

April 17th 2005

Our ref: PO5 001
Your ref:

Councillor Member
Cambridge Environment & Transport
Area Joint Committee



Cambridge Cycling Campaign

P.O. Box 204, Cambridge CB4 3FN
01223 690718 (phone & fax)
contact@camcycle.org.uk
www.camcycle.org.uk

Dear Councillor,

CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE
18th APRIL 2005

Here are Cambridge Cycling Campaign's comments and suggestions on some of the issues to be considered by the AJC on Monday 18th April in the hope that these may be of interest.

PROPOSED CORN EXCHANGE STREET CYCLE CONTRAFLOW

We were surprised and disappointed that on 12th April the County Council's Cabinet decided to defer their decision on whether to support the proposed cycle contraflow in Corn Exchange Street. The Officer's recommendation was to support it and Councillor Shona Johnstone, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, spoke eloquently in favour of the Officer's recommendation. However Cabinet were not willing to give their support at this stage and will now have further discussions on the subject with Officers of the Cabinet Senior Management Team. If this issue comes before the AJC again at their meeting on Monday, we hope for a clear AJC recommendation to both the County and the City Councils that the contraflow proposal deserves support.

AGENDA ITEM 3(a) CAMBRIDGE CORE TRAFFIC SCHEME STAGE 5: CENTRAL AREA BUS MANAGEMENT

20MPH ZONE

The Officer's report states that "One of the original aspirations of the Core Traffic Scheme was to introduce a 20mph speed limit across the whole of the Core Area to improve safety particularly for pedestrians and cyclists." We strongly support this aspiration and would favour its immediate implementation. Given the scale of pedestrian and cycle journeys within the core area we cannot see any justification for delay.

The current proposal for a new 20mph zone in the historic centre is to be welcomed but we believe that it covers too small an area (see Plan No.1). If implementation within the whole core is at present impracticable, a better interim scheme would be to set the boundary of the new zone as the ring defined by the following roads: Chesterton Lane, Chesterton Road, Victoria Avenue, Maid's Causeway, Newmarket Road, East Road, Gonville Place, Lensfield Road, Fen Causeway, Newnham Road, Queen's Road, Northampton Street. None of these boundary roads would, however, be within the suggested new zone.

The main differences from the zone proposed in the Officer's report are that the following roads would now be included: the whole of Trumpington Street, the whole of Regent Street, Parkside, Park Terrace, Burleigh Street/Fitzroy Street and the many small streets in the Kite area, King Street, the whole of Jesus Lane, Malcolm Street, Manor Street.

This proposed zone would be consistent with the County's policy. It is a clearly defined zone (more clearly defined than the one proposed in the Officer's report). It includes no streets listed in the Core Area Speed Survey (Appendix A) with higher speeds than can reasonably be accommodated within the County's policy. (If any streets do turn out not to satisfy the self-enforcing requirement, consideration could, as the Officer's report states, be given "to introduce further traffic calming measures to achieve self-enforcement.") Our suggested zone would avoid the need to install new speed limit signs in such sensitive places as outside Peterhouse College, the end of Fitzwilliam Street and the junction of Jesus Lane with Park Street.

STREETSCAPE PROJECT GROUP WORK.

We welcome most of these proposals so far as we can understand them from the very small-scale diagram provided (Diagram 1). At this stage we would mention only our anxiety about the two proposed new locations for taxi ranks (in St Andrew's Street and Drummer Street). In both cases bicycles travelling South would have to contend on their left with oncoming taxis facing in the wrong direction entering and leaving the ranks. This is not a desirable arrangement.

AGENDA ITEM 4(a)

MILTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT REVIEW

There is a curious discrepancy in bus journey times for Elizabeth Way roundabout to the Arbury Road turning between those observed in September-October 2004 and those recorded by on-bus GPS recording in November-December (Appendix C). The discrepancy needs to be explained but, if the GPS recordings of more than a hundred bus journeys are correct, not a single bus appears to have taken more than two minutes for the journey at this busy time of the year. This must cast doubts on the need for costly bus priority measures here particularly as the latest traffic figures show a continuing reduction in the number of motor vehicles entering Cambridge.

AGENDA ITEM 5(a)

CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENTS

For cyclists this scheme still has serious deficiencies. From the Jane Coston bridge to the underpass beneath the old railway, cyclists are, in effect, being forced off the road onto a shared-use path. High cycle flows of both fast and slow cyclists are expected. We ask Councillors to insist that for the cycling section of this path the Council follows government guidance which states that cycle tracks should be a minimum of three metres wide when intended for two-way use (DfT publication "Cycle Friendly Infrastructure", para 12.1.2). There

is ample space for such a width.

The Campaign's full response to consultation may be of interest

<http://www.camcycle.org.uk/campaigning/letters/2004/NA05003NorthCambridgeJunctionImprovements.pdf>

AGENDA ITEM 5(b)

PROPOSED CYCLEWAY NETWORK- CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE
DEVELOPMENT

We are disappointed that this set of schemes fails to address difficulties experienced by cyclists using the roads of this area. On-road provision should, according to government guidance, be the first priority for cycling. We ask Councillors to insist that the on-road car parking along the Botanic Garden frontage of Trumpington Road be removed, that the street lighting along Brooklands Avenue be improved and that the speed limit along Long Road be reduced to 30mph. We believe that none of these suggestions would be costly to implement.

The Campaign's full response to consultation may be of interest

<http://www.camcycle.org.uk/campaigning/letters/2005/NA05004aSouthCambridgeCycleways.pdf>

Yours sincerely

James Woodburn
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.