

September 16, 2013

Our ref: C13012

Transport & Infrastructure Policy & Funding,
Box CC1214
Cambridgeshire County Council
Castle Court, Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge CB3 0BR



Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Llandaff Chambers, 2 Regent Street
Cambridge CB2 1AX
01223 690718
contact@camcycle.org.uk
www.camcycle.org.uk
registered charity no. 1138098

Dear Sir or Madam,

Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

We write in response to this consultation on the draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire¹. Cycling is an increasingly important mode of transport in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Even for those living some distance from the centre of Cambridge travel by cycle is important. Many will use a cycle as part of a multimode trip, and many will cycle to neighbouring villages to access work, school or facilities only available in an adjacent village. Unfortunately in many areas, especially outside the city, cycling is still for the brave or those without access to other modes. This must change.

This document contains:

- **A summary of our views** (pages 1-5)
- **A critique of the main document** (pages 5-16)
- **Comments on failures in the modelling exercise** (pages 16-17)

Summary of our views

Our key message is that the cycleway network in Cambridge needs to be developed to very high standards, with particular emphasis on the main roads. Reallocation of roadspace and demand management measures to control commuter and other parking, need to go hand-in-hand. By reducing traffic volumes, and making streets more pleasant, these measures would create the conditions where some 40-45% of trips in Cambridge could be made by bike. Altogether, this will increase the total carrying capacity of the street network to cater for the massive housing growth that is now happening. This will only be achieved if more difficult political decisions are made (for example the boldness shown over the now very successful Core Scheme), rather than the compromise which has often not solved congestion problems. This is a win-win situation not only for those now cycling, but for health, public transport, and essential users of motor transport.

We believe that the opportunity to create cycle routes to the best of continental standards is achievable and that Cambridge and the surrounding area can then be seen as a model for elsewhere in the UK. Cycle provision alongside roads should not be suitable only for either “confident” or “less confident” cyclists but instead be fully suitable for everyone, by being direct, attractive, safe and maintaining priority at junctions.

We are very concerned that the standard of the modelling work fails to show the huge benefits to all modes, including public transport and other essential users of motor vehicles, of significant shifts to cycling.

Our key policy recommendations are as follows:

The Strategy needs to:

- go further than an aspiration for an “improved system of...safe and direct cycle routes”. It must instead commit to “Creating the leading cycle network in the UK, with new and upgraded infrastructure matching Dutch standards”.
- set a clear target of 40-45% of trips within Cambridge, and 30% of trips in the ‘necklace’ villages to be made by bike, which should be infused into all transport and planning decisions.
- make clear that the objective of the transport policy is to move people in a sustainable manner, even if this reduces capacity for private motor vehicles

The Strategy should:

- differentiate between ‘Walking’ and ‘Cycling’. For too long, walking and cycling have been lumped together. This is now inappropriate in a city where almost one-third of journeys are by bicycle. Cycling is the quickest mode for many trips under 5 miles especially when reliability of journey time is considered. We do not undervalue the benefits of walking, both for health and the environment, but it is only by providing far better cycling facilities that more will see it as a good alternative to the private car.
- demonstrate that cycling is by far the most cost-effective way to cater for the County’s growth strategy.
- show the benefits to both physical and mental health of ‘Active Travel’.

Together with the relevant Local Plans it should:

- Progress the Chisholm Trail as quickly as resources permit. This linear park, blending subtly into the local environment, to provide a safe cycling and walking route that would take many cars off the road, freeing space for more essential users.
- Ensure that every new housing development around Cambridge is built to the highest standard of cycle provision as a matter of course.
- Require higher standards of advice given to and by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC planning departments. Every poor decision about cycling provision can last for decades, especially where that is claimed by others as a precedent.
- Require that drivers of large vehicles (HGVs and buses) have training in ‘Safe Urban Driving’. This could be as part of the ‘Considerate Contractors’ scheme (under planning guidance), part of ‘Quality Public Transport Partnerships’ provision, and for

all employees or contractors to relevant local authorities who drive large vehicles. The similar changes within London for drivers of buses and HGVs should be used as a template.

