

Review Process

Rather than repeat the assessment of local authority cycling delivery carried out in 2003, the ERCDT is currently reviewing the progress that local authorities have made since then. We have asked local authorities to report the progress they have made. To assist them, a comprehensive guidance document is available at www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk. This sets out how the 2003 assessment was carried out and should enable them to judge how any improvement would be measured.

In 2003 authorities were assessed on ten criteria. This year they should in most cases only need to report progress on eight of these. The first criterion, Local Transport Plan and Cycling Strategy, will have remained unchanged unless the authority has produced a new cycling strategy in the last year. The second criterion, Annual Progress Report, will be reviewed by the ERCDT regional co-ordinator. For the other eight criteria we have asked that authorities only report concisely the progress they have made, including any supporting evidence where they feel appropriate.

We would also like to know how local stakeholders view the progress that their authorities have made. Again we want to know only what has changed. If you feel this change has made conditions worse for cyclists we would also like to know. The reporting form below has been produced to enable you to report your views. We would like you to keep your comments concise and in line with the guidance on each of the criterion. Please include any evidence that you feel would substantiate your comments. Also, please only give your views on **Highway** authorities, i.e. County Councils and Unitaries.

Your completed form should be returned to your local ERCDT regional co-ordinator by 23 July. The regional co-ordinator will use the information to assist them in complete your local authority's progress review. The final review will be sent to your government regional office in September to help them in their assessment of the authority's performance. It will also be posted on the National Cycling Strategy website.

ERCDT Local Authority Assessment 2004 Progress Review Reporting Form for local cycling groups	
Local Authority: Cambridgeshire County Council	
Completed by: Agreed response of Committee	Representing: Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Tel. number: (01223) 690718	Email: contact@camcycle.org.uk
Date completed: July/August 2004	
<p><i>In each of the following boxes the cycling group should give a written description of progress on the specified assessment criterion between July 2003 and June 2004. The guidance document available at www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk can be used to identify where they feel the authority could be seen to have made progress or regressed. Where appropriate please supply evidence to substantiate the written comments.</i></p> <p>The campaign group should attempt to keep comments in each section to an average of 250 words for each.</p>	
<p>Criterion A: Local Transport Plan and Cycling Strategy</p> <p><i>Unless the authority has published a new cycling strategy since the first assessment, nothing should be reported in this section.</i></p> <p><i>If a new cycling strategy has been produced we would like to know the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>How has your group been consulted at all stages in the development of the strategy and how well are your comments reflected in the final document?</i> <i>If the strategy was fully implemented how well do you feel it would improve provision for cyclists within the authority area?</i> <p>Your comments:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>	
<p>Criterion B: Annual Progress Report</p> <p><i>Please comment on the following issues regarding the production of the APR. Note we are not seeking views on its content as the 2004 APR will not be produced until after the closing date for this consultation.:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Has your group been consulted during the preparation of the 2004 APR?</i> <i>In the past, how well has the completed APR been distributed and publicised?</i> <p>Your comments:</p> <p>1. No, we have not been consulted on the LTP APR.</p> <p>2. The completed LTP APR has been distributed and publicised reasonably well. However, we feel that consultation on the revised LTP was extremely poor.</p>	
<p>Criterion C: Council Commitment</p> <p><i>Please describe any improvements in political and officer commitment to cycling that you are aware of in the last year. In particular:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>How senior officer and member involvement in consultation with cycling group may have</i> 	

increased

2. *Consistently positive statements about cycling from officers and members*
3. *Increased staff resources to deliver improvements for cycling*
4. *Increased expenditure for cycling and measures that indirectly improve conditions for cycling in particular willingness to press ahead with measures that might be considered controversial or "anti car".*
5. *The council setting an example by encouraging its staff to cycle, through an effective green travel plan and other measures.*

Your comments:

1. Consultation schemes have not increased, but are currently at an acceptable level (see later comments).

2. Statements about cycling from Officers are consistently fairly positive. Members are also reasonably positive, although in some cases, particular individuals view cyclists in general as law-breakers.

3. Limited resources often prevent delivery. Commitments over the production of, and consultations about a 'Cycling Design Guide' seem unlikely to be met in good time.

4. We have observed no particular change in the past year with a mixture of 'pro-car' and 'pro-cycling' policies. The council's long-running 'Core Scheme' continues to restrict car movements in Cambridge city centre, to the benefit of cyclists and amid much criticism from motorists. However the council is unprepared to do anything that would restrict traffic capacity on the (inner) ring road, recently rejecting a safety scheme (signals) for an important junction with a poor cycle accident record on the grounds that it would cause delays to traffic. We have seen one 'brave' scheme recently to allow two-way cycling in a city centre street where councillors on the relevant council committee were prepared to overturn officer advice (it is likely to be overturned by the council's Cabinet).

5. Cambridge City and County do well in their encouragement of 'Green Travel'.

Criterion D: Infrastructure

*Please comment on any new infrastructure introduced **within the last year** that might directly or indirectly change conditions for cyclists. (The guidance at www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk sets out the range of infrastructure measures that should be considered). We would specifically like to know if:*

The needs of cyclists are adequately considered in all schemes

The design and implementation of schemes exhibits best practice

Measures introduced for cyclists consistently support the development and improvement of a strategic cycling network

Measures for cyclists are well built and appropriate, well advertised, signed and maintained

(Please give examples and where possible attach brief supporting information such as photographs)

Your comments:

Generally, we would answer 'no' to each question. Design and implementation is rarely to best practice, for example with the LA in question taking minimum recommended widths as the standard to be aimed for. This situation has not changed in the last year. Measures for cyclists, however, are often well promoted, as in previous years.

