q1#_In_general_how_far_do_you_support	Q2 Cycling	Q2 Walking	Q2 Horse riding	Q2 Running	Q2 I do not intend to travel on the Greenway	Q2 Other	qPlease_specify_	Q3. Development of route between Haslingfield and Hauxton	Q3. Surfacing improvements between Haslingfield and Grantchester	Q3. Create a new shared use path including widening of the bridge over Bourn Brook	Q3. M11 Bridge Option A	Q3. M11 Bridge Option B	Q3. A raised table at the Burnt Close / Coton Road junction	Q3. Priority changes tot he Coton Road / Broadway junction	Q3. Cambridge to Grantchester Option A	Q3. Cambridge to Grantchester Option B	Q3. Cambridge to Grantchester Option C	Q3. Path behind Grantchester Meadows hedge	Q3. Improvements to the Barton Road / Grantchester Road junction	Q3. Junction improvements including making Grantchester Street one way between Newnham Croft Street and Barton Road	Q5 (4. How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?) On route between Haslingfield and Hauxton	Q5 (4. How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?) On route between Haslingfield and Grantchester	Q5 (4. How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?) On path behind Grantchester Road hedge	Q5 (4. How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?) Along Grantchester Road	Q5 (4. How far do you support the installation of solar studs in the following locations?) Along a path behind Grantchester Meadows hedge	5. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed route options? Please include details of the location you are referring to in your response.	6. Do you have any comments on the suggested options for signage and wayfinding?	7. Please comment if you feel any of these proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s.	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Resident in Cambridge	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Resident elsewhere	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Local business owner/employer	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Regularly travel in the area	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Occasionally travel in the area	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Work in the area	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Study in the area	Q9 (8. Please indicate your interest in this project. Please tick all that apply.) Other	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Car driver	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Car passenger	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Van or lorry driver	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Bicycle	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Powered two-wheeler	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Bus user	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Horse rider	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) On foot	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Other	Q10 (9. If you do, how do you usually travel in the area? Please tick all that apply) Not applicable	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Cambridge city centre	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) University of Cambridge	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Haslingfield	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Addenbrooke's / Biomedical Campus	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Cambridge Assessment	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) ARM	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Science Park	Q11 (10. If you travel to work from Haslingfield, please indicate your usual workplace. (If you do not commute, please go to Q11)) Other	q11#_Please_indicate_your_age_r	Q14 (12. Are you:) In education	Q14 (12. Are you:) Employed	Q14 (12. Are you:) Self-employed	Q14 (12. Are you:) Unemployed	Q14 (12. Are you:) A home-based worker	Q14 (12. Are you:) A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	Q14 (12. Are you:) Retired	Q14 (12. Are you:) Prefer not to say	Q14 (12. Are you:) Other	q13#_Do_you_have_a_disability_w	q14#_How_did_you_hear_about_thi	Please_specify	Please_tick_here_if_you_are_res	Name_of_group_organisation_
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	5	1				0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	This will help enormously			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	4	1	3	3	2	4	4	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15-24	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	Cycling from Haslingfield, the Grantchester route is the one I use least since the Busway opened. Getting into the town centre through the back streets from the station is more convenient than emerging on the Barton Road; otherwise, while I was commuting to the Science Park, going Barton-Coton-Histon Road-Busway spur better avoided congestion. My main concern with the Hauxton route are the points where the current bridleway sees use by heavy agricultural vehicles and gets deeply rutted (especially this tree-lined section -- https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.1511003,0.0829275,167m/data=!3m1!1e3); even if the design includes a relief-track for these vehicles, continuing maintenance at crossing points at the very least needs to be a part of the budgeting. Since there seems to be no budget to clear the shared-use pavement from the Hauxton end of the bridleway to the Trumpington Meadows of the steady accumulation of leaf-litter or sand and gravel I'm not optimistic about the long-term usability.	With three villages starting "Ha" in a cluster, the proposed signage isn't perhaps the most unambiguous way of denoting the destination.	The M11 bridge with a wheel channel `would of course still not be accessible for wheelchair use.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	5	5	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	Making Grantchester Road one-way in either direction is NOT the answer. Imposing AND enforcing a new 30mph speed limit, and enforcing the existing 20mph are essential. ENFORCEMENT is key. The 20mph limits are universally ignored and flouted throughout the borough.			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	4	1	0	1	4	4	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	no	no		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Other	Ongoing consultations and work of Halsingfield Parish Council over last 5 years to find a solution.		
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	2	2	4	5	5	Consider the effect on Grantchester residents when you start making changes to roads that will be detrimental to the large elderly polpuation who cannot walk or ride bikes.	No	Elderly people who rely on cars and buses to get around	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say	Email			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	£700k seems a large cost to justify ramp over steps...unless a lot of cyclists cannot manage to carry their bike. On the over A11 bridge near Granta park I prefer to carry rather than use the cycle rail because I worry about it damaging my tyres but it is probably a good idea for most cyclists. If cycle routes from grantchester are good i would prioritise Hasl-grantchester over hasl-haux because the latter road is reasonable. Currently cycling hasl-barton-camb seems quite dangerous to me esp at roundabouts. The A10 cycle path thru harston can never be safe because of all the side entrances	As stated in the brochure, upkeep is critical. A bad cycle path is worse than useless because it ends up with cyclists on the road which infuriates some drivers who think cyclists shoul be on the path. At night on the DNA path (shelford-addenbrookes) it is quite dangerous where the solar studs are covered over by grass etc...it is remarkably easy to cycle off the path without their guidance and I cant imagine that they add much to light pollution.	no	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	I really want to see a good quality off road cycle route from the end of Cantelupe road into Newnham, cost effectively.			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	2	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	I live in Haslingfield but am opposed to the potential of making Grantchester St one way in either direction. This street is the main thoroughfare into this area of Newnham and regardless of the direction, if made one way, it would only leave Hardwick St and Derby St for traffic flow in the opposite direction - both of these streets are narrow and often have cars parked on both sides. It'll make it much more difficult for vehicle access to this part of Newnham and could well have a detrimental effect on the local businesses there.	Love the simplicity of the design and think it's great - top marks. In terms of equality - please consider braille in the signage for those that would benefit from it.	As long as these Greenways are properly maintained, they would also appear to be suitable for those using motability scooters which will be a boon to the less mobile in our communities.	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Oppose	0	1	0	0	0	0		5	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	4	4	3	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	I strongly oppose the Haslingfield Hauxton shared path. It is mainly used by dog walkers as it a safe walk to let the dogs off the lead. I think bicycles should be banned. Why can't they use the road to Harston and get on the cycle way there. It would mean taking down the hedges. What would happen to all the wildlife? If more cyclists were to use it there would be accidents.I don't think the cyclists would have any insurance to pay the vet bills.	You could call it cementway		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Newspaper article			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		Signage is appropriate and in keeping with the environment where it will be located.		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	The solar light studs are really important. I commute all year round and it is dangerous for a cyclist to ride on a cycle path towards oncoming traffic which have their lights dipped right into the eyes of the cyclist.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	4	4	1	1	4	2	2	2	2	3	I do NOT support the proposals for one way traffic in Grantchester and Newnham. One way streets are seldom pleasant for cycling. Freed from the possibility of meeting a car coming the other way, many drivers will overtake in situations that are intimidating for a cyclist or simply run a cyclist coming the other way off the road. Better to use point closures to traffic, especially if "intelligent" measures are used to maintain access for emergency services, buses, local businesses and village residents, while excluding rat running.	no	Better quality paths would improve countryside access for people with mobility impairments, and reduce any perception of conflict between users on what are currently very rough, narrow paths.	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	2	3	5	5	1	1	5	2	2	2	2	2	Any one way option is to be avoided at all costs it will Crete a more dangerous route for cyclists and pedestrians			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	5	2	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	Generally these all seem to be "nice to have" but are they really necessary? What you could do is to extend the path (passes Byron's pool) along the Cam from just before the M11 bridge to Haslingford. This would keep walkers/cyclists away from the traffic.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2		"Ha" for Haslingfield could be confusing given the proximity of Harston, Harlton and Hauxton! Maybe "Has" or "Hast" if there's space.		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	(4) Very pleased at options well done	Happy with suggestions. What about a Logo for cyclist/boots to remind walkers /cyclists	M11 Bridge (A) will allow disabled small vehicles to go over	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	4	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	5 Cycle route between Grantchester & Cambridge (Grantchester Meadows -existing path) is already good enough, it is good off rd path, & only high summer is too busy to use. The rest of the time is uncongested. Save money for other cycle routes where potential gain is greater.	Sinase is nice not extensible or intuitive is HA Harston ,Harlton, or Haslingfield could full name be used		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Newspaper advert, Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	6			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	Keep signage to minimum		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		4	1	1	1	5	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	10 Haslingfield - Hauxton route to be viable for cyclists, cycle route from Hauxton to M11 would have to be substantially improved. Currently section is liability, as is section from Trumpington P&R & Grantchester road traffic lights on A10. Does it cost 1/2 million to replace steps over M11 footbridge with ramp on both sides surely that work can be undertaken for cheaper			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	5	5	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	11 Only travel by bike ,foot or bus. Do not own a car, as a choice , not as a necessity & welcome all cycling improvements			1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	5	2	5	5	2	1	2	2	2	12			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13 Excellent plans			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	55-64	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	1	5	1	1	4	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14 Grantchester road would be safer if one way unless this would result in traffic going faster (but it already speeds) Coton road Facilitates this			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	15 Please don't consult - just get on with it			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
No opinion	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	4	4	2	2	4	4	5	2	5	16			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	17 Would support scheme if used by cyclists. Following Harston improvement observe more cyclists on road than cycle way between Haslingfield & Cambridge observed 50 cyclists on highway & none on cycle way Barton - Cambridge	Daughter in law is dutch & have made frequent trips to Holland have system used by all cyclists		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	4	1	2	1	4	2	4	1	3	1	2	2	0	0	2	18 Why 2 options with 7/8 with 7a costing 1 million. isn't it better to do one route (8) really well For 4a/b Bike stairway would be adequate			0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	Yes	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	2	3	2	4	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	19			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	20 M11 Bridge - Prefer option A as bike stairway hard to use for less able bodied or tricycles / bike trailers for children discriminatory			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	22			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	This survey is a little ridiculous as it expects a detailed knowledge of the proposed schemes. Anything that encourages quicker and safer cycling has to be applauded		Getting people out of cars off their seats and into the country has to be a good idea	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	0	0	0	0	1	0		2	1	2	4	1	2	2	1	4	4	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	1		Not sure how the stud lights will work in snow	For cycle ways all riders the must be sure that the paths will be treated as the roads are when ice is forecast otherwise they will just return to using the roads	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet, Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Grantchester road fills up with morning commuters trying to avoid the queue of Barton road, going into Cambridge. So making this one way for cars (Cambridge to Grantchester,) option C, is a better option than option B. Evening traffic is less problematic. I am concerned that making it oneway might mean cars travel faster, so would like protection on the cycle path e.g. periodic bollards with fluoresent strips to help at night, and give the impression of narrowing the road. Barton rd / Grantchester road junction. Lots of cars queue here, so would be useful to have something to stop cars blocking the cyclists bypass path, e.g. yellow hash lines, a sign ? (yellow hash lines tend to rub off with traffic use)	Seems like a good idea what is proposed, useful when giving instructions to people to say "follow Ba ". Useful having different signs for different destinations	Positive impact on mental health, help people get exercise and get into the countryside.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	5	1	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	2				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		5	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	3	5	4	3	3	3	Haslingfield to Hauxton route was overwhelmingly opposed at an open meeting with Haslingfield Parish Council. Reasons against this route were: Environmentally sensitive area with variety of wildlife - kingfishers, voles, owls otters to name a few. A wide tarmac path would ruin this A valued walk by young families and dog walkers to see nature The path floods regularly in the dip by the river. One winter it was impassable The bridge is very narrow over the river. What would happen at this pinch point where most of the wild life is? Farm vehicles who have to use the path to access their fields would ruin the surface of the tarmac. See what has happened to the furrows in the road on the Haslingfield to Harlton road It is not the most direct into Cambridge and would only serve those wishing to go to Addenbrookes or Waitrose. An improved cycle path along to Barton from Cambridge would Link up with existing cycle way into Cambridge Enable pupils at Comberton VC (Haslingfield is a feeder Village for Comerton CV) to cycle safely to school which they cannot do at the moment Cylcle way to Cambridge via Grantchester is a much more direct route and serves a greater number of people			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		4	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	5	3	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4				1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Obviously I don't support all options equally but I'd like to see all of them over what we have now. Solar studs are great and it would be great to have more of them fitted.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	Instead of M11 bridge 4 - consider turn left by this bridge to NW running parallel to M11 to join the bridleway Barton to Granchester. This would utilise existing bridge and save a lot of money. This bridleway becomes Bridle Way road and joins the Barton/Coton Road. Turn right and join at 5. Only a slighter longer road section, plenty of room to make dedicated lane, overall I think this is the cheaper option and just as effective? I would be interested to find out why you did not consider this route, or if you did, what the objections might have been. (Local residents perhaps?)	No		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Grantchester Road is certainly dangerous for cyclists, so I've strongly supported option A. However, I'm concerned that drivers will speed and drive carelessly if it's converted to a one-way street for motor vehicles, safe in the knowledge that there are no cars coming the other way. I've therefore opposed options B and C.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	1	1	1	1	You cannot make Granchester road a one way street. This will mean that traffic will all funnel down Hardwick Street as Derby Street is more narrow. We will then suffer with noise/traffic or Hardwick Street/Merton street which does not have the infrastructure in place to deal with all the traffic heading into Newnham.			0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	1	5	3	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	Please do not make a pathway across Grantchester Meadows.		Why is the father on the photo on the front of your brochure not wearing a cycle helmet? A father in a wheelchair after an head injury is not any use to the family.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	1	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Email			
