

March 13, 2009

Our ref: C 09 011

Sir Brian Briscoe, Professor Tony Travers,
Cambridgeshire Transport Commission
Box No. ET1041
Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP



Cambridge Cycling Campaign

P.O. Box 204, Cambridge CB4 3FN
Phone: 01223 690718 fax: 07092 376664
contact@camcycle.org.uk
www.camcycle.org.uk

Dear Sir Brian and Professor Travers,

Cambridgeshire Transport Commission – evidence to the Commission

We write in response to the call for evidence. We very much welcome the evidence-led approach to investigation of the TIF proposals, and write in that spirit.

The Commission may be aware that we are one of the organisations that came out broadly in favour of the TIF proposals, namely c. £500m of up-front government investment combined with a weekday morning-only congestion charge. This remains our position. We created a website, <http://www.UnclogCambridge.com/> which was launched to dispel some of the myths and set out in clearer terms the benefits. This went live only a few days before Cllr Jill Tuck changed the course of the TIF proposals by announcing the Commission.

Whilst we have some reservations about aspects of the proposals, and would like to see a greater proportion of the investment channelled towards cycling – as well as a shift in County Council mindsets on some issues, we feel the proposals offer at least the possibility of achieving widespread traffic reduction and a shift towards sustainable transport in the greater Cambridge area.

We would very much welcome the opportunity to appear as a witness at one of the forthcoming public meetings.

1. About ourselves	2
2. Background: cycling's role in transport in and around Cambridge	2
3. Best-practice provision for cycling: the Hierarchy of Provision	6
4. Rationales for TIF	10
5. Provision for cycling in the current TIF proposals	12
6. Criticisms of aspects of the TIF proposals that we wish to see addressed	13
7. Rebuttal of points made in submissions and evidence given by other parties	15
8. Issues and myths	19
9. Summary.....	21

1. About ourselves

By way of introduction, Cambridge Cycling Campaign is a non-partisan, local voluntary organisation with around 1,000 fee-paying members. We work closely with local government and others to improve conditions for cyclists in Cambridge. Whilst Cambridge has high rates of cycling by UK standards, we believe that conditions and the level of cycling should be raised to match what is being achieved on the continent. And, although we are a body working for cycling, our aim ultimately is more widely towards a sustainable transport system.

We have a range of expert knowledge on a wide range of transport matters (cycling in particular). One member of our Committee, for instance, is a former employee of the Transport Research Laboratory. We pride ourselves on accurate and well-researched campaigning and reporting.

We also are strong supporters of responsible cycling, a matter mentioned below.

We have reached our view on the TIF / Congestion Charge proposals through discussion of this topic in three of the monthly meetings we hold for members, and through discussions on our e-mail discussion lists. The present response has been agreed by our Committee, taking into account member views.

2. Background: cycling's role in transport in and around Cambridge

We firstly set out a range of issues relating to cycling's role in the transport arena in Cambridge. We make no apologies for the length of this introductory material, as these points of background are crucial in understanding our overall position with respect to the TIF and the Congestion Charge.

2.1 Levels of cycling

The 2001 UK Census shows¹ that, in Cambridge in 2001, 25.91% of workers between the ages of 16 and 74 travelled to work by bicycle. This was by far the highest proportion in England and Wales, and is almost ten times the national rate of 2.76% at that time.

According to Cambridgeshire County Council's 1996/97 TPP bid, around 20% of all trips in Cambridge are made by bike. Throughout the County (rather than just Cambridge city), about 11% of all journeys to work are made by bike. We do not believe these figures have substantially changed.

We believe these figures do not generally include trips made by University students, but in practice these tend to be fairly localised in the city centre rather than spread widely around the city.

2.2 Cycling's enormous contribution to congestion reduction

As we outlined in an article² in our *Newsletter* (our main publication) back in 1998, entitled 'An Economic Case for Better Cycleways', the road network in Cambridge operates close to

¹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/47/article22.html>

capacity at peak times. A small change in motor traffic can cause a large change in delays under these conditions.

This effect is most noticeable outside school term times. Anecdotally, people in Cambridge refer to levels of traffic outside term as being perhaps 20-30% lower. However, the actual traffic volume itself is believed to be 10% or slightly lower (ibid.). Partly, this difference reflects a (quite natural) poor understanding by the public of queuing theory as applied to transport. There is a perception, even among some Councillors, that delays are directionally proportional to flows, whereas a better estimate is an exponential relationship. It is only the perceived cost of delay that holds current flows in check. The true cost of delays is of course considerably higher.

Given that cycling rates are well above this network congestion threshold, it is clear that modal shift from cycling to cars would have very serious effects on congestion.

Cycling therefore makes an enormous contribution to keeping congestion levels down in Cambridge. Whilst the 'tabloid' view of cyclists may be of being 'free-loaders' (a matter which we would dispute) and a 'nuisance' (ditto) the fact is that cycling, as an everyday and widespread activity in Cambridge, results in an enormous benefit to motorists, to the economy, and to people in Cambridge more generally, because of its decongestion effects.

Furthermore, this provides, in our view, ample justification for investment in cycling out of general taxation, as this benefits not only cyclists but car drivers.

We have suggested that the County Council ought to undertake a computer-modelling of a 'No Cycling Day', in which those who own a car but choose to use their bicycle instead switch mode to their car for a single day. We feel this would help demonstrate, especially to those who are not natural supporters of cycling, the benefit motorists receive in terms of reduced traffic due to cycling.

Cycling is not *the* panacea for solving transport problems in Cambridge, but it is a major component of the solution.

Cycling also provides health benefits and therefore reduces costs associated with poor health, as well as lowering pollution and CO₂. Not only would the TIF proposals encourage cycling and walking (even if just as part of a public transport trip), but it would also reduce the pollution in the city centre for all those living and working there.

2.3 Who cycles in Cambridge?

As is clear from standing near any main road junction in Cambridge, the whole range of people in Cambridge cycle. As in continental cities with high levels of cycling, it is not a fringe activity confined to youngsters with a high level of fitness, or 'lycra louts', but a normal activity undertaken as a regular part of ordinary, everyday life.

