to prevent access by car.</p> <p>Strategies which focus on cycling are inherently discriminatory against disabled people and there is no evidence in this document that the council has given sufficient thought as to how to ameliorate that discrimination.</p> <p>This document ONCE AGAIN demonstrates that the city council gives cyclists their entire attention and disabled people virtually none.</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to access will ensure that the needs of disabled people are reflected during the design and implementation phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel. The overall approach is to ensure that streets and spaces are inclusive in their design and which by definition are designed to be fully usable by disabled people.</p>	Yes	<p>Document to be amended to make clearer that the needs of disabled people will be taken into account as part of an inclusive approach to street and space design.</p>
The Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke, National Planning	Comment	Q1/Q4	<p>Paragraph 2.3.2 cites the increasing role of cultural provision within city centres, which is something with which we would agree. Cultural facilities, including theatres, music venues, pubs and other venues also have a wider role in supporting and improving the</p>	Cultural facilities	<p>Comments duly noted. The document emphasises the importance of creating opportunities for more cultural activities.</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Adviser) [5190]			social and cultural wellbeing of local people and attracting and retaining people and businesses within the local area. Therefore, we suggest that support and protection for culture is prominent within the plan's vision and objectives, and that a positive strategy is set out. This will ensure the plan accords with paragraphs 20 and 92 of the NPPF (2019).				
Mr Robert Sansom [102]	Support	Q1/Q4	<p>Both walking and cycling should be given equal importance as cycling can be just as accessible to elderly disabled people as walking (my 80 year old neighbour cannot walk very well due to his back problems but is able to cycle). Also cycling enables deliveries of goods thus reducing vehicle traffic.</p> <p>There should be an explicit goal to close more streets to motor vehicle traffic in the central Cambridge to make the city more liveable. Most continental European towns close the centres of their towns to traffic during the working day (e.g. 10am to 4pm).</p>	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to pedestrian access will not adversely impact cyclists or those with limited mobility. Reallocation of roadscape in favour of pedestrians and cyclists will require decisions to be made about the primary function of particular streets and spaces. The MSfP Vision and User Hierarchy is a clear statement of intent in terms of ensuring pedestrians and cyclists are prioritised in the City Centre. Such decisions may involve the closure of some streets to motor vehicles but it is outside the scope of the document to set out specific proposals.	No	
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Support	Q1/Q4	I support the statements. Removing dominance of cars, delivery vehicles and buses is good. Reallocation of road space for walking for the city centre core is good. Yes for cycling as well, but to avoid conflict at busy times, cyclists can walk with their bikes outside core times of say 10- 4pm. NB I am a cyclist as well as a walker and car driver.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Neil Shailer [8318]	Support	Q1/Q4	Mostly pedestrianize Mill Road in. Allow as much access to the shops as possible, this might mean continuing to allow car usage for the purpose of access. Pedestrians and cyclists should have priority but emergency	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>services, and public transport should be allowed to use the street. Use of along street shuttle busses should be explored. More community space for people to live and play and interact along the street. Please more cycle racks, sitting places, parklets, trees and plants and more room to walk and cycle on Mill Road. Mill Road Summer was absolutely wonderful!</p>		<p>spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Sam Webster [8324]	Support	Q1/Q4	<p>Support as we have got to get to zero-carbon as soon as possible. The number of private cars will have to be reduced even if they all become zero emissions.</p> <p>Cycling is the only mode of transport faster than walking that can bring people and goods from a much wider area into central Cambridge in a peaceful way that conserves the environment, air quality and the historic nature of the city centre</p>	Air quality / carbon	<p>Comments duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that delivery the right environmental conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise. The space focused strategies are being revised to reflect greater emphasis on reducing air and noise pollution. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets.</p>	No	
Mr FC de Blois [8337]	Comment	Q1/Q4	<p>I think Mill Road bridge should be closed to all private vehicles (except for deliveries to local shops). This will cut down on pollution and accidents.</p>	Mill Road access	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Liutao (Ms Coco Li) [8340]	Object	Q1/Q4	<p>Is Cambridge ready with a strong public transport system to make it work without affecting existing residents, users, visitors and businesses of Cambridge? What are the data and research to prove that footfall will increase, especially in the areas more than 10minutes away from the market square centre point but have been included into the</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments noted. The Study area incorporates the City Centre including the Historic Core, along with the Opportunity Areas that radiate out from it. These focus on routes that already experience high footfall and cycle usage. Gehl and others have shown that removal significant motor vehicle traffic can improve the liveable</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			scheme anyway? The "10-minute centre" of Cambridge have a large footfall due to the university, however, further away, there aren't any landmarks to ensure that footfall will be enough to sustain businesses with just pedestrians.		aspects of places with Copenhagen being a good example. The challenge is to make pedestrian and cycle movements, supported by good public transport to make such options viable and easy to use for most people.		
Mr paul weaver [8183]	Object	Q1/Q4	MILL ROAD IS AN ECLECTIC ROAD THAT NO OTHER ROAD IN CAMBRIDGE OR MAYBE ANYWHERE IN THE UK IS LIKE MILL ROAD CANNOT BE CLOSED TO TRAFFIC OR IT WILL DIE A DEATH CLOSING MILL ROAD BRIDGE FOR 8 WEEKS PROVED THAT PEOPLES LIVELIHOODS WERE AT STAKE AND SOME LOST JOBS. PEOPLE IN CAMBRIDGE DO NOT KNOW ABOUT THIS PLAN, WHY IS IT NOT SENT TO ALL CAMBRIDGE RESIDENTS FOR THEIR OPINION? THERE IS NO TRANSPARENCY HERE! ITS LIKE THE CCC WANT TO PUSH THIS THROUGH AND ONLY GIVING PEOPLE THAT DO KNOW 2 WEEKS TO OBJECT, THAT'S NOT DEMOCRACY!	Mill Road access	Comments noted. The consultation on the document ran from the 2nd Sept - 14th Oct 2019 and included static displays, staffed exhibitions and web and newspaper based publicity. The consultation on MSfP was separate from the GCP consultation on Mill Road which occurred at a similar time.	No	
The Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke, National Planning Adviser) [5190]	Support	Q1/Q5	Paragraph 2.3.2 cites the increasing role of cultural provision within city centres, which is something with which we would agree. Cultural facilities, including theatres, music venues, pubs and other venues also have a wider role in supporting and improving the social and cultural wellbeing of local people and attracting and retaining people and businesses within the local area. Therefore we suggest that support and protection for culture is prominent within the plan's vision and objectives, and that a positive strategy is set out. This will ensure the plan accords with paragraphs 20 and 92 of the NPPF (2019).	Cultural facilities	Comments and concerns noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.	Yes	A3 - Add reference to cultural facilities to read: 'Places, cultural facilities, venues, activities and travel options are available that are safe, convenient and comfortable to all.'