No opinion	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	2	5	1	3	3	1	5	5	4	3	5	3	4	2	2	4	'We strongly oppose proposal 10 because - all inbound traffic to Newnham Croft would then go through quiet residential streets (Derby & Hardwick Street) with two sharp turns making them dangerous and congested - turning wil be difficult for large vehicles including emergency vehicles - delivery lorries for the Coop will not be able to manouver due to the sharp turns - it will take away customer parking in front of the Coop - the introduction of a central island is unnecessary and a waste of money and space	The abbreviations are not very useful.		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	1	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	2	2	5	3	3	5	5	2	Is there a need for this, we do not want to unnecessarily change or damage the countyside by turning it into a bicycle highway?			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly oppose	0	1	0	0	0	0		4	3	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	I have seen posters of proposals to make Grantchester street (outside Coop) one-way. This will detrimentally affect my ability to access my street yet no official communication has been received by myself indicating you are considering this option. What are the access arrangements from Newnham Road (currently straight on at the existing traffic lights)? Do you really think the residents of Hardwick Street and Derby Street will appreciate the increased traffic trying to access Grantchester Street? This proposal is ridiculous and totally disregards the feelings and consequential disruption & inconvenience caused to residents of Newnham village. I strongly object to this proposal and request you conduct a survey of the residents effected by this proposal.	Minimal signage to conservation areas	I have seen posters of proposals to make Grantchester street (outside Coop) one-way. This will detrimentally affect my ability to access my street yet no official communication has been received by myself indicating you are considering this option. What are the access arrangements from Newnham Road (currently straight on at the existing traffic lights)? Do you really think the residents of Hardwick Street and Derby Street will appreciate the increased traffic trying to access Grantchester Street? This proposal is ridiculous and totally disregards the feelings and consequential disruption & inconvenience caused to residents of Newnham village. I strongly object to this proposal and request you conduct a survey of the residents effected by this proposal.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Social media			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	1	5	2	2	1	4	4	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	Points 8 and 10. This part has not been surveyed! A path behind the hedge along the Meadows would arrive at the Newnham end by the Skater's Meadows and the car park. The existing path is already inadequate, widening it would mean sacrificing part of the Nature Reserve or part of the established woodland, with some fine mature ash and walnut trees. Then Eltisley Avenue!! This is not a quiet road - there is car parking on both sides and on a bike, it is impossible to pass a large car, much less a lorry/van. There would then be the hazard of primary school arrivals and departures before arriving at Grantchester St. None of this has apparently been considered. This option should be rejected.	Solar studs are useless. They do not show hazards (eg unlit cyclists or pedestrians, potholes, muggers lurking in the bushes). All they show is the route and if cyclists do not know the route and have adequate front lights, they should not be there.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	5	0	4	2	1	2	3	3	3	The route to hauxton is much more preferable as it opens up routes to Addenbrookes and Cambridge station as well as the city centre. There is a perfectly good bridge over the M11 very near the one proposed it seems like a waste of money to upgrade this route when the trumpington farm company very kindly allow the use of it. I also don't see the point of the route along granchester road when the route through the meadow is already there and more direct and just needs upgrading.	No	n/a	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Email			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	3	2	2	4	2	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	1 Haslingfield to Hauxton; The dotted route between this path and the path from Trumpington Meadows, via the accommodation bridge over the M11, and thence to the guided busway would provide an important link to Addenbrooke's Hospital and the station. 4 M11 Bridge: I strongly favour Option A. Option B makes life very difficult for many cyclists. A wheel channel on one side means that cyclists have to handle their bicycle under difficult circumstances from the wrong side of their bike - not easy for many people. This arrangement also precludes Dutch-style bikes, trailers and other unconventinal bikes - and those for whom walking is difficult. 7 Grantchester to Cambridge. A cycle route behind the hedge (Option A) would be ideal but expensive. I would favour Option C over Option B. This would mean that there would be no necessity for the junction redesign at Barton Road as motor traffic would be separated from cyclists and cyclists could just use the pavement to reach the signalised crossing. There must be very clear separation of motor traffic and cyclists. 10 Grantchester Street. I do not consider much is needed here except for a clear passage for cyclists on the pavement south from Llamas Land	no		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Prefer not to say	Email			
	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
No opinion	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	4	2	3	2	4	5	5	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	3				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		3	1	2	2	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	Instead of a Path behind Grantchester Meadows hedge, I would support resurfacing and widening the existing path			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	No, just using the space to say this is Greenway is a GREAT IDEA!!! I think it will be well worth going for the more expensive options, for safety and other reasons; and I would be willing to pay higher council tax to that end.	I like the wayfinding logo. Marker posts are important.		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Leaflet			

Support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	1. Question 5 proposes that cycle traffic coming from Haslingfield would enter and cross Cot-on Road off Burnt Close, but this is already a busy and congested road, particularly at peak commuter times and weekends. 2. From Coton Road the cyclists turning onto the Broadway would be directly in competition with vehicular traffic coming both ways on the Broadway and turning left from High Street and right from Mill Way onto Coton Road. This junction opposite the Rupert Brooke pub is already hazardous at peak commuting times due to heavy through traffic. Question 6 is a dangerous and wholly impractical proposal. 3. If option 7B or 7C were to be implemented, effectively closing Grantchester Road to vehicular traffic, there would be a very significant amount of vehicular traffic forced on to Trumpington Road, Mill Way,High Street and Coton Road,(already dangerously congested at peak commuting times and often restricted to one way traffic with very poor visibility around the corner due to parking restrictions being ignored). This will both cause delays and significantly increase risks for pedestrians and cyclists along these roads. These proposals will significantly damage local businesses and result in a loss of employment in the village. 4. It is simply unacceptable to residents of Grantchester for GCP to propose one way traffic on Grantchester Road in any circumstances. Residents have a long standing and well established right and expectation of being free to use this public highway at all times of the day and night to access West Cambridge by car or other motorised vehicles as well as by bicycle. Elderly and disabled residents depend on the bus service and car transport to get to doctor's appointments and other services in Cambridge. 7B and 7C would be devastating for this important vulnerable group in our community. Residents with young children need to be able to transport their young children to schools and activities in Cambridge and to get to work, as well as to access other facilities in West Cambridge. It is entirely disproportionate to seek to penalise Grantchester residents and other road users in favour of a small number of cyclists from Haslingfield. A Haslingfield to Hauxton pathway (question 1) is the only acceptable solution contained in the consultation which will not impose unmerited and disproportionate loss of amenity and negative impact on safety and quality of life for many Grantchester residents. 5. The proposal (and the Barton proposal) add nothing to existing safe cycle access to Cambridge for Grantchester residents as the existing permissive pathway across the Meadows already adequately meets this need. To widen the existing Meadows pathway would invite high speed cyclists who would pose a real danger to the largely pedestrian users of this path.There is also the considerable risk that this would attract non-residents will seek to park in Grantchester village and then unload their bikes to cycle into Cambridge. Grantchester already has a chronic parking problem with frequent parking on existing double yellow lines creating significant danger to pedestrians and through traffic. 6. The effect of making Grantchester Road one way will inevitably be to force Grantchester residents, who are car drivers, into long and unacceptable diversions via Coton Road/M 11 or Trumpington Road in order to get to West Cambridge (eg Barton Road, Grange Road, Queen's Road, Madingley Road). The junction from Grantchester onto Trumpington Road is already extremely congested and very slow at peak hours. Often traffic is backed up into Grantchester. It really cannot take any more traffic. 7. The Barton Greenway and Haslingfield Greenway consultation proposals fail to address the negative impacts of each for Grantchester in a transparent and balance way. The two should be overlaid to show the real impacts on Grantchester residents of the combined proposals. 8. No consideration is given to other potentially much less disruptive and invasive proposals. For example, a cycle pathway from Haslingfield to the M11 (question 2/3), then turning left, (not crossing the M 11 at the existing foot bridge) and following the M11 North to the next bridge (at question 4 in the Barton consultation) , crossing that bridge and then crossing under Coton Road and along the Baulk (question 10 in the Barton proposal) would avoid all conflicts with the legitimate concerns of existing road users in Grantchester, be much safer and much more scenic for users.		The proposals for Burnt Close, Coton Road, the Broadway and Grantchester Road will seriously and negatively impact the elderly and disabled residents of Grantchester, and also families with young children in particular.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Newspaper article, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	1	5	5	5	5	5		Absolutely no solar studs please. They are very dangerous. They do not light up pedestrians at all, giving the appearance to cyclists that the way is clear, then whaaam, a pedestrian has been hit. They allow cyclists to go faster, which makes them even more dangerous. And they allow cyclists to go fast without lights....		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
No opinion	1	1	0	0	0	0		5	2	2	2	3	4	3	1	3	3	5	2	3	5	5	3	1	5	We are generally against solar lighting in a rural area			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1		Solar powered signs so that you can read them in the dark. They don't have to be very bright, a couple of LEDs would do		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	University home page		
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2				1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	2	2	1	4	1	0	1	4	4	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	I avoid cycling along Grantchester Road (7) despite cycling regularly around Cambridge. Narrow road and blind corners are made very dangerous by speeding cars. I like solar studs. Though have not viewed them for real, admittedly.			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	Haslingfield does not need a new cycleway to Cambridge. For those residents who wish to cycle to Cambridge permits are available from Trumpington Farms Ltd. The last thing the village needs is hundreds of competetive Cambridge cyclists racing in packs along the two quiet routes (Cantelupe Rd & River Lane) in the plan. They are allready a menace on Barton & Harlton Roads preventing traffic from passing and shouting & gesturing rudely when asked to move over. Cantelupe Rd is a quiet lane used for people from the village to walk often with small children, families, elderly people, dogs etc. In the evening there are numerous cyclists riding along Cantelupe Rd at high speed often without lights and I have had to jump out of their way at the last moment. Likewise the quiet path to Hauxton is used for residents walking and children playing in the river etc. and this village amenity would be ruined by competative & aggressive cyclists. There is allready the new cycle route just implemented along the A10 (Cambridge-Harston-Melbourn) implemented at huge cost and inconvenience, which cyclists should be encouraged to use for those wishing to cycle between Cambridge and the science parks in Melbourn etc.	These should encourage the use of the new A10 cycle path.	These proposals would impact on disabled & infirm people who walk on the paths, particularly Cantelupe Rd.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	I think the crucial part is putting a hard surface on the field path between Canteloupe Rd and Grantchester. A rail for bikes would be okay, no need to completely resurface the bridge. Overall, a great plan for people commuting from around Haslingfield.			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	4	5	5	5	5	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	0	1	0		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2				0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Email			
No opinion	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	The development must not impinge on sporting facilities.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Other	CamCycle		
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	Good to see this neglected route being dealt with			1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	Please do it!			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	CamCycle		
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	1	1	5	2	2	1	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		Greenways logo good, but keep signage to a minimum.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