Cyclists in Cambridge range from the very young to those of riper years, people in suits to those in casual clothing, people who cycle for short trips or commute for longer (>5 mile) trips, those who live in Cambridge and those in villages, people who cycle for work or pleasure, people who cycle in good weather or at all times, and so on.

² <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/18/article14.html>

2.4 Car ownership and use amongst cyclists

We wish to dispel the myth that those who cycle do not generally drive cars. Whilst of course some groups, such as students, are unlikely to drive cars in Cambridge, our own Members' Survey shows that very many cyclists own and use cars. They also use public transport at times and walk.

Results of our 2004 Members' Survey³ showed that, of the 293 responses we received (from our 700 members at the time, with this 42% response rate being high for what was a relatively detailed survey):

- Over 90% have a driving licence and three-quarters of respondents' households have a car (though this latter figure must acknowledge that many respondents will be members of the same household).
- Well over half of respondents drive and even more are regular walkers.

It is clear from these figures that many cyclists are people who own cars but choose to cycle instead for some or many journeys. These are people who, in particular, can be said to be subsidising those who remain in their cars, having paid road tax but providing decongestion effects. That said, much local transport is funded through Council Tax – paid not just by motorists – rather than central government funding.

Ownership but lower use of cars is a phenomenon clearly not limited to our members. People who live in terraced streets, for instance, will be aware of many cars left parked on-street for most of the time but used only for shopping or special trips for leisure purposes.

In passing, we note that we do not regard ourselves as an 'anti-car' organisation. If we projected our messages as such, we would lose members rapidly. Instead, we work to promote cycling as a realistic and widespread alternative to driving, and advocate responsible and lower car-use. Furthermore, we regard existing congestion as an anti-car issue. Lowered levels of congestion that congestion charging would encourage could arguably be regarded as a pro-car measure, for those that continue to drive. We discuss this below.

2.5 Issues relating to responsible cycling

We acknowledge that there are significant levels of irresponsible or illegal cycling in Cambridge (just as there are significant levels of irresponsible and illegal motoring). As a body, we have issued clear statements against such activity, most notably in our *Position Paper on Responsible, Legal Cycling*⁴. In this we make clear that:

"The Campaign supports enforcement (applied in a fair and reasonable manner) of all traffic regulations, for all categories of road user, to reduce conflict and road danger."

We have attended many meetings, public or with officials, at which we have stressed our desire for increased levels of enforcement against rogue cyclists.

We do believe, however, that it is objectively reasonable from a public policy perspective to treat this in the context of the varied levels of road danger presented by different classes of road user. As we outline in the same paper (with references given there):

³ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/64/article11.html> and <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/65/article12.html>

⁴ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/campaigning/papers/legality/>

“Enforcement of the rules is important for all road users. However, the consequences of transgressions by motorists are likely to be far more serious than those by cyclists. We understand that pedestrian deaths caused by cyclists are about one every two years nationally (and that, in terms of injuries, more cyclists than pedestrians are hurt in cycle/pedestrian collisions). By way of comparison, 823 pedestrians were killed by motor vehicles in 2001. Moreover, 53% of motorists do not obey the speed limit in urban roads with a 30mph speed limit; 95% of vulnerable road users survive a collision at 20mph; at 40mph only 15% survive.”

The levels of risk presented by different classes of road user require different policy responses and different types of enforcement activity. That said, we reiterate our view in favour of increased levels of enforcement against illegal or inconsiderate cycling.

2.6 Better, cyclist-responsive highway design as a means to increase cycling levels and reduce irresponsible cycling

A large part of our remit is to campaign for better highway design, which in our view has a consequent lowering of incidences of law-breaking. We discuss this issue in the ‘Legislation and its enforcement’ section our *Cycling 2020* document⁵.

Having conducted Study Visits to the Netherlands⁶ on several occasions, it is very clear to us that levels of errant cycling are lower there because the highway design approach genuinely meets the needs of cyclists rather than merely paying lip-service to it (as is often the case in the UK). People there seem to have no desire to break the law because their natural inclinations for convenient and safe cycling are already provided for them. Particular factors appear to be the use of lower speed limits, different legal apparatus (e.g. liability laws applying to motorists are different and signage caters for cycling more sensibly), and widespread provision for cyclists which emphasises cycle convenience (often at a preferential level over car transport), rather than merely safety.

Under these conditions, it is not surprising that such a high percentage of people in the Netherlands and similar countries cycle. It is this model, of vastly more convenient cycling, resulting in safety and legal cycling as a by-product, that we, as an organisation in the UK, work to promote.

In Cambridge, we believe that significant levels of pavement cycling are due to poor highway design that neglects the needs of cyclists. Obstructive car parking in key locations presents particular difficulties, as does high levels of congestion where no specific on-road space for cycling is created. East Road, part of the ring road, is an area where there is extreme congestion, on-road car parking outside shops (causing cyclists to have to merge into the main traffic stream, which is a very off-putting manoeuvre for many cyclists) and, unsurprisingly, much pavement cycling, to the rightful annoyance of pedestrians. We wish to see removal of obstructive car parking, and on-road cycle lanes of good width, combined with the crucial factor of calmed traffic (slower speeds) to facilitate convenient and legal cycling.

In summary, we feel that responsible cycling will only become widespread when decision-makers take bold political steps to cater for a road environment which meets cyclists’ needs.

By providing on-road space for cycling, and combining this with slower speeds, new people will be encouraged to cycle and will feel naturally inclined to do so in a legal and responsible

⁵ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/legislation/>

⁶ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/events/visits/>

manner. As a Campaign, we see it as our responsibility to help leverage the support of decision-makers towards this policy objective.

3. Best-practice provision for cycling: the Hierarchy of Provision

Support for cycling as a means of transport is covered in a very wide range of policy documents, both nationally and locally, and we do not propose to create a referenced list, as this is easy to find. However, in practice the situation on the ground is different. Creating the conditions for improving cycling requires real political commitment and resources. The common ‘blue sign on a pavement’ mindset is nothing of the sort.

Decision-makers often assume wrongly that cycle groups wish to see pavements everywhere being allowed to be used by cyclists. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As the most recent relevant guidance from the Department for Transport⁷ states:

“The road network is the most basic (and important) cycling facility available, and the preferred way of providing for cyclists is to create conditions on the carriageway where cyclists are content to use it, particularly in urban areas.