- Progress a series of high quality cycle routes on (or adjacent to) major roads, and to link villages both to the City and each other. We've proposed a Greater Cambridge Cycleway Network¹ which would form a series of concentric rings around the city that connect adjacent villages as well as forming a proper series of radial cycleways into Cambridge. Outside the urban area it should be accepted that Compulsory Purchase Orders are used for agricultural land, rather than have substandard, or indirect routes. Within the city traffic reduction should go hand-in-hand with reallocation of roadspace to more sustainable modes.
- Encourage the provision of bulk break, consolidation, or transshipment facilities, to enable the onward shipment of goods in more appropriate vehicles, be they human or electric powered, or simply of a more appropriate size.

Standards of cycle routes

- Cycle provision should be equivalent to those of the Dutch or Danes, and this should be added to the Strategy as a clear policy statement.
- All off-road routes whatever the flow should be wide enough to enable an adult with young child beside to be passed by a more confident person, all of whom are on cycles.
- For rural routes with an expected flow of more than 1,000 trips per day an absolute minimum of three metres should be required. We should use 'predict and provide'. Too many recent facilities for those on cycles (for example the Shelford to Addenbrooke's path) have soon been overloaded by increasing use (due to much suppressed demand).
- Design should permit use both by the confident and those new to cycling, with good visibility, no sharp or unexpected turns and priority over side roads.

Other points we make

In support:

- We strongly welcome the principles outlined in the Executive summary, in particular the need for reallocation of roadspace towards cycling and public transport, and the need for more widespread parking restrictions.
- We support the principle of a City Deal that would see closer working on transport between the three Local Authorities.
- We strongly agree with the suggestion of a city-wide Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- We welcome the work on 'final mile' logistics.

We oppose:

¹ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/108/article5.html>

- Any new major construction to create extra capacity for private cars, even in the long term.
- The unrestricted use of taxis within the City (which we believe is the view of the trade).

Other comments:

1. The term “collisions” needs to be used in place of “accidents” throughout the strategy. The County has stopped using the term “accidents” in other reports.
2. The Strategy fails to address the problem of increased traffic in North Cambridge due to the A14 changes.
3. A move to high quality schemes is important in generating evidence for more government funding.
4. Any new guided bus provision must, we believe, include high-quality cycleway provision alongside.
5. We are extremely concerned to ensure that bus priority schemes are done in a way that enhances cycle provision, and does not force cyclists onto the footway. Changes to bus provision on Milton Road should, we believe, take the opportunity to replace the current poor-quality shared use scheme with proper Dutch-style provision on both sides of the road. Queens Road and Newmarket Road need similar changes.
6. Bus congestion in the City Centre and on some bus routes is caused by excessive dwell time. Smartcard ticketing (or on-street ticketing) would not only reduce dwell time, but improve the reliability of services by reducing bunching. The strategy must include a clear timescale for delivery, as this has been long-promised but has still not been implemented. Such ticketing would massively improve public transport and would eliminate the need for a number of bus lanes that would prejudice the creation of high-quality cycle provision.
7. At Cambridge Station, the Strategy should outline reallocation of some car parking spaces so that the new cycle park can be expanded in future. A new station entrance on the island platform side should be added, with 1,000 spaces.
8. 10% of car parking space in terraced areas should be reallocated to cycle parking (which means that there will be equal amounts, since cycle parking is ten times more space-efficient). Cycle parking in Petersfield and Romsey is most urgently needed. Residents should be able to request that a car parking space outside their house be converted to a bay of cycle parking, and that this should be implemented without the need for a TRO.
9. On taxis, we support the view of the taxi trade that taxi numbers should be limited.
10. In terms of judging the more immediate priorities for connecting villages, the ‘gravity model’ should be adopted, namely that the prioritisation for making safer routes between areas should be based on the population size of the two areas being connected.
11. Cycleway maintenance and gritting needs to be improved.