One example of good infrastructure in the last year has been the new Milton

Bridge, although the entrances to it are poor and the assumption that cycle tracks rather than more direct, on-road joins, are automatically the way to provide for cycle provision has prevailed, with one accident already having taken place because of poor visibility.

The new Coldham's Lane Bridge is an example of inadequate provision which, as we expected, has resulted in expectations by motorists that cyclists 'should' be using it, when many cyclists themselves find the facility inadequate for their needs.

Our Newsletters [www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters] feature our views in more detail on a range of schemes which have been implemented over the past year.

There has been a particular emphasis over the last few years on bus priority, often at the expense of cyclists (e.g. by removal of cycle lanes or effectively forcing cyclists off the road onto cycle tracks). In our view this represents a decrease in the relative importance attributed to cycling by the county council.

Criterion E: Cyclist Training

We would specifically like to know if the council supports cyclist training as a positive means to promote cycling. We would also like to know if you have any concerns or comments about the quality of training offered.

Your comments:

Cambridgeshire County Council has a scheme for adult cycle training and several members are registered trainers. More funding for this scheme is needed, as many more people would be likely to want training if this scheme were better publicised.

Criterion F: Marketing and promotion

We would like your comments on any new cycling promotion that has been undertaken by the authority in the last year. We particularly want to know how effectively the following might market / promote cycling :

- 1. Any new marketing and promotional materials, campaigns, websites etc that may have been published*
- 2. Any new events or programmes in addition to existing ones*
- 3. Any new signing of existing or new cycle measures and how this might help promote their use and awareness of them*

Your comments:

No comments.

Criterion G: Stakeholder Engagement

We would like to know how the council's consultation with cycling groups has changed within the last year. In particular, has the scope of consultation and the response of the council to this changed for better or for worse?

Your comments:

On most major schemes there is good stakeholder involvement from an early stage, with the Cambridge Cycling Campaign involvement often limited by our own resources. Where we do still have concerns is over 'Section 106' developments. These often happen with little or no consultation, the first evidence being the appearance of the 'facilities',

However, schemes are rarely changed following consultation responses. In general, our

comments are often ignored, even comments suggesting small changes which would benefit cyclists.

Criterion H: Wider Engagement

This refers to programmes for workplace and school travel plans, safe routes to school, home zones, road safety education and work with health bodies. While these might not always be directly targeted at cycling they can affect the climate in which cycling exists. Has the council changed its delivery in any of these in a way that would influence cycling and the perception of cycling? Do the messages about cycling that these programmes give promote cycling in a positive light?

Your comments:

The Campaign has contacts with some of these bodies, with our Liaison Officer chairing the Travel for Work steering group.

Criterion I: Planning for Cycling

Has the council improved the way cycling is provided for in new developments? Does it take full advantage of funding through planning gain to improve conditions for cycling in the areas around new developments? (Please give examples and where possible attach supporting information such as photographs)

Your comments:

Within Cambridgeshire problems occur because 'planning' is generally the responsibility of the Districts, with 'transport' the responsibility of the County. Within the City of Cambridge the development control department appears to have no mechanism to ensure that submitted plans meet 'Local Plan' requirements regarding cycle provision, and there also appears to be a reluctance to enforce these standards for example, on cycle parking, which is often short of the required, mandatory standards.

Notwithstanding this, the City Council is generally much better at considering cyclists than South Cambridgeshire.

Criterion J: Targets and Monitoring

Are you aware of any new targets that the council has introduced for cycling? Has it carried out any monitoring of cycling by measuring the number of cyclists or another indicator (e.g number of bikes parked at the station)?

Your comments:

We are concerned that there are NO real biting targets for cycle use in the current LTP, unlike that for bus use. We believe that there needs to be a target to INCREASE the share of trips by bike in Cambridge.

Measurements of cycle use in Cambridge have been carried out via a 'River Cam' screenline for a number of years and this does provide valuable data. Some 20,000 cyclists cross the river Cam each week-day. With the 'cordon' survey around Cambridge, following requests from the Campaign a number of routes used by cyclists away from main roads have been included. Until the opening of the 'final' Park and Ride site at Trumpington this cordon survey showed more people travelling into Cambridge from the surrounding area each week-day bike than by the 'award winning' Park and Ride service.

Some locations have automatic monitoring, but we are aware that there are concerns about the reliability of such methods where volumes are high or site are close to vehicular routes. Apart from the 'screenline' and 'cordon' counts only 17 manual and 6 automatic sites in the Cambridge area are reported in the Traffic Monitoring Report for 2003. Some sites are monitored in the Market Towns

Although the Campaign has carried out surveys of bike parking in the City and at the Station, no results of similar surveys are published in the County Council Annual Traffic Monitoring reports. However, it is very common knowledge that cycle parking is woefully short.

We believe that surveys to determine the value of cycling to the community, and better target improvements to cater for suppressed demand are long overdue.

General comments:

Briefly comment on how you feel the council has reacted to the ERCDT assessment and any other general comments on their progress that might not be covered by the criteria above.

Your comments:

We are not aware that the Council has officially reacted to the ERCDT review. We would like to see them do so.