There is seldom the opportunity to provide an off-carriageway route within the highway boundary that does not compromise pedestrian facilities or create potential hazards for cyclists, particularly at side roads.

*Measures that reduce the volume or speed of motor traffic benefit other road users by making the roads safer and more pleasant for them to use.’
(Cycle Infrastructure Design, LTN 2/08).*

Various national guidance sets out the Hierarchy of Provision (ibid). We strongly agree with it, though in practice it is rarely followed:

Consider first	Traffic reduction
	Speed reduction
	Junction treatment, hazard site treatment, traffic management
	Reallocation of carriageway space (e.g. bus lanes, widened nearside lanes, cycle lanes)
	Cycle tracks away from roads
Consider last	Conversion of footways/footpaths to shared use cycle tracks for pedestrians and cyclists

We outline these in more detail here, and again make no apologies for doing so, as the means of genuinely promoting cycling are not familiar to many. Poor provision is widespread around the country⁸, and Cambridge contains many examples (though there are also examples of good practice!).

⁷ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpm/ltnotes/lt208.pdf>

⁸ <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/pete.meg/wcc/facility-of-the-month/>; see the archive links on that page.

The TIF proposals offer real opportunities to bring about traffic reduction (at least, not large increases that would otherwise occur) and significant reallocation of road space. We see no other prospect on the table of such measures happening in any other way.

3.1 Highest priority: Traffic reduction

At the top of the Hierarchy of Provision to encourage cycling is traffic reduction. In practice this means changes such as:

- Reducing the number of lanes for motor traffic at junctions⁹.
- Closing off through-routes (particular those involving rat-running). In areas such as Petersfield, the closure points that prevent through traffic¹⁰ are simple and cheap yet effective measures that encourage walking and cycling.
- Bollard closures, which we have strongly supported in Cambridge, as a means of preventing through-traffic. Indeed our own postcard campaign in favour of the Bridge Street closure¹¹ is has been mentioned by some County Council officers as being fundamental to the existence of Cambridge Core Traffic Scheme. We think there are few people these days that would seriously argue for Bridge Street to be reopened to through-traffic.
- And, of course, more radical measures such as congestion charging. In London, the original central London congestion charge led to an immediate reduction in motor vehicle traffic and a 30% increase in cycling¹², despite few cycling-specific measures being put in place. Cycling remains at higher levels than ever before in London.

Clearly, congestion charging presents a major opportunity for traffic reduction. It also provides the ability to free up space (see 'Reallocation of carriageway space' below) that is needed to increase and encourage cycling.

3.2 Next priority: reducing speeds

The second-highest priority for improving cycling is reducing speeds, which has a whole range of positive effects. Area-wide speed reduction in Cambridge would arguably increase levels of cycling far more than any cycling-specific infrastructure ever could.

We support the 'Twenty's Plenty for us' campaign¹³ which promotes 20mph as the standard speed limit in local areas. We feel that 30mph should be the standard limit for main streets that connect these areas together. 20mph as the norm would result in a much improved general environment for local areas, which we think would be welcomed by local communities. As a starting point, we feel it inexcusable that the whole Core area of the City Centre is still a mish-mash of 20mph and 30mph zones, rather than a coherent 20mph area¹⁴.

We think that speed reduction should form a key part of the TIF proposals.

⁹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/roadspace/junctions.html>

¹⁰ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/map/location/12506/nearby.html>

¹¹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/17/article1.html>

¹² <http://www.lcc.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1191>

¹³ <http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk/> and see <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/81/article2.html>

¹⁴ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/traffic/20mph.html>

3.3 Reallocation of carriageway space

The third priority should be making space on the roads for cycling. We discuss this in more depth in chapter 5 of *Cycling 2020*¹⁵. In summary it means:

- On-road cycle lanes of good width. There is not a single cycle lane in Cambridge that meets the recommended width of 2m¹⁶. Most do not even meet the ‘minimum’ standard of 1.5m. Lanes below this are almost always worse than nothing, as they result in closer overtaking than would happen without any lane existing¹⁷. We generally object to cycle lanes that are below 1.5m unless they are strictly in places where queuing takes place consistently throughout the day.
- Hybrid Cycle Lane provision¹⁸, a new form of provision which we have been promoting and which form a key part of the cycling part of the TIF proposals¹⁹. They are effectively wide, on-road cycle lanes, but with an ‘off-road feel’. As such, they would cater for inexperienced cyclists whilst not harming the interests of those who prefer on-road cycling. We are pleased that the County Council has ‘bought into’ this idea, but it does need design workshops in order to develop the details more precisely and determine where these would fit in terms of the legal framework for cycle lanes. The idea has also been included in the County’s Cambridgeshire Design Guide for housing²⁰ and is featured in the planning application for the NIAB site²¹ and being pushed for Northstowe²².
- Reductions in lane numbers at junctions. Junctions are amongst the most dangerous points on the road network for cyclists, and reducing lanes reduces the range of manoeuvres which take place, increasing the ability for less confident/experienced cyclists to navigate them safely and easily.
- Conversion of a small proportion of car parking in favour of on-street secure cycle parking. Cycle parking is in very short supply all around Cambridge and cycle theft represents over 10% of reported crime across the entire County²³.
- Removal of obstructive car parking on major routes, which force cyclists to merge with difficulty into the main traffic stream²⁴.

¹⁵ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/roadspace/>

¹⁶ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cyclelanewidths/>

¹⁷ “The Effect of Cycle Lanes on Cyclists’ Road Space” <http://homepage.nflworld.com/pete.meg/wcc/report/cycle-lanes.pdf>. This is not a peer-reviewed study but provides a useful starting point for future work.

¹⁸ See: <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/74/article15.html> and gallery at <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/map/gallery/69/>

¹⁹ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/transport/strategies/tacklingcongestion/ourproposals/cycling.htm> then click on “Map showing proposed improvements to the cycle network”

²⁰ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/transport/managing/networkmanagement/Cambridgeshire+Design+Guide.htm>

²¹ http://scambs.jdi-consult.net/devcon/pa.php?option=case_files&paid=137052 and especially <http://scambs.jdi-consult.net/devcon/afdownload.php?afappid=604073>

²²

[http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/db/council2.nsf/c3cf865e3cc1131380256a6b0037e439/ca4c4b2049a2710c8025742100558651/\\$FILE/080415-10%20appx%20A.doc](http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/db/council2.nsf/c3cf865e3cc1131380256a6b0037e439/ca4c4b2049a2710c8025742100558651/$FILE/080415-10%20appx%20A.doc) section 7.16.4.