12. Strategic roads should also include strategic cycle routes when they are being upgraded/built, e.g. A14. These should include measures to avoid noise for a nearby cycleway. Alternatively, such changes should offer a route that is equally convenient.
13. All strategic roads within the city, in particular the inner ring road, should not permit parking.
14. We would like to see increased funding for the Travel For Work programme.
15. A much more robust approach is needed to the monitoring and implementation of Travel Plans.
16. We would like a firm commitment that cycle training will continue, to Bikeability standards.
17. We strongly support calls by the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign to provide a cycling improvement here that would be suitable for people of all ages and abilities.
18. We are concerned that the level of cycle provision proposed for the Northstowe development is failing to reach continental best practice.

Section-by-section comments

We now comment in more detail, section by section as in the strategy document, followed by comments on the modelling exercise.

The executive summary

We welcome the policies outlined in the Executive summary, specifically that “priority will be given to passenger transport services, cyclists and pedestrians” and that “General vehicular traffic ... will not receive priority at pinch points”. In particular, that “road space will need to be reallocated from general vehicular traffic” for passenger transport (which we think should be clarified to including cycling explicitly). Also we very strongly welcome the recognition of the need for “demand management measures ... in the form of more widespread parking restrictions”.

However, we have heard such reassurances before. Many previous strategies have similarly talked about giving priority to cycling (and walking / public transport), but time and time again, compromises have been made and opportunities have been lost. However, we think this time the County will have to be far bolder, if its policy of a considerable increase in housing in the area is to continue. (For the avoidance of doubt, we take no view on the principle of that policy.)

Given that “35,000 new dwellings will be built in and around the city”, which will mean probably some 50-60,000 new people living in the area, the demand for travel into Cambridge – a beautiful, prosperous city with many reasons to visit it – will increase way beyond the ability of current street layouts to cope.

There are many areas of the city currently plagued by gridlock. Observing the inner ring road, one is struck by the absence until now of any approach to address this problem, even without the extra demand that people from 35,000 new flats/houses will bring. Accordingly, the suggestion of reallocation of space, which would need to be made in conjunction with demand reduction measures, towards public transport and cycling on this route deserves strong consideration.

Therefore we welcome the strategy outlined in the Executive Summary, but feel this has to be matched with real commitment to take hard decisions for the longer term, and that the sections later in the document need to be bolstered considerably to match this strategy. Currently those sections fail to do so, and do not go far enough in addressing the challenge.

Vision

This strategy must have commitment and not just vision, hence we think improvements are needed.

Firstly, we think the vision must contain a much stronger vision for a cycling network, and a clear target, of 40-45%, for trips by bike in the City.

Cambridge is currently the leading area of the UK in terms of levels of cycling, despite the often poor conditions for cycling, due to the low quality of infrastructure, on almost all main roads around the city. Cambridge is arguably rather complacent about this position. Strategic policy for cycling in London is moving ahead very fast, with more radical policies coming from Transport for London. A raft of changes there are starting to leave Cambridgeshire behind.

Cambridgeshire has done well to develop a good secondary network (minor streets, connecting bridges, greenways) through the city. But the real growth in cycling numbers, and therefore the carrying capacity of the street network, will come from massively improving cycling conditions on the main roads, which form the key desire lines for cycling (compared to the less direct routes that form the secondary network). This will need a carefully-phased approach but the timescale for this should be expeditious and forward-looking rather than over-cautious. The other source of big growth in cycling numbers will be from improving links from surrounding villages and the new developments; significant upgrades here will similarly increase the capacity of the network.

The County should adopt a clear target of 40-45% of all trips made in Cambridge by bike, which should be infused into all transport and planning decisions.

The vision of Cambridgeshire's Transport Strategy therefore needs to go further than merely an "improved system of ... safe and direct cycle routes". It must instead commit to "Creating the leading cycle network in the UK, matching Dutch standards, with 40-45% of all trips in Cambridge made by bike".

Only in this way will many more people consider that they have the choice to cycle. The dangerous conditions of current streets, and the often hidden cycle routes that currently exist, both prevent the prospect of a mass shift to cycling.

