

January 26, 2003

Our ref: <C 03 007>

Sybille Thirion  
Cambridge City Council  
Environment & Planning  
FREEPOST ANG6390  
Cambridge  
CB2 3YA



### Cambridge Cycling Campaign

P.O. Box 204, Cambridge CB4 3FN

01223 690718 (phone & fax)

[contact@camcycle.org.uk](mailto:contact@camcycle.org.uk)

[www.camcycle.org.uk](http://www.camcycle.org.uk)

Your ref:

Dear Ms Thirion,

#### **Cycle and Car Parking Standards**

We welcome revision of these and offer our thanks for consulting us. Our comments follow.

In general, we warmly welcome the proposed standards. We are particularly pleased to see a statement, in the form of point 1.1, explicitly recognising that high quality cycle parking facilities will help increase the level of cycling in Cambridge.

#### **Implementation of the standards**

Our main concern on the standards in the past has been the extent to which they are implemented. We are concerned that, in the past, cycle parking has inexplicably not been included as part of new developments where the existing standards mandate such provision.

How are planning applications checked against the standards? What steps does the planning department take to ensure that the required cycle parking is actually constructed?

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with you.

#### **Quantity of Cycle Parking**

We welcome the importance given to achieving a good ratio of parking spaces to floor area. Naturally, we would welcome levels as high as possible, within sensible limits.

We would welcome an additional point between sections 1.2 and 1.3 reminding developers that these are *minimum* standards and that the provision of parking beyond what is statutorily required is encouraged and is likely to be in their best interests, given the relatively high levels of cycle usage in Cambridge.

We would prefer explicit explanation of levels required in cases currently described as "on merit". We see no justification for the lack of a minimum standard, in particular for hospital

developments, given cycling's important contribution to health. Minimum standards would make the requirements clear for developers, rather than opening up a potential loophole.

We would welcome higher levels for educational institutions, especially junior schools.

### **Location of Cycle Parking**

We welcome the part of section 1.3 which says "Cycle parking should be located near the main entrance to buildings." but would like to see it strengthened to avoid the developer deliberately installing cycle parking in a remote part of the site purely to satisfy the cycle parking standards.

We have in mind the recent supermarket redevelopment at the Beehive Centre, where most of the additional cycle parking was installed at the far side of the site in a location where no supermarket users would use it.

We object to the part of the same section which states "Cycle parking should be preferably located on-site, in particular in the area comprised in the inner ring road where there is a scarcity of space. If located off-site, there should be good natural surveillance." In our view, cycle parking should always be on-site except for the case mentioned in section 1.4 when the development cannot physically accommodate cycle parking and commuted payments are paid.

### **Commuted Payments**

With regard to section 1.4, concerning commuted payments: we would welcome assurance that such a payment will actually be used for cycle parking provision elsewhere in the City. There is arguably a general shortage of parking around the City, both in the historic core and more widely, and such payments would help reduce this shortage.

### **Access to Cycle Parking**

Section 1.3, point 3 appears to be slightly misworded. May we suggest it be replaced to something along the lines of: "Cycle stands (for two cycles) should be installed 1m apart and at least 0.6m from a wall or walkway in order to accommodate cycles with front basket, child seats and panniers."

We object to the part of section 1.3 which says that "cycle parking segregate cycles from car flows when accessing the site and in the site itself because segregated provision may not be necessary or desirable.

We suggest this be replaced by a more general and less onerous requirement that there should be safe and convenient cycle access to the cycle parking from the public road network and from any nearby cycle routes.

### **Design of Cycle Parking**

We welcome the sentence in section 1.3 which says "The cycle parking should provide good support for the cycle and provide a convenient place to lock the frame of the bike to the cycle parking stand."

However we feel that more needs to be said on this subject and would like to see it expanded and promoted into a section of its own. Quality of provision should be an important aspect of any standards.

We would draw your attention to the recent Home Office experiment which studied the most optimal designs for cycle parking. Those most successful were those where the frame could be locked easily and where the cycle was provided with support at two points so that it did not fall over. In this regard, we would welcome explicit mention of 'Sheffield stands and similar designs', this format being the most optimal in our view.

We would also like to see a statement that concrete slots or the widely-used V-grip design are not acceptable.

### **Car Parking Standards**

We would ask whether the format of the booklet could be combined so as to put both cycle parking and car parking into a single chart in each section, helping integrate these.

We concur with the Council's approach of seeking a minimal level of provision of car parking, recognising both the practicalities of lack of space, and of discouragement of car usage in the City Centre, within the context of essential cases such as people with disabilities.

### **Encouraging and helping developers**

On a related matter, we would ask the Council to consider production of a short, accessible booklet outlining the practicalities of providing cycle parking. We will also be asking the County Council for such a guide to be included in forthcoming *Design Guide*, and so cross-Council co-operation on this would seem sensible.

Such a practical guide would encourage developers, including contractors for Council-funded projects, to install cycle parking more easily and could explain why it is good to provide cycle parking facilities. We believe this would help them to see cycle parking in a positive light, rather than as a burden to be overcome.

This guide could include images of best practice examples, details of where cycle parking stands can be obtained (together with approximate costings) and installed, by way of clear diagrams indicating basic issues surrounding correct installation.

We hope the above suggestions are helpful and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,  
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign,

Martin Lucas-Smith,  
Co-ordinator