²³ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/cycleparking/cycletheft.html>

²⁴ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/roadspace/parkedcars.html> which provides a graphical illustration of the problem.

Reallocation of carriageway space requires bold political steps, especially in cases of removal of car parking, which is often vigorously opposed by those nearby. The reductions in traffic that a congestion charge would bring would at last create the conditions for freeing-up of roadspace for cycling and public transport.

TIF would also bring the funds to enable hybrid cycle provision – which might well require moving of services or changing the whole road layout – to be implemented.

In summary, TIF has the ability to liberate roadspace from motor vehicles for use by other modes, not least cycling.

3.4 Cycle tracks adjacent to roads, or conversion of footways/footpaths to shared use cycle tracks

These should be the provision of last resort, but due to lack of funding and the political difficulties of reallocating roadspace, it is often treated as the norm, which we deplore. If it is impossible to improve the on-road environment, only then should cycle tracks alongside roads be considered.

Pavement cycle tracks adjacent to roads are a poor-quality solution that rarely meets cyclists' needs. They are popular with decision-makers because they sacrifice pedestrian space rather than (more politically difficult) car space. Problems are:

- Conflicts between cyclists and walkers
- Create mixed messages about pavement cycling
- Loss of momentum: stop at every side road. Each stop/start is equivalent to 100m additional journey length in terms of energy expenditure.
- Poor visibility at junctions and driveways, and so such provision is less safe due to increased numbers of junctions.
- Obstructions: wheelie bins, walkers, etc.
- Hard to maintain: can't use a road-sweeper, become overgrown with foliage, and aren't de-iced²⁵
- Poor surface and poorly lit

For all these reasons, many cyclists use the road instead (as is their explicit right under the law, as expressed in the Highway Code). This leads to cyclists being harassed by drivers who think "there's a cycle path over there – you should be using it". Milton Road is a classic example²⁶.

We want to see an end to substandard cycling provision like this. Poor quality provision is worse than none at all. This will only happen when there is a change in County Council mindset (which TIF demonstrates to some extent) and funds, as well as the availability of roadspace.

For all these reasons, we would prefer the on-road hybrid cycle lane approach as outlined above in many cases.

²⁵ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/82/article12.html>

²⁶ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/roadspace/miltonroadeffect.html>

We are in the process of creating a new position paper called 'Respecting Pedestrian Space' which makes clear that we are generally not in favour of pavement conversions. We feel that cyclists ought to be natural allies of walkers.

We wish to make clear that we have no problem with cycle tracks through areas like the commons, or Sustrans-style routes which connect up areas and which form short-cuts through areas. These are a different matter to roadside tracks criticised above which are basically a way to get cyclists off the roads. There is an opportunity to create a number of high quality routes, especially to local villages, which provide more direct links well away from traffic, that not only provide quick commuting routes, but to provide great opportunities for City dwellers to reach the less busy rural roads away from Cambridge for leisure trips (Wicken Fen, Anglesey Abbey, Wimpole Hall, Audley End etc.)

3.5 Summary

Above we have outlined our views, as also set out in our *Cycling 2020* brochure²⁷ and our *Cycling in New Developments* paper²⁸, on how best to provide for cycling.

We favour quality over quantity, believing that traffic reduction and slower speeds would increase levels of cycling, and that only cycle-specific infrastructure which is of high quality would promote and improve cycling conditions in the areas that would still need it after traffic/speed reduction.

We think that the County Council are to some extent still wedded to the idea of 'facilities' rather than 'cycle-friendly infrastructure'. We feel that the TIF proposals need to be accompanied by a greater County Council commitment to dealing with these mindset issues²⁹.

We feel where cycle facilities are created, only high-quality facilities (e.g. the hybrid cycle lane approach) has a 'demonstration effect'.

We feel that the TIF proposals offer the ability to provide both the stick of traffic reduction and the carrot of improved facilities. Both are needed; improving bus services, for instance, will be useless if buses get stuck in traffic.

4. Rationales for TIF

4.1 Housing growth issues

The issue of housing growth, particularly of 47,000 new dwellings proposed (until mid-2008) for 2016 is a major driver, in our view, for the proposals.

Whilst we agree with the consensus at the first Commission session that there is a need for higher developer funding and funding from central government for infrastructure costs, there seems to be little hope that the current levels will increase significantly (or by the levels that TIF would provide).

As we outline below, the Section 106 system is now under increasing pressure because of economic changes, and the assumption that 'the market will deliver' all the associated

²⁷ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/cycling2020/>

²⁸ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/planning/>

²⁹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/76/article10.html>

infrastructure must surely now be put under considerable scrutiny. This increases the pressure on TIF as a potential source of funding for the infrastructure deficit.

Those who have spoken so far at the first two Commission sessions on the issue of the economy seemed to present the view that the housing growth figures will return, but on a longer timescale. We as a transport campaign body are not able to give any kind of expert view on such economic matters, but if we take the view given by the expert witnesses so far, that the demand for new housing will return (but on a longer timescale), the need for traffic restraint therefore will not disappear.

As outlined elsewhere in this response, we feel that providing new infrastructure alone, without significant and stronger policy instruments to limit car usage, will not resolve the projected congestion problem. TIF offers both the stick of traffic reduction and the carrot of improved facilities. Both are needed; improving bus services, for instance, will be useless if buses get stuck in traffic.

We feel there is a very significant lack of understanding of the scale of growth proposed around the city. Anecdotally, very many people seem totally unaware that a massive 47,000 new houses are proposed in the coming decade. We feel this lack of understanding contributes significantly to opposition to proposed congestion charging, as people may have judged the proposals based on their experiences of current congestion levels rather than potential future levels.

4.2 Existing congestion problems

Witnesses at the Commission sessions seemed to concur that the congestion problem (which we would define as a 'significant' problem) was mainly limited to the peak periods.

