

Date: Wed, 12 Oct 2005 17:38:44 +0100 (BST)
From: Martin Lucas-Smith - Cambridge Cycling Campaign <contact@camcycle.org.uk>
To: localplaninquiry@cambridge.gov.uk
Cc: Cambridge Cycling Campaign <contact@camcycle.org.uk>
Subject: Local Plan - Cambridge Cycling Campaign: proofs of evidence

Dear Ms Alexander,

> Further to my email of yesterday, and your email below, please would you
> get back to me urgently concerning the sessions currently programmed for
> the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. I now need to revise the Inquiry
> Programme for the rest of the sessions and need your up to date
> information.

We write with regard to our Local Plan objections regarding the cycle parking standards.

We wish the Inspector to pay particular attention to the following issues that we raised, which we submit as Proofs Of Evidence in conjunction with our original submissions:

1/ That there is an urgent need for more cycle parking across the city, and the revision of the standards downwards is not conducive in tackling this, nor is there any systematic policy to increase cycle parking in public places. Theft has increased to a very high level, and the existence of bikes parked in unofficial areas practically everywhere across the city, with little official parking available shows why this is the case.

2/ That there seems to be no mechanism for routinely ensuring that developers include cycle parking in their developments, nor of its quantity. Any number of planning applications have passed with levels of cycle parking below what is required, or with none at all. There seems to be no mechanism for routinely ensuring that developers include cycle parking in their developments, nor of its quantity, despite the existing cycle parking Standards.

On one occasion (the Cambridge Leisure development), we requested from an Officer of the City Council what the level of cycle parking should be; it

took several weeks for a response while the Officer went away to calculate the result. This proves our case that there is no effective system in place.

Our suggested mandatory pro-forma, a required submission along with other documents relating to a proposed development, would provide a simple way for developers themselves to calculate the level and also be aware of the need at all for cycle parking. It is totally untenable for a voluntary campaign such as ourselves to have to be put in the effective position of monitoring developments for the existence and level of cycle parking and then chasing each up individually.

If there remains any doubt as to the validity of our claims, we propose that the Inspector request of the City Council a table of data covering an arbitrary 3/6/12-month period between 2002-4 with an entry for each development during that period listing the: (i) Location of development, (ii) Amount of cycle parking required under the existing Standards and (iii) Amount of cycle parking actually provided. We strongly suspect that such data would not be available, and even where it is, the numbers in (iii) would generally be below that in (ii).

We believe that planning applications which do not include details of what cycle parking will be provided, and/or which do not demonstrate that such cycle parking meets the levels required by the Standards, should be rejected automatically (just as, for example, the Local Plan states that applications which fail to give enough detail on roof-level air conditioning plant will be rejected.)

3/ The Council have not commented on the proposal for investigating the re-introduction of commuted payments, nor said why they were originally scrapped. While there is a need to have this fully investigated before we could fully be in favour of it, it is demonstrably the case that some developers (e.g. Grand Arcade, Bradwell's Court) have got away with including much less cycle parking than is required by the existing standards on the grounds that there is not space, and as such have been entirely let off providing the required number of stands.

4/ The Council have not commented on our request that the diagram of high-capacity stands be deleted from the Standards. We feel there are only very limited cases where such stands are suitable, and their prominent

inclusion in the standards does not help to give this impression.

5/ We accept the City Council's suggested changes of March 2005 relating to clarifying the wording of the bullet points as we requested.

We look forward to the Inspector's serious consideration of these points, as a means to ensure that the City Council take seriously the need to address the desperate cycle parking shortage which exists across the city, policies for which are inconsistently applied and are inadequate.

Martin Lucas-Smith, ** www.camcycle.org.uk
Co-ordinator & Webmaster, ** contact@camcycle.org.uk
Cambridge Cycling Campaign **
Join the Campaign (£7.50) at: www.camcycle.org.uk/membership/join/