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
B Nicolson [5745]	Comment	Q1/Q5	Make these ideas into clear policies statements. Make Mill Road a place for people again, rather than one where people come rather low down the pecking order.	Mill Road access	MSfP is intended to provide clarification on Policy 10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). As such it cannot 'write' new policy but instead has the role of guiding decision making and to act as an engagement tool for the City, County, GCP and others to achieve a shared vision and approach to the City Centre.		
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Q2	For Q2: Putting pedestrians above cyclists effectively risks putting tourists above locals, which is utterly absurd, as tourists spend on average 1 day here, while locals have to live here all the time.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns are noted. The user hierarchy is intended to ensure that a balanced and context led approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are both higher priority users but there will places in the City Centre where cycles will need to slow down and where pedestrian footfall is dominant. such an approach will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Dr Richard Higginson [8201]	Comment	Q2	Need for balance and realism	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	
Rosemary Rodd [8176]	Support	Q2	Better walking infrastructure within Cambridge city centre would benefit everyone - however needs to be an evidence-based approach - for example trailing additional pedestrian crossings using mobile units before deciding on final position.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to pedestrian access will not adversely impact cyclists or those with limited mobility.	No	
Dr Janette Thomas [8316]	Support	Q2	I agree with the livability components and I'd like to emphasise that cycling benefits all of them in addition to walking. Cycling is extremely beneficial as a mode of transport and can take one further and faster than can walking and so can bring people and goods from a much wider area into central Cambridge in a peaceful way that conserves the environment, air quality and the historic nature of the city centre. Indeed cycling can be a great link with public transport such as to train stations and help journeys from bus routes.	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets.	Yes	Further emphasis on the benefits of cycle-based modes to transfer goods and people while conserving the environment and more conducive to

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
							social interaction in public spaces than driving.
Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Q2	I strongly agree with the overall approach. Note that a walkable city should not imply any reduction in cycle access also. The two can co-exist happily - well-designed cycle infrastructure and access means good walking conditions also.	User hierarchy / vision	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre.	No	
Miss Mary Reid [8100]	Comment	Q2	Take care prioritising pedestrians over cyclists or you will dissuade those who cycle from visiting the city centre.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to pedestrian access will not adversely impact cyclists or those with limited mobility.	No	
Christopher Johnson [8116]	Comment	Q2	You are right to put pedestrians top of your hierarchy, but cyclists need to be made to understand this, especially for shared routes, such as the path across Parker's Piece. In France cyclists can be fined for wearing headphones or talking on a mobile. These are regular occurrences in Cambridge, along with jumping red lights and not carrying lights after dark. I am a cyclist myself, yet despair at the dangerous behaviour of so many local cyclists.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Tim Marchant [8122]	Support	Q2	But there needs to be adequate provision of segregated routes so that cyclists and pedestrians do NOT come into conflict with each other.	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.		
Ms Tina Bollerslev [8130]	Support	Q2	Yes, please VERY HIGH priority to CYCLISTS. If this was the case, I would ALWAYS cycle with my children into the centre. I only cycle with my kids to and round the city centre sometimes because Regent's Street with cycling kids is a killer and we usually HAVE TO go that way! So ... we drive to avoid the kids on bikes on Regents Street. People buy a second car or a car when they have kids because the cars have priority! Change that and families WILL change and start moving on cargo bikes - better for EVERYONE in the community!	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Dr Matthew Butler [8136]	Support	Q2	It is important to prioritise pedestrian and cycle traffic in order to reduce pollution, minimise the effective production of greenhouse gases and to ensure a safe commute into and through the city.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Comment	Q2	The hierarchy is correct i.e. pedestrians should have the no one priority. The needs of disabled people should also be given top priority. The cobbled market square is a real hazard. The cobbles should be replaced by a smooth surface.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to pedestrian access will not adversely impact those with limited mobility.	No	
Rachel Abbott [8150]	Comment	Q2	The hierarchy as defined in the document is good, however in real life the situation is very different. As a pedestrian in the city centre it is difficult to feel like your position is at the top of the stack. Cyclists constantly cycle at you, the wrong way down one-way streets and on the pavement. Pedestrians also have	User hierarchy	Comments noted. Identifying the 'user hierarchy' is an important step in helping to achieve a better balance between users in the City Centre. This will be used to inform future designs and decision making as sometimes competing demand are resolved. This could include extending pedestrian	Yes	Extend pedestrian focused areas to include hours of operation

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			to compete with food delivery drivers speeding through town on mopeds. The Monday to Saturday pedestrian zone restrictions should be extended to include Sundays too.		priority to additional streets and the times and days on which it operates but such decisions are beyond the scope of this MSfP document.		and days covered.