Secondly, the strategy should specifically state that the capacity of the existing street network will be increased in terms of the number of people that it can carry. Too often, traffic changes are determined in terms of the number of cars that a stretch of road can take, rather than the number of people. Reallocation of roadspace towards cycling and public transport increases very considerably the actual capacity (correctly defined) of the street, as the picture on page 2-9 later in the document clearly demonstrates.

We think there should be much clearer emphasis on the health benefits of cycling and active travel more generally, and that health budgets should promote cycling, within the Strategy, with a direct reference within the vision to the WHO/Europe Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT)².

² <http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org/>

Section 1: Introduction

We think this correctly outlines the key challenge: “In peak periods, parts of the network frequently operate at or near capacity” while “33,000 new homes are proposed to be built in and around the city and in South Cambridgeshire”.

The scale of this challenge indicates strongly the need for bold decisions that accept there will be short-term reductions in car capacity while people adjust their travel patterns towards efficient forms of transport like cycling and public transport. The time for compromises that fail to prioritise these modes must surely be over.

Section 2: The strategy approach

Again, we agree with the analysis which is outlined in this chapter that large housing growth will require a stronger demand management measures.

This chapter mentions the modelling that has been done. We would like the County to model the effects of a ‘no-cycling day’, on both the current network and the future network once housing growth is taken into account, to demonstrate the benefits that higher levels of cycling would bring to those who, for whatever reason, continue to drive. We think this would convince those who are not naturally disposed to supporting cycling improvements to do so.

This section of the document regrettably uses the term “road accidents”. Very few incidents involving road users are genuinely accidents, and this term is disrespectful to the families of those who have lost their lives or those who have been injured. We ask that the term “collisions” is used in place of “accidents” throughout the strategy.

Again, we strongly agree with the statement that, in Cambridge, “the capacity for movement on the transport network is far greater than the capacity for vehicles – if the network is used differently.” Indeed, figures 2.6 and 3.1 make clear that the County’s policy of traffic restraint, albeit currently limited, is working. As the adjacent text mentions, “In Cambridge, despite the growth in population in the period, the level of car traffic generated by travel to work trips slightly reduced”. In our view, this backs up strongly the need for continued but much stronger demand management measures.

We think the picture on page 2-9, showing the efficiency that cycling and public transport provides, should form the cover picture of the new Strategy.

The end of this section mentions the proposed A14 capacity increase. The Strategy fails to address the problem of increased traffic in North Cambridge.

Section 3: Funding, delivery and review of the strategy

We think this section needs to underline more strongly that cycling is by far the most cost-effective way to cater for the County’s growth strategy.

For instance, the substitution of a 5m-wide traffic lane along a key road within Cambridge (e.g. Newmarket Road), with two 2.5m cycle tracks (one on each side of the road) built to Dutch standards will increase the road capacity very substantially.

A second point is that we think that funding for cycling schemes is most likely to come if the County make, for the first time, a real attempt at providing very high quality cycle provision alongside main roads. This is the principle of the earlier “Cycling Demonstration Town”, namely that high quality provision will encourage much stronger demands for more infrastructure, and therefore have greater benefits. Weak, compromise-ridden schemes,

though cheaper to implement, are a false economy. Therefore, we think this section of the strategy must emphasise that a move to high quality schemes is important in generating evidence for more government funding.

We support the principle of a City Deal that would see closer working on transport between the three Local Authorities. The current close working between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, to co-ordinate their Local Plans, and the timing of the Transport Strategy, is a good indication of a positive and more effective co-ordinated approach.

However, we feel strongly that a City Deal must be backed with proper democratic scrutiny arrangements, in the form of a Committee system meeting in public, so that we and other stakeholders have a proper opportunity to influence proposed infrastructure changes. The recent scrapping of the Cambridge Transport AJC was not a positive step in this regard.

Section 4: The Transport Strategy

We deal with each of the sections, in order, below.

4A: Passenger Transport (bus services)

We support the concept of longer-distance Park and Ride sites, which, as the Strategy suggests, would intercept trips into Cambridge earlier. We want to see the policy objective of Park and Ride to have a stronger environmental focus to join its current economic objective of facilitating more trips into Cambridge. We are concerned, for instance, that it continues to undermine the economic effectiveness of regular service bus provision, due to the provision of subsidy that distorts the market. At any Park and Ride site sufficient provision must be made for those using cycles. The use of cycles must not be discouraged by inadequate provision.