No opinion	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	3	2	5	3	3	1	5	5	5	1	5	5	3	4	5	5	In general appears to be poorly thought out proposals. The logical route is a separate Greenway parallel to Barton Road from Haslingfield to Barton. No mention of cost benefit, no mention of potential usage, no substantive mention of total picture such as additional secure cycle racks in Cambridge, environmental impact on current paths of more cycles etc. Just seems as though there ius a huge pot of money that has to be spent. Route 1_ far too intrusive path . Need to reduce width substantially , environmental impact not mentioned 4 M11 Bridge - must be a flat surface otherwise pointless. Not only cyclists -what about pushchairs , bicycles with trailers, heavy electric bikes. 7 Grantchester to Cambridge - Must be segregation. Road should remain 2 way.	Rather silly naming. One place leads to another. What if a new village is built between Haslingfield and Barton or extends to Barrington or circular routes which link several villages. Why not simply a number like roads are numbered. In addition little mention of Maintenance. The state of existing cycleways is appalling with hedges blocking sight lines trees overhanging, potholes etc.	Can't see how a stepped bridge over M11 helps those with physical disabilities.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	3	4	2	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	2	5	5	5	4	All options in this proposal take cyclists along roads which are already congested and problematic in terms of traffic management (Coton Road and Broadway). Increasing cycle movement on these roads creates an increased risk of accidents. Using the option of making Grantchester Road one way - in either direction - significantly affects the lives of the elderly residents of Grantchester and the village's businesses, as well as forcing cycles down the narrow funnel of Broadway. The Option A for a route parallel to Grantchester Road still necessitates using Broadway. There is no indication of how cycles would get from Coton Road to the behind the hedge by the Meadows route. The only route that is non-discriminatory against the village of Grantchester and its residents is the Baulk route given a cursory mention in the Haslingfield proposal. This gives a fast, traffic free route which avoids the need to change the infrastructure of the village. It also brings both routes (Haslingfield and Barton) together at a single point at the top of Bridle Way, thus opening up a network of tracks between villages without having to travel on any roads.	What are the options?	Any route that involved changes to traffic flow along Grantchester Road will adversely affect the high proportion of elderly residents in Grantchester. A large sheltered housing complex was built with full residential warden support and a shop/post office at the end of the road. Both of these have now been removed, leavin many people isolated. Those who are unable to walk or cycle any distance are reliant on cars or the bus to reach shops and doctors' surgeries (typically Newnham and Comberton). Suggested one-way routes along Grantchester Road are likely to lead to a reduction or elimination of an already inadequate bus service, thus isolating these residents even further. Paying for a taxi is simply not an option for many.	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	5	5	1	2	5	3	1	1	5	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Newspaper article, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	(REDACTED) Haslingfield to an office near Cambridge Train Stations. (REDACTED) in Hauxton. During the summer months the existing bridleway suffices for that journey, but in winter it become impossbile to poor drainage leading to heavy mud at multiple places. So I must travel via Harston on roads. I use the guided bus way (and some times the country park). I would be greatly in favour of upgrading this route. (REDACTED). I also have the permitted access over Cantelupe farm, which I use in bad weather.		I think making wider paths will only improve the diversity of people cycling	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer, Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	Currently use bridleway between haslingfield and hauxton for bike journeys to shelford and for cycling to grantchester and into Cambridge. An improved surface would make this much easier. Also an improved route to grantchester would make cycling to grantchester and Cambridge quicker and easier. I'm in favour of well thought out cycle routes where you don't end up getting stuck when a cycle path suddenly stops.	Signs are good!	Improved bigger paths must surely increase access and so have a positive impact	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	35-44	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	2	1	3	2	3	1	5	5	5	2	5	1	1	1	1	5				1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	I am coming from Orwell and need to be on a road bike because of Chapel Hill and the distance, so the main thing is hard surfaced paths separate from the traffic. I have supported both the Grantchester Road and Grantchester Meadows off road path, but either one would be great!			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	All improvements are welcome! (REDACTED) Haslingfield to Cambridge via Barton (REDACTED) this is not a great option once the days grow shorter. I experience the traffic on the Newnham stretch of the cycle path on Barton Rd and this is very busy already - for this reason the proposed routing through Grantchester St would be the best option in my opinion.	Solar studs work well on Lamas land and would be good for the proposed routes too.		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	1	0	0		3	2	2	1	4	3	3	2	1	1	4	1	3	3	3	3	3	3				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	1	It will increase my cycling network into Cambridge therefore decrease vehicle use.	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Newspaper advert, Newspaper article			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	4	4	2	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	One-way proposals for Grantchester street will create havoc for primary school collection and delivery. and increase problems for (ILLEGIBLE).			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Just delighted that we may be able to cycle to Cambridge as a family because it is very difficult to do so at present.	A route from Haslingfield to Comberton would be equally integral - the children could actually cycle to school.		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	1	4	2	5	4	3	5	2	5	Please put solution on existing Grantchester Road and do not create new tarmac cycleway behind hedge of the road or Grantchester Meadows path. Please do not take route into Newnham. The Grantchester street proposal is unworkable. Making it one way is to restrict larger vehicles needing to get into Newnham Croft. On arrival into Cambridge along Grantchester Road, utilising existing roads especially Grange Road and Silver Street.			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Happy to support new path in any form. As long as it's smooth as poss and rideable	'-	'-	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	1	1	4	1	0	3	1	2	5	1	1	2	2	2	2	5				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	2	2	2	3	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	2	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	I would much prefer athecycle route from Haslingfield to Hauxton Option 1			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	3	1	4	2	3	5	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2				1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15-24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	A clearly segregated route for cyclists would greatly improve the ambience for pedestrians and leisure users of Grantchester Meadows. I strongly support the Haslingfield-Hauxton path, and believe that the use of a smooth hard surface for cyclists and grassy strip for equestrians is a very attractive approach.	I think the "Periodic Table" style signage is likely to be confusing. Coloured routes ("purple trail to Haslingfield") might be easier for at-a-glance navigation. Signage with journey times at entry and exit points to the Greenway network would be very welcome, e.g.: "Haslingfield to Cambridge - bike: 20 minutes; foot 40 minutes"		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4. Mill bridge - option B does not allow access for wheelchairs or prams and buggies.	No overhead lighting in out of town areas please, solar studs are good	4. Option B. No wheelchair access	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Overall these routes are very good; proper Greenways (not just routes beside major roads). The stepped bridge (over M11) idea is silly - that's not a cycling route - it has to be rideable. There is a very narrow spot at the end of Burnt Close - there is not enough room for a proper 3m bidirection route without use of private land (driveway or end of garden). The existing 1.5m is not sufficient. Can you get permission to do this properly or will the route be compromised by this very narrow bit? Compulsory purchase may be necessary? 5: Raised table. This makes sense for slowing traffic but please ensure sinusoidal ramps (or very gradual ramps). All existing tables in Cambridge on public roads have horrible lumpy ramps which are not good on a bike. The table should probably be made flush on the burnt close side, with the step just on Coton Rd. 7: Either a behind-hedge cycleway or an on-rd route could work. But if the one-way option is used it must be towards grantchester to prevent morning ratrunning, which is often at high speed. A proper segregated route behind the hedge would be best as it removes all conflict (except at the ends). I do think that Grantchester would be enormously improved by a reduction in through motor-traffic. 8. A separate cycleway to preserve the walking route on Grantchester meadows behind the hedge is an excellent idea. It is important that the route across the carpark is given a decent smooth cycling surface. I would also like to see parking reductions in all the local roads, Grantchester Meadows, Eltisley Avenue and Grantchester St, otherwise the route is compromised by being full of stored cars, with very little room to pass. 10: This formalises what happens already and is an excellent idea.	Please use full placenames, not ones so abbreviated no-one will know what they mean.		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	cyclescape		
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	1	5	2	0	1	5	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	The M11 bridge must be fully accessible to all users, such as those on mobility scooters, tricycles, cycles with child carriers etc. Only option 4A with ramps delivers this. Option 4B is unacceptable and would create a significant barrier along the router.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
No opinion	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	3	2	5	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	4	5	5	2	5	1. Question 5 proposes that cycle traffic coming from Haslingfield would enter and cross Coton Rd but this would be extremely dangerous as the road is already busy and grantchester is used as a rat run during peak times and very busy at weekends with tourists. 2 From Coton Rd any cyclists turning onto the Broadway would be in competition with vehicular traffic coming both ways on the Broadway and turning left from High St and right from Mill Way onto Coton Rd. This junction is already extremely busy and dangerous due to heavy traffic. I have seen a number of near misses of cars who don't slow down when turning right from Mill Way into Coton Rd and are travelling too fast. Question 6 is dangerous and a wholly impractical proposal. 3. If Option B or C were to go ahead effectively closing Grantchester Rd to vehicular traffic, there would be a greatly increased vehicular traffic forced onto Trumpington Rd, High St, Mill Way and Coton Rd. These roads are already very busy and congested at peak commuting times and at weekends and bank holidays and often restricted to one way traffic with very poor visibility around the corners due to any yellow lines and parking restrictions ignored and not enforced. This will both cause huge delays and greatly increase risks for pedestrians and cyclists along these roads. These proposals will significantly damage local businesses and result in a loss of employment in the village. Has anyone considered whether Grantchester wants any of this? We are most concerned at the way Grantchester has been treated over these proposals. Nothing in this for our village. You should look at ways to get traffic OUT of Grantchester, not use our village as a conduit and meeting place for more people. We are already a rat run and a honeypot village. 4. It is totally unacceptable fore residents of Grantchester for GCP to propose one way traffic on Grantchester Rd in any circumstances. Residents need to use this public highway at all times of day and night to access West Cambridge by car as well as on bike. Elderly and disabled residents depend on the bus service and car transport to get to doctor's appointments and many other services in Cambridge. Many people use the Newnham doctor surgery and the shops at Newnham. Residents with babies and young children need to access west Cambridge to get the children to nursery, creche, schools (a number of which are in west Cambridge) plus to other activities, doctors and to get to work. It is totally morally wrong and disproportionate to try to penalise Grantchester residents, the elderly, those with babies and young children and the vulnerable disabled in favour of a small number of cyclists from Haslingfield. You cannot expect the elderly residents and those with sick or small babies and children to cycle or walk to west Cambridge. A Haslingfield to Hauxton pathway (question 1) is the only acceptable solution contained in the consultation which will not impose unmerited and disproportionate loss of amenity and negative impact on safety and quality of life for most Grantchester residents. Just think of Grantchester residents' happiness... cut off from amenities and essential services. There is now no shop or doctor etc in the village, we need to travel to west Cambridge for this. 5. The proposal and the Barton proposal add nothing to existing safe cycle access to Cambridge for Grantchester residents as the existing pathway across the Meadows already meets this need. It would be ridiculous to spend money on another cycle pathway almost parallel to this one. To widen the existing pathway along the Meadows would invite high speed cyclists who would pose a real danger to the many pedestrians and families who often use this popular path. There is also a considerable risk that this would attract non residents who will park in Grantchester village and unload their bikes to cycle into Cambridge. Grantchester already has a very serious chronic parking problem with continual parking on double yellow lines and on grass verges creating significant danger to pedestrians and through traffic. Sometimes I have been unable to exit the village from my house eg bank holidays and during the Film Festival over the August bank holiday when thousands of extra tourists descend on the village. 6. The effect of making Grantchester Rd one way will inevitable be to force Grantchester residents, who are car drivers, into long and unacceptable diversions viaTrumpington Rd or Coton Rd/M11 in order to get to West Cambridge. The junction from Grantchester onto Trumpington Rd is already extremely congested and extremely slow at peak hours. When it rains it is even slower. Often traffic is backed up to the Orchard Tea Rooms. It cannot take any more traffic. Indeed you should be looking at ways to REDUCE the traffic at this important junction. 7 The Barton Greenway and Haslingfield Greenway consultations fail to address the negative impacts of each for Grantchester in a transparent and balanced way. The two should be overlaid to show the real impacts on Grantchester residents of the combined proposals. 8 No consideration is even to other potentially much less disruptive and invasive proposals. For example, a cycle pathway from Haslingfield to the M11 (Q2/3), then turning left (not crossing the M11 at the existing footbridge) and following the M11 north to the next bridge (at Q4 in the Barton consultation), crossing that bridge and then crossing under Coton RD and along the Baulk (Q10 in the Barton proposal) would would avoid all conflicts with the legitimate concerns of existing road users in Grantchester, be much safer, much more scenic and less polluted for users . PLEASE consider Grantchester residents, a high percentage of whom are elderly or infirm. We are extremely dismayed and upset at your proposals. What about us?	no	The elderly and disabled of Grantchester would be seriously negatively impacted by these proposals, They rely on cars/taxis/buses to access the amenities and doctor in west Cambridge. There are many living in the sheltered housing area. A high proportion of the village are elderly and infirm and would not have been able to get to the meeting you held. Also people with young babies, toddlers, sick children or multiple children are not able to cycle with them or walk to west Cambridge to the doctor or to nursery or schools. It is not safe or reasonable to expect these groups to do so. Your proposals seriously affect the quality of life of the elderly, disabled , the sick and parents of young children, babies.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	Strongly support the options for a well developed and maintained traffic free cycle route from Haslingfield into Cambridge.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	3	3	3				0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15-24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	although M11 option A is much more expensive and option B would be fine, it might discourage commuter cyclists if they have to dismount, - it seems worth doing the best job possible and making the bridge fully cyclable.	If there will be shared cycle/footpaths, use different coloured tarmac as well as recurring symbols. This really helps pedestrians wandering unawares on the 'wrong' side. Please don't put a raised ridge in to separate them, it's more a trip hazard than a help (I've seen this elsewhere).	It's important to keep street furniture to a minimum, preferably alongside not on the paths. This helps smooth transit for cyclists, wheelchair users, pedestrians with sight issues.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Email, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	15-24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	3	1	2	3	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Get it done ASAP as someone will be killed if we do not have designated bike routes.	Sign help but the local community will learnt he best route for themselves as they will be the main users.		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	Other	Via club secretary at CRUFC		