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Support	Q2	The hierarchy is exactly right, putting pedestrians at the top. Cyclists and pedestrians need to be separated ideally as it's menacing to have a fast cycle bearing down on you, especially if the rider has ignored the one-way traffic system in Market St area.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Strategy S4 seeks to create facilities for cyclists who want to pass through the city centre, so they have a choice to use faster, safer routes that avoid the busiest streets but with pedestrians at the top of the user hierarchy.	No	
Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Q2	I support the proposed street user hierarchy.	User hierarchy	Comments duly noted.	No	
Mr Graeme Hodgson [8179]	Comment	Q2	Yes this is absolutely the right hierarchy. With climate change and increasing awareness that we cannot simply go on doing what we've always done (i.e. private motor vehicles), it is essential that pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users be prioritised. At the same time, delivery vehicles should be given access to commercial establishments, such as those in Mill Road, but not necessarily stopping right in front, which could mean parking on pavements or making it dangerous for cyclists to go around them. I would suggest side-street parking for delivery vehicles and a requirement that shops, or delivery vehicles have trolleys.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel. Objective S7 commits to reviewing routing arrangements for delivery and service vehicles. This could be expanded to consider parking arrangements for service vehicles	Yes	Amend S7 to include limits to parking of service vehicles or improvement to loading bays
Gonville & Caius College (Alison Stanley, Endowment Property Manager) [8185]	Comment	Q2	Place user hierarchy is correct, but policing is key. Too many cyclists travel too fast, ignore one-way streets and cycle on pavements. Cycle parking provision needs to be improved as bicycles parked along streets reduce the width of pavements for pedestrians forcing them to walk in the road. Improved signage is required for pedestrians so they are aware the centre is not pedestrianised.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Objective S3 targets cyclists who want to pass through the City Centre. Objective S7 targets reviewing routing arrangements for delivery and service vehicles. This could be expanded to consider parking arrangements for service vehicles	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			Servicing vehicles should not be allowed to park for extended periods in central areas e.g. Market Square, as they block visibility of retail businesses.				
Ben Stoll [8213]	Support	Q2	The elderly and young people deserve special attention in the street user hierarchy, as they are especially vulnerable to problems such as narrow or unusable pavements, pollution and car dependency.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to access will ensure that the needs of disabled people and those with limited mobility are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Miss Amanda Nilsson [8194]	Support	Q2	I support the content of part 3 and the order of hierarchy	User hierarchy	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr Richard Smith [8233]	Support	Q2	I welcome this hierarchy of street users, particularly in recognising pedestrians and then cyclists at the top. However it would be good to describe how taxi users fit in it. I do not believe taxi users should be afforded the same priority as bus users. Buses provide far more efficient use of road space than taxis and, in a city centre, are normally much less polluting per passenger-mile than taxis. Taxis are an important part of an urban transport ecosystem, but buses should be prioritised above them. I believe taxis should be placed alongside delivery vehicles in this hierarchy.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel. In the hierarchy of users Taxis are in the specific service and delivery vehicles category meaning that bus are above taxis in the hierarchy.	No	
Mr Ian Cray [8248]	Support	Q2	I would ask that inclusion of Car Club vehicles is rated with higher priority than personal ownership vehicles.	Car club	Comment duly noted.	Yes	Include car clubs as a measure to help reduce motor ownership.
Michael Ledzion [8250]	Object	Q2	The idea of a hierarchy is a good one, however, it implicitly assumes a linear relationship in the priority order. In practice,	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>pedestrians and cyclists may (and should in my opinion) be elevated significantly higher than other priorities.</p> <p>The hierarchy could be adapted to have an absolute or primary priority (a proposal can only pass if it provides a full and complete solution for pedestrians AND cyclists equally), and once that requirement has been met, then other secondary priorities can be considered.</p>		<p>and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all to reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>		
Professor Michael Ellman [8260]	Support	Q2	I support your street user hierarchy. As someone who uses the city centre but does not have a car, I think priority for pedestrians, bicycles and buses is very sensible.	User hierarchy	Comments duly noted	No	
Mrs Anne Bailey [3998]	Support	Q2	<p>As someone lucky to live and work close to central Cambridge, this hierarchy works for me; it reflects the way I move about the city. But I realise it won't work for all, which is why we must transform the public transport offer. Can we move away from big, noisy, smelly buses (I know lots have improved) to smaller, more responsive (on demand?), electric transport that serves the needs of people with mobility issues? Or makes Park & Ride the fastest, easiest way into town? What about moving walkways like they have at airports?</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments noted. We recognise that effective movement strategies extend well beyond the 'study area' to include the wider City and outlying villages and employment areas. We are working closely with GCP to align thinking and MSfP provides a way to achieve buy in to a Vision for the kind of City Centre that is fit for the future. This will include decisions about how and what buses are allowed to pass through the centre, but it is not the purpose of the document to set out detailed plans or proposals.</p>		
Rustat Neighbourhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]	Support	Q2	Agree this priority	User hierarchy	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr Antony Otter [8261]	Comment	Q2	<p>The proposed hierarchy of street users is necessary if the Council is serious in taking a radical approach to rethinking how people can access and benefit from the city in the context of the projected growth in population and tourists.</p> <p>Except for pedestrianised areas, the current</p>	User hierarchy	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>hierarchy is generally the opposite, with roads giving priority to cars and with provision for cyclists where possible.</p> <p>This change in the hierarchy will be especially beneficial on Mill Rd which is often congested and hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists, although careful consideration will have to be given to potential impacts on local traders.</p>		<p>correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p>		
Ms Cathy Parker [2549]	Support	Q2	I agree with this hierarchy of needs.	User hierarchy	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Support	Q2	I agree with the order of hierarchy.	User hierarchy	Comment duly noted.	No	
Dr Tamsin Spelman [8290]	Support	Q2	I agree with the hierarchy arrangement. I particularly think there is a wide gap between the top four and other motor traffic.	User hierarchy	Comment noted.	No	
Ms Isabelle de Wouters [8302]	Comment	Q2	I would place public transport at the top of the hierarchy as this will enable other user use and access.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. The document aligns with GCPs City Access Project which is working to improve public transport and offer people better choices for their journeys.	No	
Mrs Nobuko Tollemache [8308]	Comment	Q2	The street user hierarchy for the very centre of Cambridge: 1. Pedestrians 2 Public transport users 3. Specific service and delivery vehicles 4. Cyclists 5. Other Motor vehicles	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrians.	No	
Peter Tribble [6896]	Comment	Q2	While generally correct, the hierarchy of needs is imprecise.	User hierarchy	Comments duly noted		
Mr Craig Wisniewski [2573]	Support	Q2	I agree that you have the street user hierarchy correct and would like to see simple changes made, if possible and as soon as possible to help pedestrians (and cyclists) as noted in my comments to Part 2. I would like to add a detailed comment that the width of buses on Mill road can be quite intimidating due to the closeness when they pass. The same goes for buses on the cycle way as they pass at high speed and there is	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			not much (if at all) separation between these pedestrians and cyclists and the buses that pass.		strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus routes and stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.		
Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Trustees) of the Charity, Co-ordinator) [925]	Support	Q2	Yes. This is the same hierarchy as proposed by Manual for Streets and it is in line with our priorities as well, therefore we support this street user hierarchy. Accessibility is crucial for both pedestrians and cyclists and considerations for people with disabilities must be included when designing facilities for walking or cycling. For example, cycle parking facilities should include spaces for people who use recumbents, handcycles or other forms of adapted cycles that provide an aid for mobility.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to access will ensure that the needs of disabled people and those with limited mobility are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Q2	Very strongly support. The current road user hierarchy is completely the wrong way around in places like Mill Road - the amount of through-traffic has reached completely unacceptable levels. The bridge should be shut to through-traffic for private cars, and a quality bus corridor and safe cycling space be created instead, with 24/7 access for traders and significant streetscape improvements.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Sam Webster [8324]	Support	Q2	I agree with the hierarchy	User hierarchy	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr Neil Spenley [8231]	Support	Q2	I am supportive of this hierarchy in principle, but some work needs to be done on how to interpret it in practice (e.g. many roads are not wide enough for a separate footway + cycleway + bus lanes + general vehicle lane - which of these is compromised?)	User hierarchy	Comments noted. The hierarchy will be used to guide future decision making about how streets and spaces are used.	No	
Abigail Wills [5028]	Support	Q2	I fully support the hierarchy. I live off Mill Road and I am daily horrified by the fact that	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			taking my children to school over the bridge involves articulated lorries passing inches away from them, and excessive numbers of cars going far too fast. Cycling trips down Mill Rd are also fraught with danger. Traffic is currently being allowed to excessively dominate - Mill Rd needs to be closed to through traffic (except for buses) as soon as possible.		each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets.		
Dr Harry Cronin [8331]	Support	Q2	I strongly support the hierarchy of transport modes which has been presented, prioritising foot and cycle travel over motor vehicles. Furthermore, I would strongly support any future proposal to close Mill Road bridge to motorised through traffic.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all.	No	
M Winchcomb [8336]	Comment	Q2	The hierarchy of needs is listed from highest priority to lowest priority as: pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, specific service and delivery vehicle drivers, and finally other motor vehicle drivers. This is the same hierarchy as proposed by Manual for Streets therefore I support this street user hierarchy. Accessibility is crucial for both pedestrians and cyclists and considerations for people with disabilities must be included when designing facilities for walking or cycling. For example, cycle parking facilities should include spaces for people who use recumbents, handcycles or other forms of adapted cycles that provide an aid for mobility.	User hierarchy	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Any improvements to access will ensure that the needs of disabled people and those with limited mobility are reflected during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Liutaio (Ms Coco Li) [8340]	Object	Q2	Please carefully consider the true meaning of inclusivity. By creating hierarchy and priorities, you are not being inclusive. Also, the Council should investigate how some might abuse inclusivity to their own financial gains. The proposal focuses on the "historic core" so why are areas outside of the core been included? What are the benefits for the areas outside of the core to be included?	User hierarchy	Comments noted.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Comment	Q3	For Q3: Steps need to urgently be taken to REDUCE the numbers of tourists visiting the city and to discourage them coming in such large numbers. Pretending that there is enough room for an unlimited number of tourists as well as the local population is total nonsense.	Tourism	Comments and concerns are noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Q3	Q3: A very specific issue is Garret Hostel Bridge, which is THE MOST IMPORTANT cycle route from the East to West of the city. Rather than give one group priority over the other, I would like to see the bridge segregated and with clear signposting to keep half of the width of the bridge (at a minimum) free for cyclists, who need speed to cross the bridge, and with appropriate and actually enforced penalties for use of the wrong part by either group (an additional income source for the council would thereby be provided).	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific solutions to particular streets but to identify a clear decision-making process that can be used to inform future design responses including how to manage areas where pedestrians and cyclists come into conflict.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Comment	Q3	For Q3: Something very important that has been left out is the need to REDUCE the number of jobs in Cambridge as a whole. If jobs and residential accommodation are in different places, a need for transport is created. If we try to add more residential accommodation to Cambridge it expands spatially or vertically, both very undesirable. Somebody needs to realise that the aim of conserving the character of Cambridge is INCOMPATIBLE with the aim of increasing the number of jobs here.	Jobs	Comments and concerned duly noted. The baseline report reflects the need to support Local businesses both in the City and neighbouring local centres. The aims and objectives of the Making Space for People document highlight the delivery of well-curated space that understands the unique character of Cambridge whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.	No	
Ms Tina Bollerslev [8130]	Support	Q3	YES! The city needs to change into a modern European city where people can cycle and walk on convenient, safe and uninterrupted pathways. We need to ensure that our children learn to physically move around in our city and community on foot or by bicycle. The city centre, especially Regent Street and Trumpington Road towards Kings College make it impossible for families to travel to and around the city centre with	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design, and implementation of	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			young kids by bicycle... so we often take the car instead and drive around to find a sneaky park. Like Copenhagen, please remove this option!		future schemes. Schemes will be required to align with MSfP to help create more inclusive streets and spaces.		