Any new Guided Bus provision must, we believe, include high-quality cycleway provision alongside, as has proven so effective with the current busway, and the strategy must specify this.

We strongly welcome the recognition that “A major impediment to the reliability of and the further increase in usage of bus services ... is the delay experienced by buses due to congestion caused by general vehicular traffic in the city”, and in general we support improvements to reallocate space for cars to buses.

However, we are extremely concerned to ensure that bus priority schemes are done in a way that enhances cycle provision, not forces cyclists onto the pavement. This was our concern in 2003 for a Hills Road bus lane². We defeated this proposal when we showed that the delays to buses was predominantly due to buses having to stop to wait for passengers to pay.

We think it is extremely disappointing that on-street ticketing, in the form of either smartcard ticketing or pay-on-street, has still not been delivered by the bus companies and the County ten years on. Addressing this would reduce the dwell time of buses at stops, which will speed up public transport journeys, reduce conflicts between buses and those on cycles, and significantly reduce congestion in the city centre. Turning to London, it is clear there that the almost complete elimination of the need for people to pay on the bus has led to radically more punctual services. There should be a clear policy objective and clear timescale for delivery in Cambridgeshire’s Strategy for the introduction of on-street/smartcard bus ticketing. Such ticketing would massively improve public transport and would eliminate the

need for a number of bus lanes that would prejudice the creation of high-quality cycle infrastructure.

We are very interested in the prospect of the Gonville Place / East Road / Elizabeth Way corridor being repurposed for public transport and cycleway provision. This would accord strongly with our own proposals for a Newnham to Newmarket Road cycleway³.

Changes to bus provision on Milton Road should, we believe, take the opportunity to replace the current poor-quality shared use scheme with proper Dutch-style provision on both sides of the road. In particular, the appalling junction with Cowley Road, which, despite enormous amounts of space here, shoves cyclists onto pavements and forces them to make numerous difficult manoeuvres involving looking in many directions simultaneously, should be completely remodelled to make proper segregated cycle tracks, removing all shared-use pavement provision entirely.

4A: Passenger Transport (train services)

New stations should include cycle parking to a level that incorporates space for expansion.

4A: Passenger Transport (taxis)

On taxis, we support the view of the taxi trade that taxi numbers should be limited. It is clear that the current free-for-all is leading to an uncontrollable situation in places such as St Andrew's Street and Cambridge station.

On the ongoing issue of the St Andrew's Street rank, we see no particular need to consider moving this, on the basis that the overranking problem here can be dealt with. In our view this is the optimal location for passengers, and that the problems of overranking can be addressed through enforcement, better cycling signage, regulation of taxi numbers and various measures to improve management of the existing taxi ranks.

4B: Transport interchanges and hubs

At Cambridge Station, we think the new 3,000-space cycle park will reach capacity within 5 years of its opening. Accordingly, we think that the Strategy should outline reallocation of some car parking spaces here with cycle parking, so that the new cycle park can be expanded in future. This would enable our long-held desire for non-stepped ramp access as the building would then be long enough. It should incorporate a connection to the Station Cycle Bridge. Lastly, the envisaged link over platform 6 to form a direct link to the current footbridge to the island platform should be added. (The cycle park has been designed to align exactly to this.)

Also, an entrance to the Island Platform at Cambridge Station should be added from the Rustat Road side, complete with 1,000 cycle parking spaces on that side.

We support the new Cambridge Science Park Station and have submitted comments on its design. We feel it will make a significant contribution to reducing over-demand for cycle parking at the main Cambridge Station.

In addition to secure cycle parking, all transport hubs should include improved cycle and walking access from the local area. In rural areas improved walking routes from 800metres and improved cycling routes from 3km must form part of the plan.

All bus stops outside the urban area should also include cycle parking.

4C: Walking and Cycling

We think this section must be split into two separate sections, one on walking and one on cycling.