Traffic in Cambridge has been held down in the past decade through, in our view, these major factors in particular:

- The bollard closures as a means to prevent through-traffic in the city centre;
- Park and Ride (which we note is really an economic instrument to enable more people to enter the city³⁰, and not an environmental scheme *per se*);
- Growth in bus transport;
- Cycling levels remaining high and not significantly declining;
- Planning policies which have meant that new housing is more subject to restrictions on the private car (e.g. lower numbers of parking spaces) than may be the case in other Local Authorities

These are all measures which we broadly support and which, mostly, seem to command reasonable public consensus.

However we feel that these measures are not likely to be able to restrain traffic growth much further. For instance, the series of bollard closures to through-traffic is essentially a completed scheme.

Changes to increase current cycling levels significantly, by improving existing cycling conditions, require roadspace reallocation.

³⁰ <http://www.lucas-smith.co.uk/dissertation/>

Only more significant and controversial demand management measures, involving changes in road space allocation or charging, would, in our view, reduce congestion much further.

5. Provision for cycling in the current TIF proposals

5.1 Benefits proposed under TIF

As mentioned above, the current TIF proposals contain a number of things which would improve cycling in Cambridge, resulting in improvements to the experiences of existing cyclists, and providing an incentive for even more people to choose to cycle instead.

We outlined these benefits in our *Newsletter* in August 2007³¹ and February 2008³². We see the upsides as:

- General traffic reduction; improved safety and air quality, reduced traffic noise, CO2 emissions and injuries.
- Less congestion, good for all road users.
- The Chisholm Trail, our long-proposed 'cycling superhighway' joining the Science Park to Addenbrookes, is among the proposals.
- Hybrid lanes, the continental-style approach to cycle lanes which seeks to balance the needs of different cyclists (on-road / off-road preference), are proposed, which we pushed for.
- Reallocation of road space to cycling.
- It will remove the excuse of "no money to do things properly".
- There is scope to do very good things to existing and new routes.
- The proposals will make people think much more about how and when they travel.
- Better chance of real innovation being backed by the DfT through the Transport Innovation Fund.
- Chance to 'fix' the city-wide cycle parking shortage.
- Chance to get problem points like Gilbert Road finally addressed.

Reduction in traffic volume and then reallocation of road space are high up in the Hierarchy of Provision (as we discussed in section 3 above) but are rarely observed in practice by transport planners. Congestion charging offers that.

5.2 Relationship to the Cycling Demonstration Town bid/status

Cambridgeshire was awarded Cycling Demonstration Town (CDT) status for (what might be termed as) the greater Cambridge area, in late 2008. This provides funding of £3.6m, which must be match-funded with an additional £3.6m, for benefits to cycling.

³¹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/73/article2.html>

³² <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/76/article6.html>

We reported on this³³ in our Newsletter in October 2008.

Like the TIF bid, the CDT proposals emphasise quality over quantity. We have rigorously supported that approach. Only through quality will a demonstration effect be achieved, that will send the message to the government that current, rather weak approaches to cycle provision should be changed in favour of bold and innovative approaches which emphasise cyclist convenience.

The CDT bid includes some of the schemes that are in the TIF proposals. We welcome this. On the face of it, this does support the assertion of TIF critics that funds will come through anyway. But the (total) £3.6m of new money will not go anywhere near as far as the £50m proposed for cycling under TIF would. Under TIF, improvements would be far more widespread and backed by traffic reduction.

Proposals now being pushed forward from TIF into CDT are:

- A scheme for Gilbert Road, possibly a 'Hybrid cycle lane' trial;
- Widespread new cycle parking provision around many areas of the city and villages
- A feasibility study for the Chisholm Trail super-cycleway. (TIF would then fund the scheme itself; the CDT money is too small for that.)
- Some kind of 'innovation', although we suspect the DfT will block that.
- Not allowing excessive compromise to creep into schemes, with design standards that meet Cycling England's requirements.
- Niggle-fixing squad.
- Links between several villages and the city. (Though we know that there is far more demand than can be satisfied through CDT for this.)
- 'Soft' measures, such as promotion and person-to-person approaches.

So far, we feel that the CDT programme is progressing well. We feel that a successful CDT programme would be the natural predecessor to a larger TIF programme.

6. Criticisms of aspects of the TIF proposals that we wish to see addressed

6.1 Potential downsides

The potential downsides that we identified were:

- Proposals for bus lanes could harm cyclists' interests if not done properly. Bus lanes must not result in cyclists being squeezed off the other side of the road onto pavements, as was proposed in 2002 for Hills Road.
- There is scope for implementation to be done badly.
- Danger of increase in shared-use pavement cycleway provision, which we would oppose.

³³ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/80/article10.html>

- The funding figure may not turn out to cover everything that's planned. We want assurances that cycling doesn't suffer if the DfT respond with less than the full £500m, or the £50m that has to be locally funded cannot be found.
- The possibility that some businesses could move out of town or edge of town developments could expand, resulting in inability to cycle to them.
- "Mindset" issues – of the sort noted below – will need to be addressed.
- We need experience and people – consultants – from Netherlands and Denmark to do the design. We shouldn't have to keep battling for the "extra 20 cm".

6.2 'Mindset' issues

As noted above, we are concerned that certain mindset issues³⁴ within parts of the County Council will act as a barrier to the improvements that could be made to cycling.

Sometimes, even simple improvements like allowing contraflow cycling in two-way streets – already done in many streets in Cambridge, and almost universally in places like Holland – or maintaining priority over sideroads at junctions, (or most crucially) extending 20mph zones around Cambridge are stopped or resisted by officers who are unwilling to go beyond very strict interpretations of policy, never mind innovation.

Crucial amongst these mindset issues will be the need to ensure that the Hierarchy of Provision is followed much more closely, with cessation of constant proposals to convert bits of pavement to being shared-use. As respondent #100 to the Commission's survey³⁵ said, "Have cyclist facilities that are there to help cyclists, rather than facilities that remove cyclists from obstructing motorists." This is a key mindset that must change – that cycle facilities must *only* be put in if they provide clear benefits for cyclists and not in order to tick a box or clear the roads for motorists.

We believe that the City Council is much more open to improving cycling in many ways, including through innovation, though some mindset issues remain.

