Dear A14 Consultation,

Cambridge Cycling Campaign OBJECT to the A14 proposals. In principle we have no opinion on the A14 widening proposals, except that the proposals do not consider the non-motorised users of this route with the same level of detail or consideration that we believe that the motorised users have had. We are also concerned that no traffic flow estimates have been produced for non-motorised users. Thousands of people cycle from villages to the north of Cambridge to work, or school everyday, yet no traffic models have been produced as part of the A14 proposals that show how many people could use a bicycle to get from Bar Hill or similar villages.

We have invited the A14 contractors to a meeting where we presented a number of points that we believe would have improved the proposals. Even though we were promised minutes of this meeting and updated proposals based on our input, we have not yet received any formal reply. We consider this an unfortunate situation that we would recommend not occur again in the future. Due to this, we are forced to repeat each of these points again in this objection letter such that we can receive a formal response.

We consider that the proposal can be improved, and we would remove our objection, if the following points were addressed.

1) An NMU path from Mere Way attenuation pond Access Road to Milton Junction, either as a fully designed cycle track or as land that is made available as part of the A14 proposals to enable other parties to construct such a path in the future.
2) An NMU path from Mere Way to the Guided Busway on north side of A14. No additional land would be required and this route is regularly used by dog walkers today.

6) An NMU path from Woodhead Accommodation Bridge to east end of Weavers Lane in Girton. Children in Girton attend the Impington Village College and there is no safe or direct cycle route that would enable these children to be healthier and reduce traffic on local roads. The most direct route is along the A14.

7) An NMU path from middle of Weavers Lane through the play area to Girton Accommodation Bridge.

3) An NMU path from Guided Busway on north side of A14 and south of Holiday Inn Lake to junction with Cambridge Road / Bridge Road (B1049).

4) Care must be taken at the Histon Junction such that this junction is not made worse again with A14 junction improvements. This junction has recently been improved to provide a safe route for the thousands of cyclists who currently use this everyday. Note: no account of this bicycle traffic has been recognised within this consultation.

5) An NMU path from Cambridge Road (Impington), just south of Lone Tree Avenue to Woodhead Accommodation Bridge. This bridge is scheduled to become a strategic cycle bridge during NIAB 3 development, due to be delivered within the design lifetime of the upgraded A14. This must be linked to enable school children to cycle to the local school in Impington. Note: this may also provide a shorter and more convenient route to attenuation pond than that currently proposed, therefore saving money.

8) An NMU path from Giton Accommodation Bridge to Huntingdon Road / Girton College. An NMU route is shown to join this bridge yet there is no link to the main cycle routes along Huntingdon Road.

9) The removal of “sharp kink” on NMU on A1307 Huntingdon Road just to the north of the A14 West/A428 over-bridge. This would be dangerous when it is icy and this NMU is not gritted in winter.

10) Upgrade of Madingley Accommodation Bridge to NMU traffic together with associated links. This bridge provides a vital link from Madingley and possibly the new local access route, into north west and west Cambridge. The diverted bridleway to the south west of this junction could carry significant amounts of commuting cycles to the University NW Cambridge site as well as leisure walkers and cycles from the site. Space must sufficient to upgrade this to full NMU standards.

11) Upgrade of Madingley Bridgeway 6 from Madingley Accommodation Bridge to Local Access Road “roundabout” just to the north west of New Girton Interchange Bridge ‘C’. Replace new “trees” planting with new
“grass” planting to increase visibility splays. Continue this around the other side of the junction to meet up with the existing underpass at the M11 to provide access to NW Cambridge development site.

12) Remove the NMU route from “adjacent” to Local Access Road to be “near” Local Access Road, preferably separated by a hedge or a line of trees. Given that the cycle track is only on one side, dazzling of headlights will become an issue, and this issue must be designed out of this junction. Trees can also provide shelter from wind and rain in this exposed location. Cars falling off roundabout, or cars that are illegally parked should not be able to reach the cycle track.

13) The proposals should designate The Avenue from Brook Beck Farm to the new Local Access Road as an NMU only road. This would provide a safer route from Madingley to the local access road.

14) Remove the detour around the attenuation pond to the north west of Grange Farm, or move the attenuation pond so that the NMU route is as direct as possible. This could be done by building the cycle route in a straight line, or moving the attenuation pond slightly.

15) There is no safe crossing facility from the NMU path to south-west of the Local Access Road to the Crematorium. Suggest a right turn filter lane is added, with an NMU protected island to the north west of this junction to enable people cycling from Cambridge to visit the Crematorium. The general principle that bicycle traffic should not have to cross more than one lane of fast moving traffic at a time should be applied to this location, and all other critical junctions. Unfortunately, this critically important safety aspect is not considered in the proposals.

16) The roundabout on Oakington Road should have a cycle track with priority all the way around, to allow all movements on a bicycle to be safely made. The scheme should be extended slight further back from this roundabout to allow cyclists from Dry Drayton to enter the NMU facilities before the traffic reaches the roundabout. Given the limited volumes of traffic on the local access road, the use of bicycle priority lanes, as recently trialled at TRL for Transport for London, should not cause a problem.