For too long, walking and cycling have been lumped together in policies and practice. This might be acceptable in other counties where cycling is at a low level. But in Cambridge, where almost a third of journeys are by bike, it is now time for Cambridgeshire to deal with these modes of transport distinctly. Whilst those cycling have some commonalities with the needs of pedestrians, they have needs more in common with drivers and bus passengers, as trips are normally longer than can be walked in comfort. It is time to eliminate this joining of two distinct modes once and for all, and put in place strong policies for each group, which are nonetheless mutually reinforcing.

We welcome many key statements, particularly that “there needs to be a step change in the number of trips”, that “whilst cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is not cheap, it is considerably less expensive than creating more highway capacity”, that “benefits of walking and cycling reach much further than simply keeping additional vehicles off the road”, especially that it “contribute[s] to the health agenda” and helps people “take advantage of opportunities to access employment, training and other vital services”.

We welcome the recognition that there is a “near market” of potential cyclists for whom “perception of safety is the most important factor determining whether someone would cycle”. We strongly agree. Although cycling is not an inherently unsafe form of transport, the current legacy of unfriendly street designs and domination by private vehicles means that safety remains a concern for a large number of people.

The key policy objective that we want to see added to the Strategy is a clear statement that new provision will be designed to the best of continental standards.

The focus of future work to facilitate cycling in Cambridge must be to reallocate roadspace by removing parked cars or by reducing the traffic lanes for private motor traffic. Much excellent work has been done over the last 15 years in developing a ‘secondary network’, e.g. paths across the greens, shortcuts, new bridges, etc. But, by contrast, many connecting roads, such as on the ring road areas, which form an essential part of the cycling network, remain hostile conduits for cars. These need to change to better accommodate those cycling and walking, to encourage much higher levels of cycling here. Steps back have occurred by creating a number of junctions (e.g. Hauxton Rd/ Addenbooke’s Road, Histon Road / King’s Hedges Road) and road changes (e.g. Newmarket Road, Milton Road, King’s Hedges Road) that have made them extremely hostile for those on bikes, and virtually un-crossable for those on foot.

These roads form natural ‘desire lines’, in a way that less direct (but nonetheless attractive) routes across the commons do not. Population growth will create clear demands for increased cycling to a level that would be inappropriate for green spaces. Furthermore, it is only along main roads, where motorists currently queue, that streams of efficiently-moving cyclists will be visible, encouraging a switch for many of these drivers. We believe there is space on many main roads within Cambridge.

We believe there is space on many main roads within Cambridge to better allocate space to cycles, public transport, and those on foot. We do not believe such roads should be used as car parking. Cycling past parked cars is difficult and risky. Reallocating such space to cycling space is a quick and cheap way of improving the environment. For example both Queen’s Road and Lensfield Road would be a far safer environment for all, that would encourage much more cycling, if the car parking were removed. We would be extremely pleased to see

this picture used, which demonstrates the point clearly:

<http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/47084/>

By way of further examples: On Queens Road, the parking along this entire stretch should be removed, and a cycleway provided at the same time. On Newmarket Road, complete reworking of the road layout is needed for its entire length. Again, the model here should be proper, wide, cycle infrastructure (minimum 2.5m) that gives people protection from traffic. There is certainly space along most of this, if a single lane of traffic along what can at times be an urban motorway, is reallocated.

The Chisholm Trail should, we believe, be highlighted as a key example of a dedicated link that would free up road space by providing a real alternative to the car. We want to see the Chisholm Trail project programme progressed as quickly as possible. We believe it will present a compelling case for government funding, particularly in relation to accessing public transport (the train stations) and accessing sites of work and education in the context of the growth agenda.

We agree with the astute assessments in the “Factors affecting a person’s decision to Cycle” box. However, we reject the implication that there are two “types” of cyclists: “confident people” who would be ‘happy’ on-road, and “less confident” people who are happy with less direct routes that meander around. The “Barriers to walking and cycling” chart of figure 4.10 needs to be adjusted accordingly.