6.3 Greater proportion of funds for cycling than 10%

The TIF proposals set out £50m of improvements for cycling from the £500m (10%). Given that cycling is at least twice this percentage in terms of current transport modal share, we think that a greater proportion should be allocated towards cycling improvements. This would mean that proposals for high-quality cycling provision, e.g. links between most of the outlying villages, hybrid cycle lanes and addressing the current infrastructure legacy, could be tackled more widely.

As we outlined at the start, money spent on cycling benefits motorists also. With better promotional activity from the County Council, this point could be more clearly relayed to the public in order to increase support for spending congestion charge receipts on cycling improvements.

We think the County ought to be setting a formal target of perhaps 30%-40% of trips by bicycle by a few years into the charging period, as a means to focus minds more clearly. This is the level of cycling that the best of our European neighbours have achieved, showing that high cycling rates are achievable with the right mindset and funding.

³⁴ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/76/article10.html>

³⁵ <http://www.cambstransportcommission.co.uk/i/assets/Interim%20Report%20on%20Public%20Consultation%20-%20Feb%202009.pdf>

6.4 Poor County Council promotion so far

We have criticised the County Council for the poor job they have done in presenting the proposals to the public.

The lack of accessible information on the benefits (and costs) of the scheme, which lead to ourselves (as an independent group) creating www.UnclogCambridge.com to explain these, and to dispel myths that were growing up, is poor.

The County Council need to realise that complex sets of proposals, especially those as controversial as a congestion charge, need a professional marketing approach, rather than issuing a several-hundred-page PDF full of dense figures³⁶ on its website as the main source of detailed information on the benefits. The associated general webpages³⁷ were uninspiring and failed to give sufficient detail in a format that would enable citizens really to weigh up the consequences of the actual scheme on their daily lives.

The lack of accessible information played right into the hands of critics, including the local media.

7. Rebuttal of points made in submissions and evidence given by other parties

We wish to address points made by others during this consultation process.

7.1 TIF under a potential future Conservative government

One submission³⁸ from the current Conservative City Councillor has said that, under a Conservative government, the congestion charging element of TIF would be scrapped, on the grounds that the 'I' for *Innovation* in 'TIF' should not merely be limited to congestion charging. We have heard this claim mentioned before and we have no reason to doubt it.

However, it seems likely that, if this were the case, every Local Authority would then start submitting bids for their pet projects, resulting in (i) a very thinly-spread set of money or high competition for the funds and therefore (ii) scrapping of this fund since it would be overwhelmed and anyway have little actual difference to other DfT local transport funding streams.

There would be much higher competition for the money, compared to Cambridge's high likelihood of obtaining it under current rules (due to the absence of other main bidders now that Manchester has dropped out). We certainly take the view that the sum currently proposed of 90% of £517m would be very unlikely to be invested in Cambridge through non-TIF means.

We feel this claim, of alternative sources of funding, by opponents of the TIF proposals should be subject to scrutiny by the Commissioners.

³⁶ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/07EE8F74-A6EF-48B9-ADB9-4528B2631405/0/FINALOutlineProposalforFunding.pdf>

³⁷ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/transport/strategies/tacklingcongestion/ourproposals/>

³⁸ <http://cherryhintonroad.blogspot.com/2009/03/congestion-charging-in-cambridge-have.html> (As an aside, this website posting also suggests that more of S106 funding should be directed to transport, but this is unrealistic because it means that there would be less for other infrastructure, such as schools.)

Lastly, we note that “The Tories says they will honour any TIF funding commitments to local authorities that they inherit from the outgoing government”, as reported³⁹ in Local Transport Today, 1st May 2008.

7.2 Accusations of government blackmail

Many commentators, including the media, have characterised the current TIF rules as amounting to ‘blackmail’, as the funding only comes on the condition of introduction of Congestion Charging. We think this is not an entirely fair representation and we feel it is being used as a smokescreen by those who take a view against the principle of congestion charging.

Many government initiatives are surely subject to having strings attached. Local Authorities are expected to meet targets, agree to rules, etc., for the receipt of funding. This is no different. It is like any other pot of money designed for a specific purpose, and if the Local Authority does not wish to accept the rules (e.g. Manchester) then the money is not received. We see no fundamental reason why the government should not entice LAs into experimenting with congestion charging by setting up a fund for such purposes, if that is what the LA is willing to do. The question is thus really about the principle of congestion charging and its implementation, and not a question of ‘blackmail’.

Ironically, the same commentators have sometimes claimed that up-front improvements should be in place in areas where congestion charging is tried out. We find this entirely correct. Motorists should have alternatives in place so that a charge becomes acceptable, as was the case in London. We suspect that many opponents of the Cambridge TIF scheme simply do not realise that the proposed charging would come into affect several years into the scheme, with years of transport investment implemented in the meanwhile.

7.3 Effect on tradespeople and delivery firms

During the Business session of the Commission on 10th March 2009, Professor Travers questioned the representative from the Federation of Small Businesses on the issue of whether a charge would adversely affect these groups of people. The representative appeared eventually to concede that even a 20 minute saving due to congestion charging, resulting in chargeable productive time, could more than offset the £3-5 cost of a congestion charge.

Our view is indeed that many tradespeople and ‘white van man’ (to use the term from a previous Commission session) would indeed find themselves as benefiting (again, the term ‘disproportionately benefiting’ was used) from the charge when the costs and benefits over the course of a year were worked out on the balance sheet.

In our view, business already pays a congestion charge. This is the costs, which are real, of queuing in traffic. The County Council’s documentation⁴⁰ (table 0.2, page xiii) shows a 30% reduction of the overall travel time spent on the highway network in Cambridge. This could be a significant level for businesses.

We feel this area is particularly in further need of scrutiny by the Commissioners. We feel that a range of ‘how many pounds are saved or lost’ scenarios could be examined.

³⁹ http://www.transportxtra.com/magazines/local_transport_today/news/?ID=3752 ; requires subscription

⁴⁰ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/07EE8F74-A6EF-48B9-ADB9-4528B2631405/0/FINALOutlineProposalforFunding.pdf>

7.4 The potential for businesses to move out of Cambridge

We accept that this would be a potential danger for any area considering congestion charging. But if housing growth (projected for 2016 but that may be delayed by a few years due to the economy) goes ahead as planned, businesses may well consider that the congestion caused (under the scenario of no charge) from the traffic generated may well cause them economic problems beyond what they currently experience due to existing congestion.