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Support	Q3	A vision for the future of Central Cambridge is vital. Problems of vehicle traffic, bicycle route management, use of overlarge buses within narrow streets, lack of accessible public spaces with room for seating and public events, a market environment urgently in need of upgrading, lack of tourism management, streets cluttered with signage, more emphasis on protecting the unique historic heritage, poor air quality...all these need to be addressed if this world famous city is not to become an increasingly less desirable destination and place in which to live and work.	User hierarchy / heritage and conservation	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.</p> <p>The aims and objectives also highlight the delivery of green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated spaces for those who live, work and visit Cambridge.</p>	No	
Mrs Tracey Cox [8180]	Comment	Q3	Chance of losing areas that make Cambridge, Cambridge Not enough time spent on traffic issues - public transport is currently NOT the answer, so what is?	User hierarchy / heritage and conservation	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. Cambridge has a special and unique character and it is not the intention of MSfP to erode these qualities but rather to help support decision making processes that will safeguard and improve them. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all and that make healthy and active travel options viable. Such an approach aligns with an improved public transport offer and will make changing between sustainable options an easier choice.</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Rosemary Rodd [8176]	Comment	Q3	<p>Much more could be done by using technology to create a "smart city" (for example better control of traffic lights to improve traffic flow).</p> <p>More "evidence-based" approach to carbon reduction needed- e.g. creating wider tarmac cycle routes has large carbon footprint, especially if hedges or grassland is removed. Council should be monitoring whether there is increased use sufficient to create a net carbon saving.</p> <p>Expansion of the evening economy should not be done in a way that simply means traders have to work longer hours for the same income (or lose out to competitors)</p>	Smart City / Carbon reduction	Comments noted.	Yes	<p>A1 of aims and objectives to expand on Smart City / carbon reduction.</p> <p>Add to the space focused straggles by adding to existing point S9 to read: 'Create opportunities to reallocate space freed up by reductions in motor vehicles to create new and repurposed public spaces with improved air quality' OR create new strategy focused on creating a clean city with improved air quality.</p>
Mrs Anne Bailey [3998]	Support	Q3	I've commented in the other sections, but I didn't get a chance to comment on whether you've been bold enough. I know that change is hard, residents' priorities can be in	Vision & objectives	Comments and concerns duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>competition with each other and the risk of political retribution looms large, but I'm not sure you have been bold enough. We must consider the implications of global warming and as a world leading centre for education and innovation we should be world-leading in designing a smart, zero carbon, liveable city that works for all. I've just returned from Denmark where I enjoyed the car-free commercial centre.</p>		<p>green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.</p>		
Mrs Barbara Taylor [5907]	Support	Q3	<p>I agree with your assessment of Part 1, the continued growth has severely impacted upon the beauty of central Cambridge. Like other long-term residents who have observed the changes, I question the growth before suitable infrastructure has been put in place.</p>	Heritage and conservation	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The aims and objectives highlight the equitable, welcoming and well-curated delivery of places that are accessible and engaging for all. This will also allow for the unique character of Cambridge to be maintained whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.</p>	No	
Dr Tamsin Spelman [8290]	Support	Q3	<p>Idea seems sounds.</p>	Vision & objectives	<p>Comments noted.</p>	No	
Mr Robjn Cantus [8300]	Comment	Q3	<p>We feel that there is a move to make Mill road closed to cars pushed by the local councillor who is bias. The cycleway needs updating - St Barnabus is a dreadful street to cycle down</p>	Mill Road access	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Mr Alan Ackroyd [8148]	Comment	Q3	<p>A number of interventions must be made to change the current City centre environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Define footpaths and cycleways more clearly, provide more cycle parking and do more to limit the need for vehicular access.</p>	Cycle infrastructure	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel.		
Professor Michael Ellman [8260]	Comment	Q3	I agree generally with what is written. I think more stress could be placed on the benefits of the green spaces in and around the city and the need to maintain them. Midsummer Common, Stourbridge Common and the riverside path that leads from Central Cambridge via these two commons to Fen Ditton are very important amenities that need to be cared for.	Green space	Comments noted. The existing greenspace network is a significant part of the character of the City and links areas outside of the study area through to the heart of Cambridge.	Yes	S13 make reference to existing network of greenspaces in this strategy.
Mr Felix Sanchez Garcia [5806]	Support	Q3	I completely support this vision. I'm sick and tired of cities designed for motor vehicles. Cities are for human beings, not for cars.	Vision & objectives	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all. This will help to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user during the design and management phases and as a result reduce conflict between different users and modes of travel.	No	
Rosemary Rodd [8176]	Support	Q3	Broadly support but there should be recognition that not all shops will be able to insist that deliveries or collections are done at specific times.	Retail	Comment duly noted.		
Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Q3	I support the strategies.	Vision & objectives	Comment duly noted.	No	
Mr Graeme Hodgson [8179]	Comment	Q3	Yes, I agree with all these elements of the vision, but it is indispensable that city planners actually walk the talk when it comes to the restriction of motor vehicle traffic flow which is the only way these objectives can be reached realistically.	Vision & objectives	Comment duly noted.	No	
Ben Stoll [8213]	Support	Q3	Answers yes to Question 3, suggests further consideration of centre-periphery connections under Question 4, suggests a special strategy for assessing whether Mill	Mill Road access	Comments noted. It is not purpose of MSfP to propose specific changes to streets in Cambridge but more to create a shared vision and approach that can be used to inform future decision making.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			Road could be made a car-free zone permanently.				
M Winchcomb [8336]	Comment	Q3	Question 3: I agree that 'Central Cambridge should be a healthy, vibrant and engaging place that is accessible, well run and welcoming to residents and visitors alike.' We are and need to remain a magnet for tourists from across the country and the world to continue to enhance our economy and community. Good cycle facilities and promotion of cycling, walking and use of public transport will enable people to move around the city centre much more freely, as the traffic could be reduced significantly with such measures. This would also help to decrease the air pollution too.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit. The space focused strategies are being revised to reflect greater emphasis on reducing air and noise pollution.	No	
Mr Ian Cray [8248]	Object	Q3/Q4	The definition of Cambridge - historic core is not broad enough. The wider community of Cambridge should/need to be included in the SPD.	Heritage and conservation	Comments noted. The scope of the study area is identified in Figure 2. The document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement Policy 10 in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge. Comments on the document are welcomed from all in the community.	No	
Sam Webster [8324]	Support	Q3/Q4	Qu 3 - I agree Qu 4 - I would raise the priority of transitioning to zero-carbon transport infrastructure. There is a climate emergency. Qu 5 - I strongly support the strategies that will make significant reductions in carbon emissions i.e. S4, S5 and S6	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	Yes	Include a reference to transitioning to net zero carbon in the Aims and Objectives
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Comment	Q4	For Q4: We urgently need to improve air quality in the city centre by prohibiting diesel vehicles, most particularly buses. Electric buses would be absolutely fine. Obviously, they will cost more, but the alternative is the health cost of filthy air.	Air quality	Comments and concerns duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places by providing the right environmental conditions including air quality. the requirements for low emission buses are beyond the scope of the MSfP document but are governed through agreements between the County Council and the bus operators. Low emission buses are already being trialled in Cambridge and it is likely that they will form an increasing part of	Yes	Add to the space focused strategies by adding to existing point S9 to read: 'Create opportunities to reallocate space freed

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					the fleet in the coming years as older vehicles are phased out.		up by reductions in motor vehicles to create new and repurposed public spaces with improved air quality' OR create new strategy focused on creating a clean city with improved air quality.