17) The Dry Drayton / Oakington over-bridge must have a full width NMU track on at least one side - this could be done by adding an additional canter-leaved bridge to the west side of this bridge, or by reducing the width of the local access lanes. The proposal at the moment shows no NMU facilities on this bridge, requiring all NMU traffic to cross over a 60 mph road twice. This is entirely unacceptable and must be resolved.

18) The roundabout on Dry Drayton Road should have a cycle track with priority all the way around, to allow all movements on a bicycle to be safely made. The NMU tracks should be extended along Dry Drayton Road towards Oakington to allow cyclists from Oakington to enter the NMU facilities before the traffic reaches the roundabout.

19) There is a missing NMU link from Bar Hill to the Oakington Road roundabout. A route to the east of Thruffle Way and around the edge of the Golf Course would provide an excellent way to access Madingley and Cambridge from Bar Hill. At the moment, the
A14 proposals require a significant detour, reducing the incentives to use a bicycle and therefore increasing the traffic pollution that this scheme would provide.

20) A NMU tunnel should be provided under the main access into Bar Hill such that access can be made safely from the proposed NMU bridge to Norway Park / Trafalgar Way industrial estate.

21) Access should be provided for NMUs to the Services and Hotel to the north of Bar Hill, probably from Trafalgar Way. Requiring people to cycle down an entrance ramp to the 70mph A14 is not acceptable.

22) It is not clear by the Bar Hill NMU Bridge access ramp on the south side is so curvaceous. It would be more attractive to have a single radius curve rather than multiple turns. In the winter, if this route is not gritted a single curve would be safer than the current proposal.

23) The NMU crossing of the Local Access Road from the Bar Hill NMU Bridge appears to not be signal controlled. The island provided also appears not to be able to accommodate bicycles with trailers. The island must be wider, and be more protected from errant vehicles, perhaps using high curbs. We however would request a full signalised single stage junction, but keeping the central refuge to allow permissive crossing out of peak periods. If a full signalised junction is provided, then separate signals should be provided for pedestrians as they would take significantly longer to cross the road, and therefore separate bicycle signals would increase the motorised traffic volume of this junction, whilst also increasing the bicycle traffic volume of the junction.

24) The NMU path from the Local Access Road to the B1050 climbs up a hill to a motorised junction and then back down again, the NMU path should continue at the bottom of the embankment providing a safer and less energetic route. It is unacceptable to design bicycle routes that require climbing and descending when a flat route could have been provided.

25) The NMU path appears to cross the main junction between the Local Access Road and the B1050. Given that these arms will take all the traffic from Northstowe to Cambourne, Waterbeach and beyond, we consider it unacceptable that there appears to be no safe provision to negotiate these junction. The ideal solution would be to place tunnels through the three motor-roads such that there is no need to interact with motorised vehicles at all at this location.

26) The NMU path appears to lose all priority at a very minor farm access track just to the west of the Bar Hill junction. This is simply unacceptable - the NMU path must have as much priority as the main local access road has. The NMU path must be designed to attract all NMU users, from fast cyclists to families out for a joy-ride, to horse riders and walkers.

27) The NMU path has no safe route through the junction with Robins Lane, the only way in and out of Lolworth for motorised traffic. The preferred solution would be to completely separate the motorised traffic from the NMU traffic using a tunnel through the new bridge over the local access road and A14.
28) It appears that the NMU path loses priority at the Utton’s Drove junction. Given the lack of possible traffic at this point, the NMU path should have priority, but must be deviated back at least 5m from the main local access road to provide a safe buffer for traffic giving way to the prioritised NMU traffic. The turning radius of these junctions should also be tighter than currently shown to reduce the speeds of turning traffic to increase safety.

29) There appears to be no way to access the Traveloge from the NMU route. Access must be provided from the main NMU route to all buildings along this route. This will enable people who are not legally able to drive to still access jobs at these sites.

30) There appears to be no way to access the Buckingway Business Park from the local access road’s NMU path except by using Anderson Road in the far north west corner of this site. It may be more appropriate and safer to also allow access to the business park from the NMU path at other points, for example at Rowles Way.

31) The NMU path’s interaction with the main roundabout on the north side of the Swavesey Junction is high problematic. The NMU route is set back far from the roundabout, allowing cars time to accelerate into crossing NMU traffic, this is unacceptable. There are no safe refuges for crossing NMU traffic to wait if the traffic is busy. When this is combined with traffic exiting randomly from a roundabout, possibly without signalling, this makes the junction less safe than it could be.

32) The NMU path from the Swavesey local access road / Anderson Road roundabout climbs with the road to go around another roundabout before going down again. This change is levels is not appropriate for NMU traffic that is not expected or desired to use the main A14 junction, and where no provision has been made for them. It would be better to keep the cycleway at ground level to the north of this junction. This also removes the temptation to play frogger with HCV’s from St Ives or Huntingdon to access Boxworth - instead, NMUs would be directed towards the safer provision that has been provided.