In other words, the dangers exist under both scenarios. The claim that a congestion charge would cause business flight seems therefore to be being made without taking into account the proposed housing (and therefore traffic) growth.

7.5 Views that a charge might deter shoppers

As the charge would only be in the weekday morning peak, we feel that the danger to shops is relatively small, with the exception of those used 'on the way to work'. Clearly there would be an issue with deliveries, although we discuss that issue elsewhere in this response.

We suspect this claim is partly a lack of understanding of the actual parameters of the scheme, namely operation only on weekdays from 7.30am until 9.30am.

It would be important for any congestion charge scheme to make clear the times of the charge in all publicity, so that people are not dissuaded from using the city for shopping (or indeed any other activity) on the assumption that there is an all-day charge.

7.6 Points made at the 'Business' session of the Commission on 10th March 2009

We were dismayed at the jibe by John Bridge during this session that the congestion charging seminar arranged in 2007 by the Chambers of Commerce contained only businesses against it, and that 'only the cyclists' were in favour. We believe that others were also willing to consider a charge, though the majority view did indeed seem to be against a charge.

More notably, however, we were struck that, with this exception, no mention whatsoever was made by Mr Bridge of cycling as part of the transport mix in Cambridge during that Business session. We feel his failure to acknowledge the massive contribution that cycling makes (as outlined above) toward reductions in congestion, which benefit his members very considerably, and instead make a jibe about cyclists at a public meeting, displays a lack of understanding of the transport issues under consideration insofar as they apply to Cambridge. We also find it unfortunate that more consideration is not being given by the Chambers of the massive level of investment that would be lost if the TIF proposals are thrown out.

Many businesses in and around Cambridge do an excellent job in promoting cycling to their employees, and recognise the benefits that cycling has, both to the city and to the individuals concerned. This is strongly to be welcomed.

However, it is clear from media reports that many businesses (some of whom may well be very supportive of cycling) are against the proposals for a congestion charge, and (for the avoidance of doubt) we make no claim to be representative of any business interests (including those run by our own members). However, we feel that many businesses may become more predisposed to the proposals if they are made more aware about the benefits and congestion reduction savings they could make. The reporting in the media certainly has not done so in our view.

Mr Bridge also mentioned at the Business evidence session that the structure of the Commission had changed since first set up, and that the Chambers of Commerce had initially been invited. We were one of a number of groups (including the City Council) that complained about the initial proposals, which we felt would deny a wide range of people the ability to present views on this. We are glad that the County Council recognised this and performed a u-turn towards the more independent model now in operation, which creates the opportunity for a whole range of views to be considered.

One speaker implied that businesses in Manchester were predominantly all against the proposed TIF proposals there. This does not tell the full story. There were in fact two business lobbies, one for, and one against, campaigning on the issue. United City, the 'pro' lobby, did include a number of very large and well-known companies⁴¹.

Lastly, we wish to note the paradox that one of the business speakers presented the view that it was important that people be encouraged to change their transport behaviour, but that business was unlikely to be able to do this itself. We feel that the same response could well be given by many other constituencies in Cambridge, with the overall result that no significant behaviour change would result. We feel that everyone, business included, has a role in promoting behavioural change in transport, in order to promote the efficient operation of the city. We feel that only measures as radical as congestion charging would really result in people thinking about the consequences of their transport activity and how that could be modified.

7.7 Other funding sources will come if the Cambridgeshire TIF bid is scrapped

We think this claim cannot be taken at face value. There are funding sources, but they are dwarfed by the £500m proposed (£100m/year).

Of course it is true that there are other funds that would help fund a variety of transport initiatives. The LTP (apparently about £10m per year, a figure stated several times by officers during the first-round TIF consultation), Cambridge Cycling Demonstration Town (£3.6m), the Guided Bus (£92.5m over three years), funding for the Chesterton Railway Station (recommended by EERA for a £19.8m grant, and which can now be removed from TIF), growth funds to Cambridgeshire Horizons (various), Growth Area Fund (GAF) grants, etc. all represent funding streams which the County Council have been successful at obtaining. However, these total less than what TIF offers.

Furthermore, the Section 106 system, in which housing developers in particular are expected to provide large sums of money to offset the impacts of their development, looks particularly problematic because of the economic situation. It is well-known that the funding expected from the Northstowe developers to pay for part of the Guided Bus has been delayed, and some £23.7m⁴² is now at stake. (And unlike localised schemes, large new housing developments require schools in particular which tend to get first call on the money.)

The first two sessions of the Commission both put forward the view that the regional infrastructure deficit is several times the value of TIF. But TIF would take us a long way there.

Furthermore, these funds all seem to be capital funding rather than revenue funding. Anyone who works in Local Government would agree that it is the latter which is hard to come by. Road maintenance is an excellent example of an underfunded system that fails all groups of road users, especially cyclists. Revenue from congestion charging (as distinct from up-front

⁴¹ See references given on http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_City

⁴² http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/cn_news_home/DisplayArticle.asp?ID=371383

TIF funds) would provide a major new source of funding into County Council local road maintenance revenue budgets, and the value of improving the transport network on an ongoing basis through this should not be underestimated. We understand from the TIF documentation this revenue source (from charging of motorists) to be in the region of £30m/year, some three times the current LTP funds.

We note that, under continued questioning by Professor Travers, John Bridge from the Chambers of Commerce was unable to give any serious actual examples of where funding to anything like TIF levels would come from, despite presenting a view at first that such sources are available.

7.8 Levels of support for the TIF proposals

We feel that much reporting on the TIF proposals (seemingly often referred to only as “congestion charging”) by the media and by those against the proposals has not reflected the range of views that actually exist.

The main consultation found that:

- Only 31% supported the principle of a congestion charge, but: ...
- 55% would support a charge if revenues were spent on improving transport in Cambridgeshire [which is a legal requirement anyway]
- 44% would support the congestion charge if it only operated between 7.30 – 9.30 am Monday to Friday [which the County Council proposed anyway]
- 59% would support a congestion charge if attractive alternatives were in place for travelling in Cambridge [which £500m – ten times current funding levels – would surely help provide]

We feel these figures are worthy of wider dissemination.