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	5	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	'- The proposals seem to be of a high quality. I'm impressed. - It seems to me essential that Option A is used for the M11 bridge. This is the one thing, which to me could make or break the route. - If it is either/or, the Grantchester Road off-road cycle route gives better access to West Cambridge, as well as the City Centre. If both that and the Grantchester Meadows routes are proposed, I support them both equally.	They look good. Keep them simple. Could colours and/or shapes be used as part of the logos to differentiate Greenway routes?		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	2	1	4	2	4	2	1	5	5	1	1	4	3	1	1	4	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	The M11 bridge (with steps) is the biggest 'put off' for cycling into Cambridge. Creating a proper patch that is off road but that is tarmac is the best solution via cantalupe road to Grantchester. The Barton Road is not a safe bike route. Having cycled in the dark as a commuter a new 'cat eye' route would be ideal. I nearly hit a brown cow in the pitch black on a grantchester path. A route from Haslingfield to Hauxtin is also much needed.	Make signs clearer for the existing bike path in Hauxton to Trumpington so that even teenagers could use them. The current route is not that clearly marked.		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	5	5	1	5	Make roads safer rather than destroy countryside	Just put traditional signs up inkeeping with history and landscape		1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Newspaper article			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	For the M11 bridge we only strongly support option 4A because only that option would create a bridge that is fully accessible to all people of all abilities, whether they be using cycles, tricycles, cargo cycles, adapted cycles, handcycles, mobility scooters, etc. We cannot support options 7B or 7C as they currently stand because there would be no protection for vulnerable road users from fast-moving motor traffic (it would be even faster-moving than today if the road became one-way). An unprotected contraflow cycle lane is not safe on a National Speed Limit roadway, and users travelling with-flow would be in danger from fast-moving motor traffic coming up from behind, especially considering the several blind bends present on Grantchester Road. We are disappointed that the simplest, cheapest and most obvious option is not included in this consultation: removal of all motorised through-traffic from Grantchester Road. There are suitable alternative routes that motor traffic between Newnham and Grantchester can easily use. Access arrangements for property owners along Grantchester Road can be worked out on a case-by-case basis. This 'option 7D' would provide a safe and accessible Greenway route between Newnham and Grantchester at very little cost and zero environmental impact. If option 7C were modified to have strong physical protection from fast-moving motor traffic for people walking and cycling then we would be willing to consider it. Given that modification, option 7C is preferable because it eliminates morning rat-running that creates dangerous conditions on Grantchester Road in Newnham where the road has to be shared between people cycling and driving. We strongly support solar studs in all locations indicated. At critical points such as any bollards in the path, junctions and crossings there should also be street lighting for safety purposes.		People with protected characteristics under the Equality Act of 2010 will greatly benefit from a fully inclusive design for non-motorised pathways. This includes people who are slower or more vulnerable while walking or cycling, or who use cycles adapted for disability or mobility scooters. Please ensure that the design of the pathway is usable by people of all ages and abilities.	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say	Email, Social media, Word of mouth		Yes	Camcycle
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	I would favour enhancing the existing path across Granchester Meadows (compared to building an exactly parallel path). Particularly if one of the options A/B/C for Granchester Road is progressed, then all that is needed across Granchester Meadows is heavy maintenance of the existing path to bring it back to the standard it was when built.			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Email			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	5	5	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Closing Grantchester Road to through traffic from the rugby ground to the Broadway has much to commend it, even though it is not offered as an option.	They all look attractive.	no comment	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		5	1	1	4	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	1	1	5	2	2	3	2				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			

Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	0	2	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	0	1	5	3	3	1	3	3	More discussion needed	Minimum		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Social media	
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	4	3	2	3	3	2	4	4	3	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	The proposal to make Grantchester Street one way is mad! We live in (redacted) Street and to think all traffic entering the village has to navigate around Hardwick St and Derby Street will be disasterous - large lorries daily unload in Derby Street, the junctions at Derby St and Cambridge St will be dangerous - particularly at school times. We strongly oppose any changes to this junction			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	2	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	5	5	5	5	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer	
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	General comments on the whole fantasy scheme: Freeways (bridles etc) are a good idea as long as they do not affect normal roads. Traffic will never reduce or decrease. In the real world the car will always be there. Concentrate on improving traffic flow.	What nonsense. Put up route maps or village names.	All the proposals are discriminatory in one way or another. You just have to decide which groups to ignore	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		discreet finger posts only	What happens to Bus 18 if Grantchester road is made one way?	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	5	2	2	4	1	5	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	Cambridge to Grantchester option A - why should we? Pedestrians have three options - meadows path, path by river, permissive (?) path on east side of Grantchester Road. Dogs of leads, joggers with earphones in, large groups etc make the meadows path inconvenient and the other two are not suitable for cycles. At the very least it should be made clear that this is a cycle path and that other users must give priority - keep dogs on leads etc.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	Re question 10. If implemented, traffic from Barton Rd for Newnham will have to turn sharp left into Hardwick St near the Red Bull or Derby St which is small and congested. Cyclists going to Cambridge will join the one way system where?			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No		
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Millions spent already on cycle paths. Cyclists rarely use them. Unless all new proposals are linked to requirement to use them money ill spent while villages continue to suffer in a number of ways. Priorities? Section 106 from new development is not benefitting long standing communities.			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	Parish council meeting
	0	1	0	0	0	1	walking dogs	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	3	2	0	0				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	4	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	please give priority to the improvments 2,3.4 and in particular, to option 4a. It will be really valuable to have a good route from cambridge to haslingfield, thats genuinely accessible to all. even with heavy e-bikes and mobility scooters. I prefer option 7a to 8, because tho a wider path on grantchester meadows would be nice to make it easier for cyclists and pedestrians to pass, it will dump the extra bike traffic in Newnham, where roads are narrow and congested. Minor improvements to grantchester street junction (10) won't be sufficient to fix this. Hence I suggest spending the money to make a nice off road bike path along barton road, and making that the main greenway. But overall I STRONGLY SUPPORT the plans to create good greenways	don't overdo it!	option 4a (not 4b) is important for allowing disabled access. This morning I saw a disabled lady in an electric buggy taking her dogs along the rough path heading for the bridge over the M11, which sadly she currently can't cross	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	1	3	1	1	5	1	5	5	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	Leaflet	
Oppose	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	5	3	3	2	2	2	Concerns re additional cycle traffic via Grantchester Meadows being funnelled into Newnham Croft where roads already congested. Plan to make Grantchester Street one-way between Newnham Croft Street and Barton Road seems ill-conceived, given volume of traffic in the area and size of vehicles servicing Co-op store, especially with current parking problems.	No		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	
	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Oppose	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	5	3	3	2	2	2	Concerns re additional cycle traffic via Grantchester Meadows being funnelled into Newnham Croft where streets are already congested. Plans to make Grantchester Street one-way between Newnham Croft Street and Barton Rd seem ill-conceived considering volume of traffic in area and size of vehicles servicing Co-op store, also skip lorries, bin lorries. No space to negotiate corners.	No		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	
Strongly support	0	0	1	0	0	0		1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	4	All the proposed routes must take into account that horses are not bikes! They need space hence bridleways! They need space a runaway spooked hose will terrify most non horse people	Clear large and defining who goes where	Only if horses and their riders are given full consideration will it be a positive	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Support	0	0	0	0	0	1	Driving	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	1	5	5	4	4	5	2	2	2	2	2	Oppose control of traffic between Granchester and Cambridge. If it is turned into a one way system I do not feel this will solve the issue. Many other things within Cambridge have to be sorted, there are too many poor pavements with mediocre use of space (why are there still so many pavements with grass? It gets muddy most of the time... this space could be use for cyclists if it is not given to pedestrians anyway?). Also on the road that comes from Barton to Cambridge why are cars allowed to park on this road on both sides? Usually the traffic is blocked as big coaches and lorries that need more space cannot manoeuvre because of parked cars on this road. Why are some big lorries allowed to drive at peak times within Cambridge etc.		It would impact negatively the Rugby Club and Cocks and Hens Tennis Club.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	2	0	0	2	5	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Newspaper article	
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	5	3	3	3	3	3	I live on (redacted) Road, north Cambridge and travel along the Backs, to Newnham Road, and Barton Road. Then left onto the Granchester Road to the tennis club. I would be seriously inconvenienced if I had to travel via Granchester or the M11.	No. Do not have the necessary technical expertise.	I am a pensioner and the proposed change of use from each-way to single way would disproportionately affect my ability to get to the tennis club.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	5	5	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	I am personally opposed to either one-way option, since it would make access extremely difficult to two important public sports facilities, the Rugby Club and the Cocks and Hens Tennis Club. It is a narrow country lane in question, and I feel sure that ways could be found to allow motor traffic (e.g. by slowing it down, or with chicanes) even if restricting it. A separate cycle/walking path would be the best solution, in my view.	Not sure how these work in practice.	Anyone trying to get to either sports ground would certainly be affected by a one-way system: e.g. visiting teams, clubs, beside people from the other side of town.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email	
Support	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	2	2	4	1	2	3	4	5	5	2	2	5	1	2	2	4	2	The proposals would make it very difficult for all sports amenities in the Grantchester Road area and, given that we need better access to sports facilities not worse, the proposals in this region are bad		The proposals would very negatively affect sports facilities in the Grantchester road area	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	information from tennis club
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	I travel regularly from CB25 to the tennis club off Granchester Rd. I use my car to get to appointments on time, because public transport is unreliable, has a very limited availability, necessitates a change of vehicle in the town centre, and takes too long to be practical. Options A, B and C will all cause further delays, unnecessary extra mileage and unnecessary extra polution as a result. It is too far to walk or cycle there and back. I am not the only person to travel regularly from CB25. THERE ARE MANY MORE IMPORTANT PROJECTS NEEDING PUBLIC MONEY SPENT ON THEM THAN THIS PROJECT, LIKE MAKING GOOD THE ROAD SURFACES THAT WE ALREADY HAVE, INSTEAD OF ADDING BOLLARDS AND TINY ROUNDABOUTS IN NARROW ROADS ETC. WHAT IS THE POINT OF MAKING NEW CYCLE PATHS FOR CYCLISTS THAT DON'T BOTHER TO USE THEM WHEN THEY ARE AVAILABLE? AND, WHY IS IT EXPECTED THAT EVERYONE WANTS TO OR IS ABLE TO CYCLE SUCH LONG DISTANCES?	NO	NOT EVERYONE IS ABLE OR WANTS TO WALK OR CYCLE LONG DISTANCES.	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	No	Other	