Mr Martin Atherton [8135]	Comment	Q4	There is an immense amount of detail which ignores some critical points like the need to remove diesel buses from the centre of Cambridge and the need to encourage driving to maintain city centre businesses. One restaurant in Market Square is already leaving because of the hostile environment. The other issue is the school run. You need to focus on what can be done to move children onto bikes and buses. Do not remove any more city centre car parks. Preserve the existing number of spaces at Park Terrace - we don't need another hotel there.	Air quality	Comments and concerns noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places by providing the right environmental conditions including improved air quality. Low emission vehicles are part of how this can be achieved. Travel planning and ensuring that the right facilities are in place to help support healthy and active travel also includes addressing 'the school run'. Strategies that seek to prioritise healthy and active travel choices will be informed by MSfP and align with the Vision, Aims & Objectives.	No	
Sergio Bacallado [8212]	Comment	Q4	Pavement parking in Romsey town is a blight on the neighbourhood that needs a long-term solution. The practice neglects our most vulnerable neighbours and causes persistent inequalities across the city. It should be made a thing of the past.	Parking	Comments noted. Pavement parking is linked into effective management of streets and spaces and the ability to enforce against it.	No.	
Miss Amanda Nilsson [8194]	Comment	Q4	I support what is listed in the introduction, purpose and context	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Dr Steven Pope [8229]	Support	Q4	I agree with all the main findings of this.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted.	No	
Mr Daniel Ashby [8226]	Object	Q4	<p>Closing Mill Road to vehicles will be a catastrophe for shops and residents. When Mill Road closed for vehicles when road works were conducted on the bridge, shops on mill road reported serious losses revenue and residents reported increased commuting times (meaning more traffic, pollution, and stress).</p> <p>Some better ideas to make the street safer could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - make a cycle lane more explicit on the road. - block trucks from using mill road. - have cycle areas on the pavements too. - have cyclists obey the one way systems on the Romsey streets. - Introduce Parking permits for residents. 	Mill Road access	<p>Comments noted. It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>	No	
Ms Elizabeth Walter [5088]	Comment	Q4	Reduction of traffic on Mill Rd and need for robust data on potential impact on traders.	Mill Road access	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Mr Andrew Warren [8276]	Object	Q4	Don't ban traffic on Mill Road, it will diminish the area's prosperity	Mill Road access	<p>It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Nigel Seaber [5559]	Support	Q4	I agree and applaud the overall objectives and the outlined strategies. I do think that the targets need to be bolder and more radical	Air quality	The traffic reduction target identified aligns with the GCP City Access work. Clearly an improvement over this target would be		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			<p>and visionary, e.g. a far greater reduction in traffic than 24%. Regarding the Mill Road ecosystem, which is unique in Cambridge, if the objectives and implementations are radical and wide ranging then a huge benefit to all stakeholders, including businesses, can be achieved. To succeed it must cease to be a through road, including the use by taxis for access for the train station, but with suitable access to businesses for all users.</p>		<p>welcome but 24% is still ambitious when aspects such as the exiting 33% modal share for cycles is factored into thinking. Regarding Mill Road, it is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decision making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.</p>		
Dr Sarah Burch [8287]	Comment	Q4	<p>I support the overall objectives of this document, including the user hierarchy. However, it is not bold enough, nor is there sufficient emphasis on the green objective throughout. As the council has acknowledged the climate emergency, every action should contribute to or be informed by the green objective. Making Cambridge liveable must include liveable for biodiversity and wildlife.</p>	Vision & objectives	<p>Comments and concerns duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.</p>	No	
Mr FARAZ KHAN [8178]	Object	Q4	<p>- council present data that is disconnected - and analysed prejudicially. - the problem is Tory neoliberalism laws - find ways to work around</p>	Vision & objectives	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The data sources that have informed MSfP have been cited in the document to maintain an open and transparent approach.</p>	No	
Peter Tribble [6896]	Comment	Q4	<p>The scope of the consultation and the geographical area are poorly specified.</p>	Scope	<p>Comments and concerns noted.</p>	No	
Mr Craig Wisniewski [2573]	Support	Q4	<p>Cambridge should be at the forefront of sustainable development, considering that its main output is intellectually based (plus support businesses). Cambridge should look to other cities that have implemented successful solutions and the University can perhaps engage in practical research to progress the "future city." All residents should be considered, but I don't see mention of affordable housing and supporting vulnerable individuals - the number of people apparently living on the street and asking for money, seems to have</p>	Housing / Homelessness	<p>Comments noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.</p>	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			increased considerably and it seems to me that some consideration be made to address this in a positive, gentle and caring way.				
Dr Elizabeth Howell [8327]	Object	Q4	Any plans to close Mill Road bridge would be counterproductive with regards to traffic (as all other roads will get congested- I witnessed this on Hills Road when it was closed), and ruinous for the small businesses.	Mill Road access			
Ms Tina Bollerslev [8130]	Support	Q4	Absolutely support!!!! We need to change our city NOW so that people will choose to cycle and walk, not drive. We have plenty of bicycles in our family, but we always end up driving when we go to the city centre because it is NOT SAFE to cycle in the centre with kids, especially Regent's Street and Trumpington Road / Kings College.	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre.	No	
Mr Martin Thompson [2615]	Support	Q4	It will require much close working between the City Council and County Council to achieve these aims. The County Council having responsibility for the city streets makes no sense.	Scope	Comments noted. The City works closely with County and other stakeholders to achieve a co-ordinated approach. Part of the role of MSfP is to achieve alignment and buy in to an overall vision for the kind of City Centre that will meet future needs and to inform and align with GCP City Access work.		