The continental approach, e.g. in Denmark or the Netherlands, aims to provide a network that is direct, pleasant, safe and fast, for *everyone* who cycles. Cycle track provision alongside roads there is designed, as should be the case here, so that people cycling are not disadvantaged at junctions or by blockages. (By contrast, current cycle provision alongside roads in Cambridge are either narrow on-road cycle lanes or are shared-use paths that both pedestrians and cyclists alike detest and which often introduce new safety problems of their own.) Just because some people are ‘less confident’, they should not be disadvantaged by inadequate facilities; nor should facilities be inadequate in ways that leads confident cyclists to want to use the road instead.

In terms of the new developments, the Strategy rightly proposes “Using the opportunity that the new developments in and around the city present to create a step-change in the level and quality of walking and cycling facilities that are provided”. We think every new housing development around Cambridge ought to be being built to very high standards of cycle provision as a matter of course. However, the variable quality of advice from the County Council hitherto has meant this is not happening. As a voluntary group we have felt powerless to stop this given the enormous amount of documentation involved in every planning application.

Therefore we want to see an urgent overhaul in the standard of advice given to the City and South Cambridgeshire planning departments. We believe that every poor decision that they take due to advice from the County Council that fails to require continental standards of cycling provision will lead to 50 years of poor travel patterns.

Such advice has been poor at time even for existing parts of Cambridge that suffer from dangerous cycling conditions. For example, the suggestion by the County that it would be acceptable for new Tesco and Sainsbury’s stores on Mill Road to deliver on Mill Road itself are plainly nonsensical. Such bad advice puts City Councillors in a difficult position of having to argue against officer advice (leading to potential planning appeals) despite being obvious common sense.

Moving to the question of routes from between villages to Cambridge, we agree with the Strategy that there are many opportunities here. The approach of “proper, high quality, direct links between each village into the city” is one we strongly agree with.

We think the strategy must establish the principle of a Greater Cambridge Cycleway Network⁴, namely a series of concentric rings around the city that connect adjacent villages as well as forming a proper series of radial cycleways into Cambridge. This would connect communities as well as providing the secondary benefit of an increasing leisure cycling network.

Outside Cambridge there are huge opportunities to upgrade routes between villages and into Cambridge. Sealed surface paths away from main roads at least 2.5 m wide, could be provided on the path of an existing RoW, or adjacent to farm tracks. Such routes can be used by those cycle commuting, those going to school or college or those accessing shops or other services in adjacent villages. Without a good quality sealed surface such routes tend to be restricted to leisure traffic, as those in ‘ordinary’ clothes cannot easily use them without getting dirty or dusty. The County should be prepared to use Compulsory Purchase Orders to create such routes. Such routes also provide excellent opportunities for leisure trips from Cambridge into the surrounding countryside.

There are many missing links. Clearly it is not going to be possible to fund all these immediately. However, establishing the principle of routes between each area of the Network would provide a stronger policy basis for seeking developer contributions when opportunities arise, and provide a better long-term basis for strategic planning than presently.

In terms of judging the more immediate priorities, the ‘gravity model’ should be adopted, namely that the prioritisation for making safer routes between areas should be based on the population size of the two areas being connected. Effectively this forms a ‘predict and provide’ approach to new cycleway provision – there is a clear hunger for safer routes in many areas.

As noted above, there is significant scope for increasing leisure trips by bicycle. By way of example, destinations such as Wimpole, Duxford, Anglesey Abbey and Wicken Fen all need better connectivity for cycling.

In terms of speeds in rural areas, outlined on page 4-26, we believe that a move from 60mph to 50mph on country roads will make no difference whatsoever to improving the attractiveness of these roads for cycling. Narrow rural roads with 60 or 50 mph limits and no public transport, mean most see no other opportunity but to use a car unless away from roads paths are available. Reducing the speed limit to 40mph as suggested in the DfT circular 01/2013 ‘Setting Local Speed Limits’⁵ must also help. On busy rural roads, to keep vulnerable users clear of faster-moving traffic, paths alongside the road should be clearly separated from traffic, e.g. by a verge of at least 2m.