Support	0	1	1	0	0	0		4	5	5	2	4	1	1	1	5	5	3	1	2	5	5	5	3	5	No.1 Haslingfield to Hauxton - shared use path alongside Bridleway, path should look as rural as possible with no solar studs, to maintain these lovely tracks. The grass tracks should be on the field side and be at least 3m wide. No.2 Cantelupe Farm I strongly oppose the addition of a hard surface track next to this Bridleway. This is a lovely long grassy track which would had the rural feel ruined by a hard path next to it. I strongly oppose the use of solar studs on paths in the countryside as it destroys the rural feel and upsets the circadian rhytmns of local wildlife. No.3 Bourn brook it would benefit horse riders to have a wider bridge, however the Bridleway through the wood should not be widened, as it is an acceptable width and would be detrimental to the path. If trees are felled this would not be a Bridleway through a wood, as there are so few trees. I strongly oppose the widening of the path through the wood and the felling of any trees as we have so little woodland in this area and we need to preserve want we do have. Habitats would be destroyed in the felling of trees and otters and other wildlife have just returned to this area. No.4 M11 bridge improvements should make the bridge accessible to horse riders, however the current proposals will not be of a standard enabling horses to ride over the bridge, so therefore mounting blocks should be provided at each side. If the existing steps are replaced with ramps as there is such a steep incline the ramps will have to extend a long way out to provide a shallow enough gradient. This will impact on the current grassy tracks, which are currently ridden on by horse riders. Horses at the moment can use the path after the motorway bridge as it is a permissive Bridleway and should continue to be included. However a ramp would be a better option for horses. No.5 Grantchester Burnt Close horse riders should be included on this part of the track, which is currently a public footpath, but is well used by horse riders. At the moment horse riders are not mentioned. No.6 Grantchester horse riders should be included in the plans for road improvements. No.7 Grantchester to Cambridge Option A path behind the hedge would be the preferable and safest option for horse riders as it is off road. This is currently a permissive Bridleway on the Definitive Map. Option B/C means that horse riders are still on the road with the traffic, a speed limit of 15mph would be necessary along with speed bumps or other traffic calming measures. No.8 Grantchester Meadows the shared use path should include horse riders, who are excluded at the moment from The Meadows. However a safe route is needed for horse riders to link up with the Barton Greenway. No.9 Barton Rd junction horse riders should also be taken in consideration as they may wish to use this route to link to the Barton Greenway or to access Cambridge. At the moment horse riders are not mentioned. No.10 Grantchester Street horse riders should be included in any proposals for traffic calming along this street. At the moment horse riders are not mentioned. I strongly feel that the Greenways should preserve the rural feel of the countryside and should include grassy tracks and not include solar lighting. A lot of the tracks being used are already Bridleways and I feel strongly that these especially should have grassy tracks to enable horse riders to have a softer surface. The hard surface should not be stony but smooth and should ideally blend in colour with the countryside ie not be black Tarmac.	Please ensure horse riders are included on all signage where applicable.	Please don't discriminate against horse riders by excluding us from any Greenway tracks.	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	4	4	5	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	I use route 1 (Haslingfield to Hauxton) 3-5 times a week. It can be too muddy over the fields in winter / after rainfall, requiring cycling on the road to Harston, which is indirect, and dangerous. I strongly support the changes to connect Haslingfield with Cambridge and make cycling this route safer. It is very unclear from a cost analysis, what may be achieved with the funds, and I would propose that anything on this route is better than nothing. Smooth tarmac isn't needed, but simply an extension of the gravel path currently running alongside the river would be fine, provided it was maintained. This would allow the path through the fields to be cycled and walked in all weathers.	I oppose the solar lights, as I consider it necessary that I would have a strong bike light in any case, and the solar lights may be detrimental to the wildlife at night. I love cycling through the fields and only need the paths to be accessible year round (and maintained)		1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	5	5	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	Grantchester St/Newnham Rd junction is very dangerous. Especially with Co-op delivery trucks so near to the school. Don't see how those trucks would exit/enter street elsewhere if made one-way as other roads in the croft are very small. Something needs to be done about the junction though.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	5	5	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	I refer to access to/from Cocks & Hens Tennis Club on Grantchester Rad, whose access is immediately on the Southern boundary of Cambridge Rugby Club, and whose members live up to 10 miles away and have a need to travel by car from both directions - with either of options 7B or 7C, one of vehicular access or egress to the Tennis Club will require a round trip via Grantchester, creating extra road traffic, or encouraging parking in the Fulbrooke Road residential area. If the two way section is extended to our Tennis Club entrance, then confused vehicles will attempt to access or turn in the unsuitable private Tennis Club entrance.			0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media, Word of mouth	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	Route options B and C will have a severe impact on my access to the Cocks and Hens Tennis Club. I live in (redacted) and travel to the Club via Grantchester. Under the current plans, one of my journeys to or from the Club would involve travelling up to an extra 3 miles to the Barton Road, travelling along roads that are already heavily congested at times. These problems would not be alleviated by moving the start point to the Grantchester side of the Club's entrance, and to locate it anywhere on the other side would still affect the many members who approach the Club from the Barton Road. In addition, at the point where a two-way system becomes one-way, there will be a number of cars who will seek to turn in the driveway of the Club and this is not designed for heavy traffic.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	Considering the attention given to preserving the shops in Newnham Croft, making Granchester Street one-way is a very ill-conceived proposal. Forcing HGV traffic along Derby / Hardwick Street is not only very dangerous, it's inconsiderate to residents. Those narrow streets are lined with homes, most without front gardens, and sending lorries down there is most inappropriate.	The awful lycra louts who will dominate this 'greenway' rely on satnav. Families using the greenway won't be in any rush. Is there really any need for signage other than a few simple instructions clarifying who can and can't use the path?		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Flyer, Word of mouth	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	studs should be placed in the centre of the cycleway.This avoids over growing,and halves the amount of studs and cable if not solar powered.Routes across open country are not considered safe by most people and use will be low.The survey should ask everyone on the route whether they would use the route instead of a car.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Other	
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	4	4	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	We thought part of the consultation involved A603 and M11 at the roundabouts and a possible underpass. We did not see this in the literature we received although it was talked about at the Village Hall. Not sure about underpass. Traffic lights would probably be better and cheaper.			0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	0	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	A route from Haslingfield to Grantchester would be phenomenal. The backbone & infrastructure is practically there. We painfully cycle it everyday or cut through the farm. This has to happen! it can only be a great thing! For us to work & safely access the city and for city people to access a wider countryside.			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	5	4	0	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	3	5	5	It is nonsense to take cyclists through the village of Grantchester. You say you want to develop an off-road route. Coton Road and Broadway are among the most dangerous roads in the area, with speeding vehicles, disabled elderly people and children crossing the roads, and parked cars making visibility very bad. Traffic in Grantchester already causes accidents and blockages. Choosing to contribute to this, especially by changing the Coton Road junction so nobody even needs to slow down, is utter madness		Taking more traffic through Grantchester puts residents - a large proportion of whom are elderly and have long term health concerns - at greater risk. Closure or partial closure of Grantchester Road risks losing the bus servcie, which is already pretty pathetic, but at least gives older people who can't drive or cycle a way to get out of the village. Use the Baulk route and stop thinking about making the village even more of a traffic nightmare	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say		
Support	0	0	0	0	1	0		1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	I support the proposal of linking Haslingfield to the Melbourn Greenway and am strongly opposed to the Grantchester route. The reasons are: Cheaper and more direct access to the bio-medical campus which is a likely destination for people cycling to work. The Grantchester route is of no benefit to Grantchester which already has an adequate cycle path through the meadows. It encourages further traffic through Grantchester which would be much better accommodated on the Melbourn Greenway. If a pleasant green footpath or bridleway has to be sacrificed for the benefit of Haslingfield then it is logical to choose a route within the Haslingfield parish. To put a 3 metre hard surface between Cantelupe Farm and Grantchester sub-urbanises an unspoilt area of countryside which is and has been for many years enjoyed by those who take the trouble to go there, which has included Queen Elizabeth the First. One of the main purposes of the Greenway project is to reduce traffic into Cambridge, which means encouraging people to cycle to work, and yet the early engagement response survey shows very little anticipated use for this purpose. It is clearly best for Greenways to negotiate new routes with landowners which do not violate existing footpaths and bridleways. If it be decided that there is some valid reason to continue to prefer the Grantchester route to the Hauxton route then serious consideration needs to be given to the Baulk route, which starts by passing up the west side of the M11 before joining the existing Barton to Grantchester bridleway for a small stretch before leading to the Baulk. All routes are dependant on agreement with the landowners and I therefore find it surprising that the Grantchester route has not already been discussed with the landowners and tenants concerned. This would also include the riparian owners of that part of Burnt Close which is not adopted. I believe that the Greenway project is in principle a good idea, but that it needs to be handled with sensitivity and in some locations it has to be accepted that there is no practical solution. The idea of giving the Greenway priority over road traffic between Grantchester and Newnham indicates a failure to understand that the project has to be subordinate to the general welfare of people;e who live in this area.	No.	I support the comments made by Grantchester Parish Council.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Greenways would benefit all cyclists (bicycles, tricycles, cargo-bikes, e-bikes, disabled cyclists https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/campaigning/guide/) of all ages, not just young, fit & Lycra-clad males		Greenways would benefit all cyclists (bicycles, tricycles, cargo-bikes, e-bikes, disabled cyclists https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/campaigning/guide/) of all ages, not just young, fit & Lycra-clad males	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media	
No opinion	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	3	3	3	2	5	5	5	3	2	5	2	2	1	1	1	All options for Granchester Road seem sub-optimal and an alternative that does not involve making the road one-way will be much less disruptive.	None	No	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	Grantchester meadow - 8. OPPOSE I would prefer the option A question 7 shared use path parallel to Grantchester Rdl. I do not think we need two cycle routes. I would not want to increase traffic through the environmentally sensitive Grantchester meadows. I think increased commuter cycle traffic would have a negative impact within the croft, particularly at peak times when children are going to and from school			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	5	5	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	The Broadway in Grantchester is a bottle neck so see alternative sketch. I understand that the general view was not to touch the meadows but this can not be seen from the river banks and used to be a cricket pitch			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	1	1	4	3	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	2	1	3	2	3				0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	4	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	2	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	It would be preferable to close Grantchester Road to through traffic for motor vehicles	Clear and obvious signage required, suitable to direct visitors rather than just locals, the proposed abbreviations will be confusing and inadequate, no gimmicks needed, just clear signage of a decent size, not poxy little discs on little posts.	Positive especially if properly signed	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	5	2	2	3	4	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	7. Grantchester to Cambridge. Grantchester Road is used as a rat run for traffic going into Cambridge (cutting out queuing on Barton Road). The only way to make this one way has to be Option C. Not an issue with traffic leaving Cambridge in the evening. I cycle daily to Cambridge from my home in Haslingfield meaning the shortest distance is via Barton. This has huge issues with queuing traffic before the cycle path starts.	Make it clear. It is impossible to find Hauxton cyclepath and bridge from Trumpington at the moment. Not conducive to encouraging cycling.	Having a safe well lit route is a priority for all especially women and younger users.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	There is an existing bridleway from Haslingfield to Cambridge which runs over a bridge and would require no conversion cost. It runs into the road called Bridle Way in Grantchester. This could also be extended north to create a route to Barton as well, along the existing bridleways.		Could mobility scooters be used on these routes and could this cross the bridge over the motorway? (This does not affect me personally)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	2	1	0	0	2	4	4	4	4	0	2	4	5	5	5	3	5	Many of the proposals, especially in the village of Grantchester and closer to the city would disrupt the current traffic to an extent which means they create new problems without any guarantee of creating some solutions.		I rely on the bus service in and out of the city and feel the introduction of a one way system on Grantchester Road would threaten this service. I am aged 79 and live on the Broadway in Grantchester.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		Leaflet	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		Leaflet	
No opinion	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	5				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	2				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Newspaper article	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	2	2	3	4	5	4	4	5	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	1. Seems expensive given there is already a bridle way. 2/3. Not clear that the current situation is bad - nor is the cost given. 4/5. Rather depends on projected usage. Option B is ok if less than 10 people per day, but for more than 100 per day then Option A is better. Similarly, table is of little point for few cyclists. 6. Currently not a "difficult" journey. I cycle it daily in "rush hour" 8. Why is widening the existing meadows path not an option? Why not make Eltisly Avenue / Grantchester Meadows / Grantchester Road triangle one way to facilitate cycling this route.	Re Solar studs - cyclists just need to buy better lights. I realised within months of moving from Cambridge that this was necessary. Solar studs on unlit roads should not be necessary. There is a case on off road sections as it makes people feel safer, but they may not actually BE safer - an ability to see a potential attacker won't help if there is no-one to call out to.	As a woman I prefer to avoid poorly populated areas at night. As such when cycling between Cambridge and Grantchester I cycle via the road not the meadows. I would not use 7a or 8 at night. 7 a & c would have implications for the bus route of No.18 between Grantchester and Cambridge - it could route via Trumpington but Newnham residents would then have no bus. Bus is predominantly used by older people and people with disabilities - could be indirectly discriminating against these groups.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	I travel to the Cocks & Hens tennis club on a very regular basis. Travelling from Linton to the club under the proposed one-way system would be extremely impractical.		The proposed system is very much geared to those who live in the locality and have a bike. No consideration is given to those travelling further afield.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth	