33) The NMU path at the main “services” roundabout appears to be very close to the path of the main motorised traffic. If any motorised vehicles fails to make this corner, for example if the road is icy or slippery due to a diesel spill, then there is a significant risk of ingress into the NMU path. Safety barriers or a greater separation is required.

34) It appears that Scotland Drove is disconnected from the NMU path. Linking Scotland Drove to the NMU path is essential.

35) Whilst there appears to be minimal NMU facilities provided with the New Barns Lane bridge, there does not appear to be any safe way to access the NMU facilities on the north side of the “de-trunked A14” at this point. This is a link that must be reconnected. It should be worth noting that a signalised crossing at this point may also clearly signal that this is no longer the international motorway (European Route 24), but just a local access road towards St Ives and Huntingdon. If this cannot be provided, then a crossing refuge large enough for bicycles with trailers must be provided.
36) There is no mention of whether the detrunked A14 would become safer for people walking, cycling or no horse-back. Given that this should be considered the continuation of the local access road, and that the local access road has NMU facilities all the way, we consider that the detrunked A14 should also have a safe, segregated NMU path. It is absolutely unacceptable to consider that bicycle traffic should move onto a 70mph speed limit dual carriage and cycle within the main traffic lanes. It should also be noted that whilst the NCN51 is just a few miles to the north, this route regularly floods and therefore the A14 local access route would be the main direct cycle route between St Ives and Cambridge.

37) The new Connington Road has NMU facilities that appear to completely lose priority at even the most minor of junctions. This is unacceptable. NMU paths must have the same priority at minor junctions as the main carriageway has.

38) The Fenstanton footpaths 6 and 14 have been blocked up, yet there is no apparent way to get from the existing end of these footpaths to the new bridge over the A14.

39) Fenstanton footpath 14 is routed along the line of the old B1040. This route should be upgraded a full NMU quality. A route along the north-east side of the A14 at this point should continue all the way to Brampton. If a legacy is to be provided, then an additional crossing point for the river and railway for NMU traffic must be provided along with the A14 motorised route. This route should connect with the Hemmingford Gray bridgeway 10, the Mere Way bridge, under the A1198 Ermine Street, Godmanchester 1 bridleway, under the

B1043 Offord Road, and over the east coast main line railway. It should then continue over the River Ouse to the B1514 Buckden Road. This route would then allow NMU access to Grafham Water and beyond.

Network Rail has just announced plans to close all 'at grade' level crossings over the East Coast Railway in this area including that at Offord.

An NMU adjacent to new A14 over the Ouse and Railway in this area would have a symbiotic relationship with this program, reducing trespass risk on the line at the same time as improving the permeability of the area for those on foot or cycle.
40) There appears to be no NMU provision on the Park Road over-bridge. This is unacceptable. All roads over the main carriageway must have NMU provision.

41) Cycling access to the employment opportunities at the Brampton Hut services appear to be non-existent. Even the circuitous proposed new bridleways don’t provide access to the server area. It would be therefore be useful to provide a new NMU route from West End, Brampton, up to the new A14 over-bridge and then to the Brampton Hut services.

42) It would be useful to provide some future proofing into the A14/A1 junction such that if additional development occurs in the area, NMU traffic can be safely routed through this area. Provision of NMU tunnels or bridges should be designed in now such that they can later provide a network of cycle routes - a true legacy. The following are two critical suggestions: Rectory Farm attenuation pond to Brampton Hut service area; and a slightly wider bridge over the east coast main line to allow a cycle route along the side of this train line.

43) There are no details of the design of the NMU paths. We care about the details, because this can make a difference between poor infrastructure and excellent infrastructure.

44) We consider the following the absolute minimum for new construction: 4m wide bi-directional shared-use path (foot / cycle / horse) with a 1m wide grass strip on one side, and a 3m wide grass strip on the other. Trees should be planted along the side of these routes to create an avenue that breaks the wind, a major problem in this area. Where constraints demand, for example on bridges or in tunnels, the width can be reduced to 3.5m cycle-able wide of hard surfacing - implying at least 4m wide space.

45) Tunnels should be straight, extensively lit, and people should be able to see in and
out. Slides should be sloped such that people can't hide at the side of the tunnel. There should be no pillars.

46) There should be no “cyclist dismount” signs. These should never be necessary. Neither should there be “give way” signs on NMU paths; NMU traffic should have priority over side roads, as required by the High Way Code rule 170 - the infrastructure should clearly enforce this rule/

47) Giveaway signs and markings on the road should be behind any NMU paths.

48) NMU paths should have a design speed of 20 mph with the appropriate visibility splays, and a design speed of 30 mph if downhill grades are involved. Steep hills should be wider to accommodate weaving cyclists going uphill, and faster cyclists going downhill. No bridge should have a grade steeper than 1:20, and shallower grades should be used wherever space permits.

49) Cycle tracks should be machine laid.

50) Lighting at junctions should provide additional lighting for NMU paths. In rural areas, solar studs should be used. A centre line should not be marked on NMU paths.

51) Direction signs should be installed on all NMU routes giving the best route to different locations, just like the motorised roads have.

We look forward to having a continued dialogue around these objection points.

Robin Heydon
Campaigner