Rachel Abbott [8150]	Comment	Q4	<p>Air Quality is impacted by the number of large lorries driving through the City. It would be a low cost, simple step to enforce street weight limits and time restrictions so blatantly ignored by lorry drivers.</p> <p>Encouraging/incentivising the use of electric or low emission vehicles would also help improve the air quality.</p> <p>There are a lot homeless, beggars and drunks in the city centre on a daily basis. Resources need to be put in place to help them improve their situation and transition to be clean and sober. Emmaus is a great example of how this can be done.</p>	Air quality	Comments noted. Effective management is a key part of achieving better streets and spaces within the study area. The Aims & Objectives identify the need for effective management at 'A5'.		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Support	Q4	I applaud the council for declaring a climate emergency, now we need action. Green infrastructure is a part of tackling effects of our heating climate. We need as much of this as possible.	Climate	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Ms. Meg Clarke [2541]	Support	Q4	I applaud the council for declaring a climate emergency, now we need action. Green infrastructure is a part of tackling effects of our heating climate. We need as much of this as possible.	Climate	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Co-op (Mr simony cross, Store Manager) [8237]	Comment	Q4	Linked to the proposal to Close Mill Rd to traffic. We clearly along with all other commercial business need transport links to either attend our place of work (Some people travel in from neighbouring areas) and also receive Deliveries to serve the local Residents. How does this work?	Mill Road access	The document does not propose to close Mill Road to traffic. It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Miss Cassie Lynch [1871]	Comment	Q4	Mill road should be closed permanently to private vehicle traffic, with the exception of residents.	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No	
Mrs Silvia Pizza [8266]	Comment	Q4	I have lived off Mill Road for almost 52 years, Yes there is a lot of traffic and yes we are fed up will the limited parking which we have in our street, this said I would not want any different IF IT MEANS THE SHOPS, RESTAURANTS AND CAFFE WILL LOOSE CUSTOMER, ITS NOT FAIR TO CHANGE THINGS AT THE EXPENCE OF PEOPLES LIVELY HOOD! I say STOP THE CHANGES!	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.	No.	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Mrs Anne Bailey [3998]	Support	Q4	I support these recommendations. Cambridge is a liveable city already, in comparison to many, but as the population grows, we must protect this. Walkability is one of the most important features. I think you've missing an opportunity to highlight the wellbeing aspects of a walkable city, not just for the health benefits but for the social benefits and creating feelings of connectedness. We have an epidemic of loneliness in the UK and many have experienced poor mental health; designing a city for wellbeing is the right thing to do.	Health and wellbeing	Comments noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that delivery the right environmental conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise. This could be expanded on to also highlight the health benefits associated with walking and cycling.	Yes	Additional text to emphasise the health benefits of walking and cycling
Ms Cathy Parker [2549]	Comment	Q4	Yes, I agree with all your aims. Other benefits of making Cambridge a better and safer place for cycling is that this in itself would help realise the other aims you value: cleaner air, reducing traffic and so benefitting pedestrians and facilitating public transport, preserving the historic aspects of the city.	Aims and objectives	Comments duly noted. The vision and objectives reflect the findings of the Baseline Report helping to deliver a green, healthy, equitable, welcoming and well-curated place to live, work and visit.	No	
Dr Sunit Ghosh [8307]	Object	Q4	In section 2.3.1 it states, 'there is evidence for increase in footfall following improvements to public spaces and allocation of road space in favour of pedestrians and cycles.' However, no actual evidence is cited, probably because there is not any. Simply put: where is the increased footfall going to come from? Cambridge has one of Europe's highest net incoming commuter traffic to resident population ratios according to the 2011 census data and so relies on cars to bring people into the city to work and shop. Shops rely on the high volume of customers coming from outside the city.	Retail	Source: 'Public spaces, public life', 1996, Jan Gehl and Lars Gamze, The Danish Architectural Press and the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts School of Architecture Publishers. Source: 'New city spaces', 2001, Jan Gehl and Lars Gamze, The Danish Architectural Press.	No	
Mrs Charlotte de Blois [5247]	Comment	Q4	Mill Road requires careful traffic management. Traders need deliveries, so pedestrianization is unrealistic. Residents and shoppers alike need freedom from traffic mounting pavements. Pollution levels are unacceptably high particularly children. The ultimate destinations of through-traffic should be analysed in depth and alternative routes	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			north and south of the city should be provided. I suggest closing the bridge to non-public motorized traffic and removing double yellow lines. Traders should be allowed to receive deliveries at all times of the day, and systems devised to allow traffic to turn at the bridge on both the Petersfield stretch and the Romsey stretch.		these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Dr Paul Gilliland [8321]	Support	Q4	Fine as a general approach, clearly will vary depending on location and context, e.g. cycling around Drummond Street bus station.	Vision & objectives	Comments duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians and cyclists (including EAPC) are higher priority users in order to create a place which is safe, accessible and engaging for all.	No	
The Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke, National Planning Adviser) [5190]	Comment	Q4	We are supportive of the strategies set out, but we consider the plan would also benefit from a strategy of supporting Cambridge's varied and vibrant cultural facilities. As well as supporting the social and cultural well-being of local people these help bring people into Cambridge which increases footfall supports local businesses.	Cultural facilities	Comment and concern duly noted. The scope of the document is to provide more specific and detailed guidance on how to interpret and implement policies in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relate to Central Cambridge to influence decision making. The document acknowledges the importance of creating space and opportunities for more cultural activities.	No	
Katy Cosh [8095]	Comment	Q4 / Q2	The objectives and priorities seem reasonable. Will we have an opportunity to contribute ideas/comments on proposed solutions? I would particularly like to see something done about the corner/road between Drummer Street Bus Station and John Lewis/Downing Street. We only live in Chesterton, but I am put off from bringing my children into town on bikes that way because of the heavy and intimidating bus traffic. I understand the need for public transport, but cyclists are essentially cut off from coming into town via Christ's pieces and this means we have no good cycle route through to museums/Newnham etc	Cycle infrastructure	Comments and concerns duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. It also ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre. The hierarchy also prioritises preferred users during the design and management phases, reducing conflict between different users and modes of travel. MSfP does not set out specific schemes	Yes	Increase emphasis on improving cycling and pedestrian safety through separated routes from vehicular and bus access - Add to S6 to read: ' Re-appraise bus and coach (public and tourist)

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
					within the City Centre but provides a clear approach to inform future decision making. Future schemes that help to implement the Vision, Aim & Objectives & Strategies will be subject to public consultation.		routing and the location and function of stops and drop off points to minimise impacts on the enjoyment of the city centre, and increase safety of other users, whilst maintaining or where possible improving access into the city centre.