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	3	3	0	3	2	5	5	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	Route options B and C will have a severe impact on my access to the Cocks and Hens Tennis Club. I live (redacted) and travel to the Club via Barton Road. Under the current plans, whereby the new one-way stretch is shown as beginning at Fulbrooke Road, one of my journeys to or from the Club would involve travelling an extra 2.8 miles to Grantchester, travelling along roads that are already congested. Whilst my own problems might be alleviated by moving the start point to the Grantchester side of the Club's entrance, this will still affect the many members who approach the Club from Grantchester. In addition, at the point where a two-way system becomes one-way, there will be a number of cars who will seek to turn in the driveway of the Club and this is not designed for heavy traffic			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Email	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	1	4	3	3	4	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	Although some junctions are proposed for improvement, other junctions are not mentioned. Specifically the junction between Fulbrooke Road and Grantchester Road already suffers from narrowing due to parked cars and restricted sightlines, which makes it dangerous for vehicles emerging from Fulbrooke Road. With additional traffic from cyclists, and particularly in view of their vulnerability (I cycle over this junction daily, and drive it regularly) please can attention to be paid to improving existing junctions where increased traffic of vulnerable road users will only heighten the risk. This is one example, I'm sure there are others.			1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	5	3	1	1	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	At present this is not a cycle path and unless you live in Haslingfield you cannot use the current cycleway as this is on private land and the farmer will not allow you to so this needs to be addressed. You cannot have a cycle path that can only be used by the residents of Haslingfield so I strongly oppose this route.	This is a rubbish waste of money.		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No		
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Making Granchester road safe for cyclists is critical to this route			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Other	GCP Website
Strongly support	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	5	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	2	2	2	3	2				1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	3	0	3	2	5	5	5	2	1	1	3	3	5	2	5	Grantchester road should remain two way except in the morning rush hour when it should be one way from Barton road to Grantchester from 7.30 to 9am. Speed should be restricted to 20mph all day and speed humps should be installed as in Grange Road. The one way options will add mileage for members of the tennis club creating more pollution and adversely affecting membership numbers.	signage is distinctive and clear as illustrated.		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	4. Opt. A is ideal but very costly so B is ok. Options 7/8 look like alternatives, I doubt that both are needed. Option 8 is preferable as it leads more directly into central Cambridge Lack of a direct connection via Greenway between Haslingfield and Barton makes it dangerous for children to cycle to Comberton Village College		Option 4a would enable motorised scooters for the disabled to use the route, but it is a very expensive option and not clear how many would use it.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	2	1	4	3	4	2	4	4	0	3	4	2	2	2	3	2				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	3	3	2	4	4	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	4. For buggies, children, cycles with children's carriage, option B is restrictive and might stop families using the route			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer	
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	1	4	3	3	3	1	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	7. Cambridge to Grantchester. I do not consider that any of the options offerec provide the most sensitive route and good value for money. The current narrow tarmac path along the meadows can be upgraded to a proper wide shared use path at a fraction of the cost of the other options. Objections to such an upgrade are based on trying to preserve a "rural idyll" along that route that already doesn't exist due to high demand.			1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet	
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	1. Raised table - Burnt Close / Coton Road junction. This could cause structural damage to the historic grade 2 listed buildings, 9-13 Coton Road when heavy vehicles mount the table. 2. Change of use - who will pay for the maintenance of Burnt Close? The private residents currently contribute to the maintenance of the road.	Avoid unnecessary signage - ubanisation, particularly in conservation areas	There are many elderly and infirm people resident in Grantchester. Closing or partially closing Grantchester Road would make it very difficult for them to visit essential services eg pharmacy, doctors and banks.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet	
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	Oppose Grantchester Meadows. I would prefer the option A question 7 shared use path parallel to Grantchester Road. I do not think we need two cycle routes. I would not want to increase traffic throught he environmentally sensitive Grantchestre meadows. I think increased commuter cycle traffic would have a negative impact within the croft particularly at peak times when chidlren are going to and from school.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet	

| | | |

Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		0	2	3	3	3	2	0	2	3	3	5	1	5	2	2	2	2	5	Grantchester Meadows hedge route: leads into Newnham, especially Eltisley Ave which is already full of parked cars & larger vehicles eg supermarket delivery vans, builders lorries etc. At the Grantchester St end there are loads of school children between 8 & 9 am and about 3:30 pm being taken / picked up by cars and many bikes with trailers.	Please keep the signage to a minimum, not what Cambridge usually suffers. Support solar studs but not high level lights.	In Newnham Croft there is a large sheltered housing complex with many fragile elderly and disabled people. These people use the local Co-op and other shops which require crossing Grantchester Street. Loads of bikes (especially those whizzing along) would / could cause difficulties.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	Grantchester to Cambridge (Options 7) - why not (link and) widen existing pathway across Grantchester Meadows. Proposal 8: Revisit issue of widening existing path by allotments rather than destroying allotments. (The situation is now different from previously as part of a proper Greenway.) Proposal 10: One-way Granchester Street looks nice but entirely impractical for the consequent access to and through small residential streets (with tight turns and parking restrictions). Why not link a cycle route to Lammas Field via Nature Reserve and existing boardwalk? Eltisley Avenue is not suitable for a dedicated cycle lane or dual use path.	Strongly support stud lighting (preferably) on all cycle routes for night-time safety. Continuous studs with occasional walker-style 'waymarking' would signal routes through. Good signage examples shown for initial signage on different routes. Minimum signage in Grantchester Meadows and Nerwnham Croft conservation areas. (useful for	Continuous cycle ways would also benefit mobility scooters	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	1	3	1	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	3	3	I strongly oppose the proposal for a shared-use path behind the hedge from the Grantchester Meadows path and the proposal to make Grantchester Street one-way for motor vehicles between Newnham Croft Street and Barton Road for the following reasons: (1) This route would require users of the Greenway to travel through the already heavily congested narrow streets of the Newnham Croft area, including Eltisley Avenue (unsuitably narrow, with 2-way traffic and parking on both sides of the street) (2) If Grantchester Street is made one-way, heavy goods vehicles entering Newnham Croft, (shop delivery lorries, skip lorries, removals lorries, refuse collection lorries etc) will have to use Derby Street or Hardwick Street both of which are far too narrow, and with tight turns, to accommodate such large vehicles. The result would be chaos.		If the M11 bridge stairway is retained, this would impede access for the disabled.	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	3	3				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	1	4	2	2	2	4	4	4	2	4				0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	5	5	1	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	I support the haslingfield - cantelupe road - improved bourne brook crossing - burnt close greenway. Then starting from the broadway opposite merton house diagonally across red-lion meadow to behind the hedge to newnham. to not be obtrusive - it all needs to be sensitively landscaped. You will need archeological surveys, particulary on grantchester meadows.	good + discrete signs. compatible with the rural character of the area	Anything affecting bus journeys to and from grantchester will have serious effect on disabled and/or elderly. No road closures please	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	Haslingfield-grantChester route is essential. Hauxton route less cit			0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	4	2	3	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	Option 10 is not clear How are residents expected to get into Newnham by car. What changes are needed to hardwick street and Derby street to cater for trFfic coming from Barton Road. Will they have to become one way too.	More clarity needed. Documentation and analysis is incomplete.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No				
No opinion	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			I would have to drive into Saturday city traffic on a long detour in order to get from Chesterton to Cocks and Hens tennis club on the Granchester Road.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	3	3	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	5	5	2	2	0	1	1	1	3	1	Options B and C will have a severe impact on my access to the Cocks and Hens Tennis Club. I live very near (redacted) and normally travel to the club via Barton Rd. Under the proposed plans one of my journeys to or from the club would mean driving not only approx 3 additional miles but importantly along roads that are increasingly congested. My own problems would be alleviated by moving the the start point to the Grantchester side of the access road to the club this will still affect members who travel to the club via Grantchester. Finally, the driveway to the club is narrow and not capable of being used by a potentially large number of vehicles turning as they are likely to do if the two way system become one way.		none other than the above	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Email, Word of mouth			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	0	2	5	2	0	0	4	4	4	5	0	5	3	3	5	5	5	I normally travel to Cocks & Hens Tennis Club on Grantchester Road via Barton Road as I come from Highfields Caldecote. The idea of a one-way system is quite untenable. It would entail me having to do nearly an additional 3 miles to do the circuitous route proposed. The additional impact on Coton Road for current users and residents is the stuff of nightmares: people having to travel along a road they don't want to, and in the normal course of events, would not need to, and folk not wishing to have the extra traffic either! The suggestion of putting a cycleway behind a high hedge is immediately fraught with danger: it would make it too isolated and create a perilous opportunity for attack, even in daylight.	Limited		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	3	3	3	1	1	1	5	1	3	5	1	5	5	5	5	1	5	The guiding principle of green travel should always be to AVOID further encroachment on rural land or countryside. This means the Grantchester Meadows option should be COMPLETELY EXCLUDED. It is not green - it is the application of more concrete. Developing existing roads i.e. Grantchester and Barton Road is much more environmentally sound. Both Grantchester and Newnham villages should remain quiet family villages. A modest develpment of the Haslingfield -Grantchester route may be unavoidable, but the bikes should then be funnelled into Grantchester Road. I feel very strongly about this. Cycleways should not mean concreting over more countryside. They should be given space FORMERLY ALLOTTED TO CARS on existing routes.	On existing roads, clear lighting and signs are useful. In the countryside, they are a source of light pollution and further encroachment on nature. Chipping away at our natural environment and calling it 'green' is a misnomer.	I am very concerned about the impact of large groups of rapid male cyclists on the families trying to get young chidren to Newnham Croft. Large and unaware cycle commuters are a threat to small children. It would be unwise to direct cyclists along Grantchester Street for this reason. Mothers with small children are effectively disabled though they are often ignored.	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	4	3	5	1	1	5	1	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	NO to option 8 - encroachment beside Grantchester Meadows - this will i. destroy privacy and security of Newhman Croft ii. Impose higher volume through traffic on Newnham Croft and its residents iii. Further degrade Grantchester Meadows I will be prepared to fight tooth and nail against option 8 Yes to new way to west beside Grantchester Road to Barton Road	Keep signs to a minimum Signs erode landscapes		1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		0	2	2	5	2	2	1	3	5	5	1	2	2	3	2	2	0	2	As a Grantchester resident, closure of Grantchester Road in either direction is totally unacceptable. Regardless of the apparent calculations of small additional mileage to reach Cambridge (city) by car it will add significant time to (for example the station at peak times) due to very high traffic congestion and cause massive inconvenience. Alternative routes out of Grantchester will not be viable (the queues at Trumpington are huge in the mornings (can be up to 30 minutes). The best cycling route into Cambridge is and will be across the meadows, but the path needs to be improved (sympathetically in keeping with the rural feel it now has ie not black tarmac) and preferably add a path on the other side of the hedge to separate cyclists.	include Grantchester as part of the signage	closure of Grantchester road will severely impact disabled people and those who support them (ie carers) especially if the bus is unable to continue due to this proposed closure. (If a road is one way then it is closed in the other direction)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	5	5	5	3	4	3	3	2	3	5	We think it is pointless to have two new cycling/walking routes between Grantchester village and Newnham, one behind the hedge from the existing Grantchester Meadows path (option 8), the other alongside but behind the hedge along Grantchester Road (option 7A). We should strongly oppose the former because of its deleterious environmental and visual impact (substantial loss of trees, tarmacking, etc) on Grantchester Meadows, and would therefore prefer the latter. We often cycle along (the narrow) Grantchester Road and a separate cycle path beside it would definitely be safer.			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Leaflet, Newspaper article, Word of mouth, Other	Residents Association		
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	Route options B and C will have a severe impact on my access to the Cocks and Hens Tennis Club. I live in (redacted) and travel to the Club via Barton Road using a car. Under the current plans, whereby the new one-way stretch is shown as beginning at Fulbrooke Road, one of my journeys to or from the Club would involve travelling an extra 2.8 miles to Grantchester, travelling along roads that are already congested. Whilst my own problems might be alleviated by moving the start point to the Grantchester side of the Club's entrance, this will still affect the many members who approach the Club from Grantchester. In addition, at the point where a two-way system becomes one-way, there will be a number of cars who will seek to turn in the driveway of the Club and this is not designed for heavy traffic.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	5	5	5	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	5	5	3	2	3	I am opposed to any route that turns a lovely rough grass dogwalk between Grantchester and Haslingfield into a highspeed cycle route with a tarmac, or equivalent, scar right across the fields, unsafe to allow dogs to run free on. This year the tractors have used much of this grass route, at least on the Grantchester side, and so any hard surface would have to be of a standard to support their weight, which I think means the surface is unlikely to last long, leading to a scar on the landscape that could not be used by the cyclists it was planned for. There would be no way of deicing the route, making it extremely unsafe in winter. I don't believe enough people want to cycle in from Haslingfield to justify this destruction. If a route is needed, I believe it should be along the complex of concrete roads already in existence due to the farm traffic and should follow alongside those routes, alongside and separate for safety.	Again, any lighting should be kept in areas that are already lit. One of the koys of the fields is that you can enjoy the stars, which is unusual so close to a town. I would not like to see any lighting along the route between Canteloupe Farm and Burnt Close.		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Email, Word of mouth			
No opinion	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	My wife and I regularly play tennis at Cocks and Hens, travelling from Trumpington. To make the Grantchester Road one way either direction would mean we would have to travel significant miles further on busy roads to and from the club. Furthermore B and C would have an impact on bus service 18. Have accurate numbers of prospective users of any of the proposed changes been sought and is the investment and upheaval justified?	Grantchester Road, being narrow and at times busy could do with road markings either side, a sign warning of a bend (where a vehicle has been in to the trees)and speed limit signs.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Other	Via the tennis club.		
