

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 2005 23:40:56 +0100 (BST)  
From: Cambridge Cycling Campaign <contact@camcycle.org.uk>  
To: Joyce Patrick <Patrick.Joyce@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>  
cc: Cambridge Cycling Campaign <contact@camcycle.org.uk>, "Nigel Brigham (E-mail)" <nigelb@sustrans.org.uk>, "Clare Rankin (E-mail)" <clare.rankin@cambridge.gov.uk>  
Subject: Re: FW: Strategy

Dear Patrick,

> As promised, the amended provisional cycling strategy to go with our  
> LTP.  
>  
> You will note that it follows closely the old strategy document the  
> difference being that it does not contain a programme. This will come in  
> March 2006. The document reflects our reduced budget - now =A3350k only  
> from the LTP but despite this out action list is essentially unchanged.  
>  
> The programme when it is drawn up (and you will get to see this first)  
> will include not only LTP funded projects but also those from other  
> sources of money - S106, GADG etc. which is where most comes from  
> anyhow.  
>  
> Don't be alarmed at the removal of the user hierarchy, this is now in  
> the main LTP document and it remains unchanged.  
>  
> I have a vanishingly small length of time now before this is to be  
> submitted, so if you really need to seek to change anything please can  
> you be very quick and can it be small!

Thanks for this. We have a few comments as below.

## 1) TARGETS

We'd be interested to know what the targets (marked as XX) are to be. We note that the Cycling and Walking strategy for cambridgegshire states:

"cycling increase in Cambridge as existing target ie one percentage point increase per year as a proportion of the total number of journeys. This

would mean an increase from 13% to 18% (ie an increase of 38%)"

which should be echoed in this document.

## 2) BUS LANES ETC.

At the end of "ensure that schemes that reduce the facilities for cyclists are not introduced unless there are compensating benefits for other sustainable modes of travel or casualty reduction" we'd like to see added:

"and ensuring that there is clear, independently-gathered data used to justify any such change"

## 3) CYCLE PARKING

We would like strengthening of mentions of cycle parking, particularly the need for more provision in public areas. For instance, Oxford's equivalent document has the much stronger:

"The Council will provide, or secure the provision of, 500 new cycle parking places per annum at locations which are accessible to the general public. Priority will be given to key destinations such as town centres, shopping developments, employment locations, public transport nodes (stops/stations/interchanges/Park-and-Ride sites), schools and colleges, public buildings, hospitals and leisure facilities. The Council will seek to ensure that all new cycle parking provision is designed and installed in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix M. [Paragraph 5.7]"

## 4) ENFORCEMENT

We'd particularly like to see this aspect echoed, from the Cycling and Walking strategy for cambridgegshire:

"Work with the Police to develop a concordat for enforcement of traffic regulations where their non-enforcement discourages cycling or causes danger (e.g. parking on statutory cycle lanes) (crime and disorder list, priority3, planned for 2203&2003)"

## 5) HIERARCHY OF USERS

You mentioned:

- > Don't be alarmed at the removal of the user hierarchy, this is now in
- > the main LTP document and it remains unchanged.

We are pleased to see this in the main document. We feel mention should briefly be made in the strategy.

Hope these points are useful.

Best wishes,

Martin