Mr Joseph Adam [8145]	Support	Q5	I support the document. I'd like to see it include mention of reducing air and noise pollution in the centre of Cambridge as well.	Air quality	Comments duly noted. The aims and objectives highlight the delivery of green and healthy places that delivery the right environmental conditions including cleanliness, air quality and noise. The space focused strategies are being revised to reflect greater emphasis on reducing air and noise pollution.	Yes	Add to the space focused straggles by adding to existing point S9 to read: 'Create opportunities to reallocate space freed up by reductions in motor vehicles to create new and repurposed public spaces with

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
							improved air quality' OR create new strategy focused on creating a clean city with improved air quality.
Cambridge Glenys self [8149]	Comment	Q5	Inclusion of the Market Project in any future SDP docs.for public consultation. People, the general public, need to be able to have their say on its future.	Market square	Comment duly noted.	No	
Liutaio (Ms Coco Li) [8340]	Object	Q5	Is Mill Road really part of Central Cambridge? If so, why is Mill Road not on any maps? Why is Mill Road not promoted and supported by the City Council? Does pedestrianisation actually help non-high streets positively? Where are the relevant data and research to support these claims? What will happen to the residential property owners if Mill Road becomes redundant? Are there other ways to make Cambridge "greener" without completely closing off traffic on all the roads proposed?	Mill Road access	It is not the intention of the MSfP document to set out specific approach for identified streets within the study area. The document will help to inform future decsison making to achieve a better balance to key streets and spaces but must also allow for businesses to operate. This may involve changes to current servicing and access regimes, but these will need to be understood and worked through as specific schemes are developed.		
Mr Tim Marchant [8122]	Object	Q5	Cambridge is THE Cycling City in the UK. Not including CYCLING as one of the key components of a liveable city is an unforgivable omission.	Cycle infrastructure / Vision & objectives	Comments and concerns noted. The user hierarchy ensures priority is given to pedestrian and cyclists. The Making Space for People document also highlights movement focused strategies to facilitate cycling through the city centre with faster, safer routes that avoid busy streets. Point S6 of this section strategies for the re-routing, location and function of bus stops to minimise impacts on other users of the hierarchy while improving access to the city centre.	No	
Miss Katie Hawks [8199]	Comment	Q5	The spaces for pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicle users don't necessarily have to be separate - we do need more communication/ awareness. A lot of cyclists are dangerous; many cycles without lights at	User hierarchy	Comments noted. The user hierarchy is intended to provide a design basis for streets and spaces that are naturally self-policed.	No	

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
			night. There aren't police to catch them. Also, more importantly, how's this: as part of their licence, how about cab drivers HAVE to have a cycle proficiency certificate?				
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Q5	For Q5: Strategy S3 is an oxymoron (self-contradictory). The fastest routes are the shortest ones, and by their very nature do not avoid the busiest streets.	cycle infrastructure	Comments duly noted. The user hierarchy ensures that the needs of each user is observed so that a balanced and sustainable approach is developed. Pedestrians are highest priority and cycle routes need to be considered in order to ensure that the correct priority is given to the preferred user to reduce conflict between users.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Support	Q5	For Q5: I strongly support S4; in particular there is nowhere near enough cycle parking in the city centre. However, there is no point providing it in ways such as the Cycle Point at the rail station, which both has a high cycle theft problem (with nobody willing to review the CCTV footage, according to the local paper), and in its multi-layered parts is cumbersome, time-consuming, and difficult to use. Cycle parking needs to be with Sheffield stands that cannot be unscrewed from the ground.	cycle infrastructure	Comment and concern regarding cycle parking design and location duly noted.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Comment	Q5	For Q5 S6: You cannot minimise impact on tourist convenience while achieving any benefit in terms of e.g. air quality and congestion. Instead tourist coaches should not be permitted anywhere inside the ring of Park and Ride sites, with payment to park their required for coaches, thus funding provision of electric buses to convey limited numbers of tourists that the city can actually cope with to drop-off sites near the city centre. These electric buses would then need no parking facilities inside the Park and Ride ring.	Bus infrastructure	Comments noted. Bus and coach access to the City Centre is a significant component of any access and movement strategy for Cambridge. We are working GCP to understand how this can be managed. The need for a strategy is highlighted in S6.	No	
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Q5	For Q5 S15: We already have an over-thriving cafe culture in Cambridge, at the expense of many other uses for the city centre.	Mix of uses	Comments noted.		

Appendix B

Id & Name	Support / Object / Comment	Question No.	Representation Summary	Theme	Council's Response	Change to document	Proposed Change
Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Support	Q5	For Q5 S18: I support anything that will reduce tourist numbers.	Cultural facilities	Comment and concern duly noted. The document does not seek to reduce tourist numbers but to create a tourist circuit to reduce congestion in hotspots in Central Cambridge	No	

Appendix 1: Consultees

The following organisations were directly notified of the consultation on the draft Making Space for People: Vision, Aims and Objectives and Strategies document in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) via email, or post where no email address was available. Individuals are not listed.

[To be updated]