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	2	0	0	2	3	5	5	2	3	5	2	2	2	4	2	As a member of Cocks and Hens Tennis club Option B and C- proposals to make Grantchester Road a one way route will have a big detrimental impact on my ability to travel to and from the club as I access the club via Barton Road.	No		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
No opinion	0	1	0	0	0	0		4	4	4	4	2	2	2	5	3	3	5	2	3	4	4	5	5	5				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	No	Social media, Word of mouth			
Support	1	1	0	1	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	1	5	2	2	5	1	5		minimal signage, just for basic directions to villages, please		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	4	4	3	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	I see no need for conversion to one-way for Grantchester Road if there is a separate shared use off road path behind the hedge. Commuter traffic is a problem here so why not instead introduce a 'no motor traffic' between the hours of 7.30-9.30am - as at Wort's Causeway? The Grantchester Street/Barton Road/Newnham Road corner junction is a major problem for cyclists turning into Grantchester Street from Barton Road - ie a large number of school children attending Newnham Croft Primary School. I have witnessed several near misses merely for my own children, let alone those reported by other parents. Converting a short section of Grantchester St to one way will not solve this issue and it must be addressed. Making this part of the street one way could cause more problems than it solves. Please please please consult further with stakeholders such as the school, local businesses and the sheltered housing at Lammas Court before going any further with proposals around this junction.	No		1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	1	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	3	2	5	5	5	5	1	5	2	2	5	2	5	Please do NOT make any part of Grantchester Road one-way --- it would make the whole exercise very ungreen if Fulbrooke Road residents had to make a massive detour to get to Barton Road, for example... Please do everything in your power to prevent hare coursing.	minimal signage, please		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	0	0	1	0	0	0		1	3	2	1	5	3	2	4	1	1	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	I think the expensive option A for Grantchester to Cambridge Road is unnecessary, as the far cheaper restriction of the road to one-way would be plenty. Spend the difference of £760k on something else!	The Greenways logo itself is nice, as it is neutral and non-specific. I look forward to mostly using this new route as a horse rider, and I very much hope that all the blue roundels along the way will be those with horse as well as pedestrian and bicycle on them, NOT just the pedestrian/bicycle versions. Even where you've been unable to fit in a grassy strip as well as tarmac, the whole route must be available to horse riders.	Options such as the shallow ramp for the M11 crossing are really important and should be prioritised. Also note that this provides suitable access to that key link in the route to horse riders too.	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Social media			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	I think the proposals would be a great idea. I also think a cycle path next to the potentially dangerous road from Haslingfield to Harston for Haslingfield residents who travel south on the A10 to Foxton station and other destinations south of Haslingfield and Harston.			0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Social media			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	4	3	5	1	1	2	5	1	1	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	I can't state strongly enough my OBJECTION to a new shared-use path behind the hedge beside the Grantchester Meadows path to Cambridge. This is a beautiful area of great importance to wildlife that I and many others treasure. It would not environmentally friendly to create a path here. My preferred option is the one way option to Grantchester, with cars on one side and cyclists on the other (separated from the cars for safety, by a fence and hedges). A second best would be the path behind the hedge running parallel to Grantchester Road). Again, I would like to state my STRONG OBJECTION to any development of the Baulk route.	Should be unobtrusive and minimal.		1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	2	5	I am writing primarily as a resident of Grantchester with a strong desire to preserve the rural quality of Grantchester Meadows. ROUTE 7A This strikes me as easily the best option. I realise that the Parish Council has expressed concern about adding cycle traffic to the Broadway. Since I live (redacted) I'm in a position to say that adopting this route would not be problematic, since motor traffic has to slow to come past parked cars as things stand, and is accustomed to giving way to bicycles. If the motor traffic is slowed, all to the good. It often comes too quickly into the heart of the village. ROUTE 8 I am concerned that having a cycle path even next to the current path, behind a hedge, will give the Meadows more of the feel of an urban park - if it has solar studs, that will be even worse. If this is the decision, I'd greatly prefer the cycle path to come off the Grantchester Road where proposed in the current plan. I realise that the Parish Council has suggested another route, across a broader expanse of the Meadows, coming off the High St end of the Broadway, to avoid additional cycle traffic on the Broadway. I think this is a mad idea, not just because of what I've already noted, about the viability of cycle traffic on the Broadway already, but because that open stretch of the Meadows is essential to the rural character of the whole area, and it should not be cut across by tarmac where (at the moment) there is only the slightest, greenest pathway. ROUTES 7B and 7C I understand the Parish Council's concern about the possible loss of the bus route if the system becomes one-way but I think a loss of provision is unlikely and a short-sighted basis on which to make any decision. Making Grantchester Road one-way for motor vehicles would make it safer, and a cycle path could be fairly easily accommodated - though the road is far from wide. It would not, however, provide a very green way into and out of Cambridge, and that makes it less attractive given the spirit of the overall scheme.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	I suggest existing roads should be widened if necessary, and the country left untouched.	Keep signage to an absolute minimum. And only at the beginning of paths or anywhere where paths fork. But not into the countryside at all.		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	I am astonished that these proposals have ever reached the public consultation stage given that clearly represent poor value for money and do not support the stated aims of this project with respect to cycling, walking and equestrian travel. There are no major housing or employment nodes in this area so this project should be stopped now as it does not meet basic aims that the GCP was created to address. This looks suspiciously like an attempt to use Government money to fund a set of recreational cycling projects with no practical use to most people in the area. Stop this whole proposal now and come back when you obtained the demand data for trips in this area and have a business justification that supports spending these large sums of public money.	Another complete waste of money and an expensive solution looking for a non-existent problem. We do not need another fancy signage/wayfaring solution but rather focus on improving and extending what we have now which is fit for purpose. Clearly money is burning a hole in the GCPs pocket to suggest nonsense like this.	I prefer to focus on the majority of non-protected residents who do not receive the attention they also deserve from public bodies like the GCP.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	1	1	3	1	1	5	5	5	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	Grantchester meadows route much more preferable to Grantchester Road route, as more likely to be used (and would be used anyway even if greenway ended up on Grantchester Road). One-way at Grantchester Street/Barton Road/Newnham Road junction is mad. We need large vehicles to enter Newnham when needed (e.g. coaches, removals) and not possible via Hardwick Street and Derby Street.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Yes	Leaflet			
Oppose	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	I would only support improving the existing path behind Grantchester Meadows hedge. This is where I walk and ride my bike. It is very busy with walkers and bikers especially on the weekends.	no		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	The path that runs alongside Grantchester Road behind the hedge between the edge of Cambridge and Grantchester is a rare survival of non-concreted land near the city. I regularly walk here with my family and jog here alone. This is an unspoilt rural walk which should be preserved for future generations. Our children love to leave the city and run along this grassy path. This would be spoilt if a cycle path were running next to it. I also notice it is the only walk in the area where dog walkers don't have to worry about their dogs being run over by bikes.			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Oppose	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	I would only support improving the existing path behind Grantchester Meadows hedge. It gets crowded especially on weekends in summer. I do not support making the Grantchester road one way .	no		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	We have brought up two small children on (redacted) and are horrified at the thought of Grantchester Street becoming one way and forcing the butchers vans, builder's lorrys, school buses etc up Derby Street or Hardwick street. These streets are too narrow for this sort of traffic. We have had to get out of bed and come into the street at night to help lorries negotiate their way out of the street when they have accidentally come this way. Lorries are forced up onto the pavement if they come along Derby street which is not safe. We cycle regularly down Grantchester street and always feel safe as the speed bumps stop cars coming too fast - we don't see any need for a one way section.			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	My only concern is that commuters will stick to the road in the winter and evenings. In which case more should be done to improve the road route between Haslingfield and Barton in order to link in with the Barton greenway. I know the old rail bridge is a big constraint but if the aim is to get more people cycling then the lack of natural surveillance with the off-road route as proposed may put off some users.	None, all looks good.	No comment	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	4	5	5	2	3	2	5	5	2	2	4	3	4	2	4	2	I feel very strongly that we should not make Grantchester Road a one way road. It would create unnecessary additional car mileage for people travelling between Gratnchester and Newnham. I would very much like to keep the rural nature of the track between Grantchester and Haslingfield.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	4	4	2	2	2	2	5	5	2	2	4	3	4	2	5	2	Making Grantchester Road one way would create unnecessary additional mileage for many people, further clogging up the roards, for no significant benefit.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	2	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	3	3	4	2	4	I understand Grantchester residents have proposed a different route between Grantchester and Barton Road using existing farm tracks which seems more sensible than any of the options proposed here.			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	1	0	1	0	0		3	4	4	5	5	2	2	2	5	5	4	2	5	3	2	2	2	5	I am very against drastically changing the countryside			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25-34	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	1	5	2	2	5	2	5				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	This project should be stopped forthwith and any proposals and money directed to other areas (e.g. Trumpington etc) which may meet the Government criteria for transport infrastructure investment by the GCP but not areas to the West of Cambridge which clearly do not. This is a sledgehammer to crack a nut and a completely disproportionate set of proposals which will potentially waste large sums of public money and do not provide value for money. Simply cutting and pasting the Camcycle lobby group proposals to spend millions on their pet schemes in not acceptable to me and nor is hiding behind the term greenway when in fact they are really cycle ways that promote recreational activity not utility journeys. In particular this scheme may be subject to legal challenge on the basic grounds that the money given to the GCP was for transport initiatives that relate to and support employment and/or housing growth nodes. This area does not meet that criteria at all and there are simply not enough 'utility' journeys undertaken by walkers or cyclists to justify this level of public spending. I note with interest that as usual no demand figures or any evidence is provided of both current usage and future usage of these cycle ways which is unacceptable. None of these villages have sufficient populations (or future growth) to generate the number of 'utility' journeys the GCP is supposed to be about facilitating. 1 Haslingfield to Hauxton Given the size of these two settlements there is no justification for spending this amount of money as there simply not enough people cycling along this route for work, service or education. If recreational cycling is to be encouraged then find another pot of money for a cycle way like this please. 2 Canteloup Farm Again there is no justification for spending this amount of money as there simply not enough people cycling along this route for work, service or education. Given the existing very low numbers of cyclists who might be using this route do nothing as it is quite usable as it is thanks and no need to ruin the rural scene any further. If recreational cycling is to be encouraged then find another pot of money for a cycle way like this please. 3 Bourn Brook to M11 Again there is no justification for spending this amount of money as there simply not enough people cycling along this route for work, service or education. 4 M11 Bridge (Option A) This is a complete waste of public money and completely unjustified given the number of people who might use it. 4 M11 Bridge (Option B) This is a slightly less of a waste of public money than Option A but still completely unjustified given the number of people who might use it. 5 Grantchester – Burnt Close /Coton Road Junction This should be funded from the Highways budget if there are serious safety issues otherwise don't bother. 6 Grantchester – Coton Road / Broadway Junction This should be funded from the Highways budget if there are serious safety issues otherwise don't bother. 7 Grantchester to Cambridge (Option A) Is this as joke? There are not enough pedestrians or cyclists using this route to justify spending £810 on it let alone £810,000! Only a handful of people are actually using this for their commute into Cambridge and the road is perfectly safe as it is. This is a complete waste of public money. 7 Grantchester to Cambridge (Option B)	Current signage is fine and if it is not broken there is no need to fix it or spend more public money than is absolutely necessary.		1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Flyer			
Oppose	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	1	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	Any proposal that makes all or some of Granchester Road one way will greatly increase the mileage done by motorists and is very harmful to the environment as many motorists will have to do and extra 2 o 3 miles every day or more often	if you create any cycle routes make sure the right of way is clear.. it is not on the Milton road one and a teenage was killed there a few years ago.. nothing as been done to improve the street signage or the faded road signage... there is also a hedge obscuring junction vision which contributed to the fatality.	Older people at the Cocks and Hens club, families and children here... who cannot cycle..	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	4	4	4	2	2	3	3	3	Greenway on one-way Grantchester Rd (7B or C) can work fine and poses fewer problems reaching Barton Road..	They look fine.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Newspaper article			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	4	4	1	5	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	I am entire agreement with Camcycle's expressed view on options 7B&C, and on their highlighting that the simplest, cheapest and most visionary option has been taken off the table, i.e. full road closure. However, given the strong local opposition to this initial idea (though I do not know the views of Haslingfield or Barton on this), which is the reason it was not consulted on, and the strong current feeling of many against the one-way closure idea, I strongly support consideration of a new option, which is: Grantchester Road could become a 'Quiet Road' within the Greenways project. A new option and an alternative to a one-way system, aimed at achieving a safer, quieter and more pleasant journey from Grantchester to Cambridge for cyclists and for all. Grantchester Road could be temporarily closed for northward entry (except cycles, buses and registered carers) from the Grantchester end by the Rupert Brooke Pub (say) 7-9am, weekdays only. All other times cars would travel in both directions. This option would include traffic-calming measures to make the road safer for cars, cycles, mobility scooters etc., such as a 20mph speed limit, lower weight limit (except buses), and very clearly marked and protected cycle lanes I hope that this option can be explored further. Thank you.	Signage should be clear, simple and well designed; it should be an example of the best that can be done, and avoid street clutter.		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Email, Social media, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	5	5	1	2	2	1	1	1	5	2	I do not think grantchester road should be made one way. I am not sure about changing priority at Coton Road / Broadway Junction. I think cyclists should go along the high street (grantchester) joining a widened meadow footpath at the red lion pub. ? 2 fields this would join a new path to the west of thehaedge along the existing grantchester meadows path. Alternatively, a path could go diagonally across the meadows after the last house ont he right as you enter broadway as this would join a path parallel to the estates meadows path.	Signage is only useful to those who know the codes. Ha. Ba. etc. I like the symbol.	Closing the Grantchester road is likely to affect the elderly people of both Newnham and Grantchester who use the route by car. The new route improves path for electric wheelchairs. Closing the route to make it one way is of inconvenience to many businesses and both city and village residents.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	5	5	5	3	5	1	1	1	3	3	The most important aspect is to imrpove cycling on the very dangerous grantchester road (no.7). A cycle way behind the hedge is the only good option.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	4	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1		Look smart and are clear		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	25-34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	3	3	3	3				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	1	1	1	3	5	5	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	How many cyclists will use the Haslingfield/Hauxton route for the £ where are the cars on Broadway/Burnt Close going? Baulk route would not be used as too far from direct route for these cyclists from Haslingfield, also from Barton to Cambridge road (existing cycle) is faster and quicker			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	5	2	2	2	3	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	3	The suggestions to tamper with grantchester rd are absurd - take no account of ? of the ? ? two way access for large number of grantchester residents	The clearer the signage the better for all. Beware however of excess and clashing signs. Discrete that informative.		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	5	1	0	5	1	1	1	1	1	It would be a real disadvantage to grantchester having grantchester rd one way. Lots of people rely on the number 18 bus which travels this way.	The lighting is very bad for people who live in grantchester and who wish to cycle in the evening. I strongly support the stud lighting.		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	I strongly oppose Options B and C (Cambridge to Grantchester Road) because of the effect it would have on getting to / leaving the Cocks & Hens Tennis Club. Were a one way system to be introduced, wth restrictions to begin at Fulbrooke Road, this would involve an extra 3 miles or so motoring along road already heavily congested and with fast moving traffic. Even if the start of any one way system to be moved to the mouth of the bridleway approach to the tennis club (immediately to the south of the Rugby Club) this would create a very dangerous turning point for vehicles have to change direction. Why not do as is done somewhere opposite Addenbrookes Hospital where a "rat run" road is simply barred to traffic from 7.30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and impose to the same type of restriction to Grantchester Road between the bridleway entrance just referred to and apply that that to traffice trying to travel from The Rupert Brooke public house in Grantchester and the first of teh college sports grounds nearest to Grantchester. Tie that in with a 20 m.p.h. speed limit all the way, allied to speed bumps, and you surely have a much simpler, safer and far less expensive solution.	No	Not applicable.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Newspaper article, Email, Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	The cycling path and walkways will be much to stop cars coming into Cambridge. Our family will cycle!			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	2	1	3	2	1	4	4	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	Cycle traffic through Newnham Croft would be made safer if the triangle formed by Eltisley Avenue, Grantchester Street and Grantchester Meadows were made one way for all traffic. This would avoid conflict between bicycles and cars travelling in opposite directions which is particularly acute in Eltisley Avenue where cars are parked on both sides. An alternative would be to make just Eltisley Avenue one way for all traffic.	Although signing must be visible and clear, it should be in keeping with the environment in which it is located.	No comments	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Email			