We feel that the fact that there is actually a seemingly positive overall level of support when the three conditions noted above are in place, despite them being part of the Cambridgeshire proposals anyway, indicates a lack of understanding of the details of the scheme. Anecdotally, few people seem to realise that the scheme would only operate for ten hours a week, for instance. The poor County Council informational activity (see above) is partly culpable for this.

8. Issues and myths

Many of the points we make in this section are as outlined at www.UnclogCambridge.com , where further points are made beyond those listed below.

We urge the Commissioners to undertake scrutiny of these issues.

8.1 “If the government has the money for transport it should give it anyway without a charge”

Some people seem to be of the view that if the government has the money for transport it should give it anyway without a charge. We feel this is wishful thinking and will not happen. The government is not just going to increase by ten times the amount of funding for transport

it provides to Cambridgeshire just like that. We feel this argument is being used simply to dodge hard decisions.

8.2 Would a congestion charge be regressive?

On a very basic analysis: The poorest quartile of society have no access to a car, so a charge will not hit them. The richest quartile make far more car trips than those in median groups, so unless they make changes to travel behaviour the rich will contribute the most.

Furthermore, because the moneys raised from a charge have to go back into transport, this means that greater funding for the alternatives will become available. This is as has happened in London, where improved public transport and better cycling conditions leads to a virtuous cycle of improvements. Of course in the short term, there are bound to be difficulties created for some people. But in the longer term, demand management should help everyone.

8.3 Discounts for residents

Some groups and political parties around the City have proposed that residents should get a substantial discount. We disagree. It would be both unfair and would undermine the traffic reduction potential of any congestion charge. A smaller discount might potentially be acceptable, as this would probably not affect the viability of the scheme too much, but it would need to be looked at carefully.

Firstly, residents of Cambridge driving around Cambridge do cause congestion (even sometimes when leaving the city) in the same way as those who come into Cambridge by car. As the CEN reported⁴³, "Highways chiefs surveyed the city's inner ring road during the morning peak of 7.30 to 9.30am and found two-thirds of car journeys were made by residents - and many were driving two miles or less."

Yet people within Cambridge are exactly the people who have a greater number of transport alternatives available to them already, and will have even more once the initial up-front investment in transport has been introduced. For instance, people living in Cambridge can often choose between walking, cycling, various local or longer-distance bus routes, taxis, (sometimes park and ride) and of course the car. By contrast, someone travelling in from Huntingdon only has the Park & Ride system available to them, and three long-distance buses per hour to a more limited number of locations within Cambridge. On this basis, people outside the city but having to travel into it are already disadvantaged in transport terms.

It is true that the London scheme has residents' discounts. However, this results in higher charges for everyone else because discounts result in reduced effectiveness of the overall scheme, because of less income, and thus a lower transfer of funding to public transport.

8.4 Other myths

We have given answers to a range of myths that grew up during the first consultation round, at <http://www.UnclogCambridge.com/myths/> . These are:

- "Park and ride sites would be inside the charged area"
- "Local taxes have paid for the scheme to be drawn up"

⁴³ http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/cn_news_home/displayarticle.asp?id=257453

- “The money would be spent on an Ely Bypass”
- “Shopping and leisure establishments would lose out”
- “Money from a charge wouldn’t go back into transport”
- “The operating costs would eat up the revenue costs”
- “Ditton Meadows would be split in two”
- “Government money to aid the new developments would be enough”
- “Money would pour straight into Stagecoach bus company”

9. Summary

We hope the above is a useful and thorough summary of what is for us is a key transport question for the future of Cambridge.

In our submission we have pointed out various areas where we feel the Commissioners need to give particular scrutiny to the views of respondents and witnesses.

9.1 The Commission’s survey questions

In answer to the specific questions that the Commission has posed in its survey:

1. With the congestion in and around Cambridge and plans to build a large number of new homes in Cambridgeshire, do you think transport improvements are needed?

Yes, as we outline above in section 4 of our letter.

2. What do you think should be done to improve public transport, walking and cycling facilities, and the road network, to cope with congestion in and around Cambridge now and in the future?

We outline this in sections 3 and 5 of our letter above, and in our document ‘Cycling 2020’, available on our website or upon request.

3. Cambridgeshire County Council has bid for £500 million from Government under the Transport Innovation Fund scheme. What are your views on the proposals? Do you think it will help solve congestion in and around Cambridge?

Yes, we feel it would be major contributor to this. Both carrots and sticks are needed, but County Council mindset issues need to be tackled. We outline our views on how it would help cycling in sections 3 and 5 above, and in our document ‘Cycling 2020’.

4. Is Cambridgeshire County Council planning to spend the £500million for transport improvements in the right way? What changes would be better, or more acceptable, for local people and businesses?

We outline changes that we would like to see to the scheme in section 6 of our letter above.

5. To obtain the £500 million of Government money to improve public transport, walking and cycling facilities, and the road network in and around Cambridge, a form of demand

management, such as congestion charging, is needed. This is part of Cambridgeshire County Council's proposals. Does the need to tackle congestion justify a charge for most vehicles coming into Cambridge in the morning peak (7.30am until 9.30am)? Are there alternative ways of reducing congestion and greenhouse gases?

We believe a charge is justified in the context of very considerable housing growth. We believe that substantial traffic reduction, of the kind that will be needed with such housing growth, can only be achieved in the medium term with both sticks and carrots. The carrots must include a very substantial element of improvements to cycling, which will benefit both cyclists and motorists, as we outline in section 2 of our letter.

In summary, TIF has the ability to liberate road space from motor vehicles for use by other modes, not least cycling, as well as provide funding for these alternatives, both up-front and through an ongoing revenue stream.

9.2 Finally

We have already provided copies to the Commissioners of our publications, *Cycling 2020* and *Cycling in New Developments*. These form our major policy positions for cycle-friendly infrastructure.

We prefer to be contacted by e-mail wherever possible, as our Committee are distributed around the city and surrounding villages and do not meet in person on a weekly basis.

Yours sincerely,
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign,

Martin Lucas-Smith
Co-ordinator