No opinion	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2			TheCocks and Hens would be affected by members traveling to club	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet		Yes	Cocks and hens tennis club
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	4	2	4				1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		5	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	3	3	2	5	2	2	2	2	I strongly object to the proposed change to the Haslingfield-Hauxton route. As a walker and dog walker, my experience of shared use paths is that cyclists dominate and threaten the safety of walkers, adults and children, dogs, people with pushchairs etc. The development of greenways may be necessary to encourage people off the roads but the development of every last piece of the natural environment will mean no-one can ever enjoy the real countryside, children will grow up only knowing paved and lit paths, never experiencing the pleasure of standing on an old bridge watching the wildlife moving along the river below - the wildlife that the recent substantial investment on the nearby weir is supposed to encourage - dogs can never be let off the lead safely. This area is one of the few remaining untouched areas where we can really enjoy the countryside, we should value and treasure it. The proposed improvements to the Cantelupe Road route to Grantchester, a route already in existence, surely will provide the necessary access to Cambridge and remove unnecessary duplication with a second route so close by.			0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Flyer, Email			

| | | |

Strongly support	1	0	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	0	4	1	2	4	1	1	1	1	1				0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	All routes, options, locations etc.... What a waste of money. How about fixing up the roads first? This whole scheme relates to minority users and groups... typical of this country. Get priorities right!!!			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	5	2	2	2	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	5	5	Barton Rd / Grantchester Junction. The proposed redesign should not further delay vehicles' progress out of the city. The traffic already backs up to Parkers Piece due to traffic lights / pedestrian ligths in Newnham. Cyclists should be forced to use these cycleways and not the road. The existing cycleways on the Newnahm Park / Barton Road should have bigger clearer signage to encourage cyclists to use it more. All the money spent on cyclists is wasted if they don't use the facility. Make a byelaw. Costs should also be weighed up against possible numbers of users / numbers of journesy otherwise we will end up like Harston - millions spent and so few users. Cheaper to sent everyone by taxi			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1				1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	3	2	4	2	4	4	3	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	3	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	Grantchester to Cambridge. Options B and C will increase road traffic along Barton Road, Cambridge west of the Grantchester road junction.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet			
No opinion	0	0	0	0	0	1	Landowner for significant section	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Concerned that as a landowner no consultation was undertaken prior to the launch of these proposals.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth		Yes	King's College
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	1	2	4	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	Is there a good reason for not being able to negotiate the use of the "Cantaloupe Farm" access road, which currently needs special permission? There are far greater funding needs within Cambridge City eg Fen Causeway to Parkside (very un-cycle friendly)			1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	3	2	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	A 3 metre wide path is unnecessary, this takes green space from wildlife, adds to flood risk and encourages cyclists to cycle faster. Wide cycle paths are counter productive.			1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	5	5	2	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	We are particularly opposed to the proposals for one way traffic on Grantchester Road and Street and believe that the implications of these proposals have not been properly thought through.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	1	4	2	2	2	2	5	The route behind the hedge at Grantchester meadows (8) would lead from congestion in Grantchester to congestion in Newnham Croft. There are only 3 narrow entrance roads and cyclists would be in conflict wtih oncoming traffic, particularly in the morning when children are coming to Newnham Croft School.	Keep signage to a minimum and at a low level, not on huge poles	There is sheltered housing on Grantchester St and a high number of elderly and disabled people living in Newnham Croft who would be further disadvantaged by additonal cyclists, especially at speed.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	1	1	5	1	1	Pt 7 Option C. Grantchester to Cambridge. Signage needs to be clear. the diagram shows a small one way cycle path and the cyclist coming from Cambridge is on the main road. This cycleway has to be two way and segregated from traffic. Otherwise it will be unsafe like Downing St but out of town. Speed limit for one way cars should be reduced to a max of 40mph on all of that section. Pt 9 Barton Rd - Grantchester Rd Junction. Existing proposal is unsafe and potentially dangerous for cars. Imagine a car trying to turn right from the motorway end in the rush hour. There is a constant stream of traffic coming the other way out of town. Eventually a gap approaches but just before that moment a car has turned left into Grantchester Rd from town. The second car is already in the "waiting area" before the block, waiting to get past a car coming rom Grantchester. The first car ends up inadvertently stranded in the middle of Barton Rd which would potentially cause an accident. The Barton Rd is so busy even out of rush hour, that cars turning right out of Grantchester Rd have to sometimes wait for several minutes before they can get out. This is enough time for there to be a queue of cars behind the waiting car which would mean that the one waiting at the block can't move foward. The additional problem of adding a tree in the middle of the junction would reduce visibility for car drivers. The safer option would be to introduce a full traffic light system for that junction with a separate pedestrian / bike section to the left of Grantchester Rd. There wouldn't then need to be a bike path across the pavement twoards the crossing with the problems described above. Something definitely needs to be done at this junction, but not in the way proposed by Greenways. My option immediately above would significantly reduce the danger of this junction for both cars pedestrians and cyclists. Pr 8. Grantchester Meadows. Once cyclists are in Newton Corft, an alternative option would be for them to go down South Green Rd and have a link through to the college grounds and Kings Rd. The cyclists could then cross over Barton Rd safely at Barton Rd / Grange Rd / Kings Rd junction.	Signage needs to be clear and simple to avoid the kind of issues with Silver St. If Grantchester Rd were to be made south bound only from the Fulbrooke Rd / Rugby Club to the Rupert Brooke, a NO ENTRY sign is needed at all times at the Rupert Brooke with below it in black lettering any exceptions eg "except cycles"		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	5	5	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	What a waste of money and it mean loss of nature and wildlife which is part of living in the countryside.	Do nothing, not needed	Waste of money	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Other	Grantchester Parish Councillor		
No opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	I (REDACTED Rd and am authorised to object to any plan to make Grantchester Road sing track in either direction. We bring cars and cars with trailers from a wide area and either way would represent a huge diversion. In addition we open to the public regularly which brings up to 100 cars to the Rugby club where we rent parking. They would have to divert and might choose not to come also putting so call congestion elsewhere			1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	No	Word of mouth		Yes	Cambridge and District Model Eng Society
Support	1	0	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	I am responding as (REDACTED). Subject to satisfactory arrangements with the landowners, including ourselves, we believe that the route via the Baulk offers the most cost effective, least disruptive and safest solution. This would unite the Haslingfield and Barton cycleways and avoid disruption to motor traffic The Haslingfield route needs a bit more work to negotiate a straighter route across the field from the motorway bridge to the crossing on Coton Rd. Some further thought is needed about the Coton Rd crossing and how the route finishes in Newnham			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Strongly oppose	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	4	4	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45-54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places".	Continuation of comments under Box 5 Above: Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.	Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	No	Word of mouth			
No opinion	0	0	0	0	0	1	Landowner for significant section	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Concerned that as a landowner no consultation was undertaken prior to launch of proposals.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth		Yes	Kings College
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0		3	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	the whole scheme is unnecessary and hugely damaging to nature and wildlife which CRT has spent years helping to recover and you are about to damage it beyond all recognition	Yes, do nothing - not needed	All this is to help promote developers to develop between Grantchester and the M11. Shame on you	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Yes	Other	Grantchester Parish Council Forced You		
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	4	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	1	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	Do not create light pollution in the country site	Any signs should be small and low rather like signposted events in Grantchester	Trust all paths accessible by wheelchair and other aids for the elderly	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Email, Word of mouth, Other	Meeting in Grantchester		
Support	1	1	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	the proposed route through Grantchester would cause great problems for pedestrians, compromising their safety	Keep signage to a minimum	See 5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	1	2	3	3	1	5	5	1	2	5	3	3	1	3	1	Proposal 10. We have serious concerns about turning Grantchester St into a one way street. The current two way system forces traffic to ove slowly, which is extremely important given the proximity to the school. Making Grantchester St one way would increase the traffic noise and pollution along Merton, Hardwick and Derby Streets. We STRONGLY object to this proposal			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35-44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	1				1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45-54	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	1	1	1				1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet			
	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	4	3	1	5	2	1	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	Why not connect Haslingfield to the hub a the New Addenbrooke's site for the new proposed rail station to avoid more congestion in Central Cambridge. The planning on the Meadows is for agriculture and is privately owned by Kings College. Natural England backed this with a grant in 2000. People come from Cambridge for social reasons. The Meadows are Permissive only and as such I have, together with others, kept it clean of litter and cut back brambles for safety reasons. As a walker I know how poorly maintained authority paths are. This includes Cambridgeshire, along with eight other counties.	The option I suggest is to be more futuristic of the hub at the new BioScience site and the need to relieve congestion in the city centre.	As an 82 year old I need the bus for shopping, the doctors surgery at Comberton, Social and to access further bus and train routes.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	Prefer not to say	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	The path to Grantchester and Barton must be connected to Comberton. The schools there (Comberton College) would benefit enormously.	Solar studs for wayfinding along path and street lights at junctions so cars can see pedestrians / cyclists.		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Social media			
Support	0	1	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	If Grantchester St is to be made one way between Newnham Croft St and Barton Rd, how are large lorries such as the ones that deliver to the Co-Op, removal vans emergency vehicles, builders lorries (I could list more) to use the area? It would mean using streets such as Derby and Hardwick Streets to get in and out which is impossible for such vehicles.	If signage is only going to be two letters such as BA for Barton would visitors to the area really know what they mean. Keep place names in full!		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	2	4	2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	5	5. Oppose both Option 7A (Path behind hedge Grantchester Road) and Option 8 (Path behind Grantchester Meadows because (i) environmental damage to hedge/field boundary (ii) will be isolated and perceived as unsafe by most groups at night & winter from dusk - and so will not be used. Oppose both Options 7B and 7C One-way to S to N and N to S because (i) impact on passing trade to pubs and businesses in Grantchester (ii) risk to No. 18 bus (iii) removal of important emergency route when A10 (Trumpington Road) is blocked (iv) environmental damage due to extra journey lengths & travel time but would support an option 7D for a vehicle/motorbike no entry point at southern end of Grantchester Road (Just N of Rupert Brooke) OS GR 432557 Operating 7am-9am Monday to Friday only (c.f. Worts Causeway). Restriction would not apply to buses/ambulances/registered medical and care workers. Plus 20mph speed limit on Grantchester Road and significant traffic calming measures providing to create a "Quiet Road with passing places". Oppose Option 10 Grantchester Street one-way because (i) will create significant extra risk to pedestrians, cyclists and cars existing Newnham Croft as the inbound traffic from the city would have to enter Newnham Croft via Hardwick Street and Derby Street before moving along Merton Street and Newnham Croft street and then turn right on blind corners across the traffic exiting the Croft (ii) impact on deliveries to Co-op which are by articulated cool-chain lorry and coaches collecting children from the school for trips eg to swimming, outdoor pursuits and visits. Grantchester Meadows route - would ask that this option is brought back onto the table for reconsideration as a slow Greenway option from the SW corner of the Blue Ball meadow (OS GR 432557). Survey data confirms that in morning commuting time (7.45am - 9am) only one cyclist every three minutes currently uses this route so there is minimal impact on Newnham. Ideally the faster cyclists being guided along a calmed Grantchester Road from this point/fork in the route.		7. Oppose options 7B & 7C One-way S to N because of (i) risk of loss No. 18 bus and impact on disabled and those with reduced mobility (as well as the vulnerable and those on low incomes) both in Grantchester village and Fulbrooke, Grantchester and Selwyn Roads (ii) carers visiting people in Grantchester and Newnham would have their travel times and travel distances significantly increased. Often carers need to visit four times per day. This would create "reverse modal shift" including at non rush-hour times when Grantchester Road is virtually empty.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	Leaflet, Newspaper advert			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	1	4	1	1	1	1	5	5	2	0	5	1	5	1	5	1	I am concerned that the new routes will allow both fast cyclists off to work and people out for an afternoon (?) stroll are both considered in the planning of all Greenways.			1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Newspaper article			
Support	1	0	0	0	0	0		3	2	2	4	1	2	2	2	5	5	5	2	5	3	3	2	4	4	I stronly oppose any restriction to general traffic along Grantchester Rd or Grantchester St. I feel that any development that brings fast cycling into the centre of Newnham would be dangerous and a threat to the nature of the area.	To be minimal and discreet		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	0	1	0	0	0	1	I don't walk far but improvements in Newnham area will be helpful	3	3	3	1	4	2	1	1	5	5	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	I have very good experience of solar stud lighting in Newnham, simple attractive and effective.	Childish and unhelpful to tourists and visitors who will need a map / codebook to interpret these abbreviations. Long names can be shortened in more conventional ways eg H'Field, H'Sea, but most could be printed in full, eg St Ives. No one will be going so fast that they cannot be read.	Think proposals are fine, even oldies like me will have more time to manoever and will run less risk of being mown down by cyclists or galloping horses.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75 and above	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
No opinion	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	3	Concerned about area 3 - crossing a beautiful spinney in Barton parish - please do not destroy our rural setting. Connectivity with Addenbrookes / Biomed much more direct with Hauxton route.			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	1	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		Although I support the solar studs as a "better than no lighting" option I believe good lighting is essential for the safety of cyclists etc using the paths. Solar lights don't provide good light if it has been a dull few days.	The M11 bridge option B would be unsuitable for wheelchair / pushchair access. Option A is significantly more disabled person friendly.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Support	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	I have a concern about who has priority at functions and that cyclists will ignore signage. Also that Barton Rd will become a speed run, endangering other traffic and pedestrians using or crossing the path			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Flyer			
Oppose	0	0	0	0	0	1	Dog walk every day.	5	2	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	0	5	The proposed Haslingfield to Hauxton cycleway is neither needed or wanted. The bridleway provides a fine country amenity for horseriders, dog walkers and walkers. In its current state it is awonderful area for wildlife, with trees hedgerows and set aside fields running down to the river. A concrete strip throughthe area would ruin its current diversity. Please do not do this.		Elderly people who cannot ride a bike and may not run a car, but have a dog to exercise, need the country walks to keep fit. In picture one I see no sign of walkers or dog walkers on the pathway. It would appear we are being ignored.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	No	Leaflet			
Strongly support	1	1	0	0	0	0		1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	2				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65-74	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		Leaflet			

| | | |