At present this objective will be treated as a quick ‘tick box’ solution that in practice achieves nothing and will only delay real action. Only proper, off-road provision, preferably separate from both motor vehicles and pedestrians, would do that, or much lower speeds.

Moving to the question of maintenance of the cycle network in and around Cambridge, it is disappointing to see (on page 4-25) a picture of a key cycleway that has not been gritted. Recent years have seen some improvements in gritting policy, but the cycleway network still remains distinctly second-class compared to other gritted areas.

4D: The Road Network

The road network will always be a key part of any cycle network and for that purpose we split it into five categories:

1. **Strategic, regional, roads** (currently administered by the Highways Agency and unfortunately possibly outside the remit of the County): A policy should be added that strategic roads must include strategic cycle routes when they are being upgraded/built, e.g. A14, and that where possible such routes should be added to existing strategic roads. These should include measures to avoid noise for a nearby cycleway (as is done elsewhere) – as otherwise places like the A14 would be unpleasant. A barrier of trees and hedging, sufficiently away from the road, should suffice. Alternatively, such changes should offer a route that is equally convenient.
2. **Main roads outside settlements** (the remainder of 'A' roads within the study area outside settlements and with current speed limits of 50mph and above): Only a high quality cycle route separated from traffic will be sufficient to encourage cycling. Care will be needed at junctions to ensure that those on cycles are not disadvantaged. If those confident on cycles remain on the road it shows a failure of provision and design.
3. **Minor roads outside settlements:** Unless clearly good and direct off road alternatives exist a speed limit of 40mph should be imposed as detailed in the DfT 'Setting Local Speeds' as all such roads in the area will carry significant numbers of those on foot or cycle. The circular says: "40mph should be considered where there are many bends, junctions or accesses, substantial development, a strong environmental or landscape reason, or where there are considerable numbers of vulnerable road users."
4. **Main roads in Cambridge and villages:** Unless clearly good and direct off-road alternatives exist, all waiting should be banned. We discuss elsewhere in this document how proper cycle infrastructure is needed on these routes.
5. **Minor streets in Cambridge and villages** (principally for local access, that are not in the above categories): These are main areas where people live and so should all have 20mph limits to make cycle and walking for all easier more pleasant and safer. The speed on minor roads and streets in villages also needs addressing. Village streets are often twisting and lack footways. 20mph should be the default speed on all but major roads in villages, as a way of making cycling and walking safer and encouraging less car use for short trips.

Demand management and parking

We strongly agree with the need for demand management measures in the form of more extensive parking controls. In our view there are four key points.

Firstly, we strongly agree with the suggestion of a city-wide Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The current piecemeal approach leads to displacement and has hotspots of encouragement of commuter parking, which is not sustainable in a growing city. Implementing parking controls provides two benefits: firstly, it reduces the space occupied by parked cars, and secondly it reduces motor traffic on the roads. Both these free up space, making cycling a more pleasant activity.

Secondly, there needs to be a clear policy that all main roads within the city, in particular the inner ring road, should not permit parking. Places like Lensfield Road, East Road, Queen's

Road, Station Road, Arbury Road and others are key routes where the movement of both cars and cycles is paramount and yet both are blocked by such parking.

Thirdly, there needs to be a new, and robust, policy that states that 10% of car parking space in terraced streets should be reallocated to cycle parking (which means that there will be equal amounts, since cycle parking is ten times more space-efficient). In particular, this should apply to all residential streets Petersfield and Romsey. This policy would mean that the level of demand for cycle parking would be satisfied, that pavements would become unblocked by poorly-parked cycles, and that people have the choice of sustainable transport.

Residents should be able to request that a car parking space outside their house be converted to a bay of cycle parking, and that this should be implemented without the need for a TRO.

Lastly, the Strategy needs to define clearly what the balance is between the competing objectives of reducing parking to aid traffic flow and the raising of revenue. Recent discussions, for instance, about the removal of a mere 10 pay-and-display parking spaces in central Cambridge in order to create hundreds of much-needed cycle parking spaces, have run into the question of acceptability to the County Council due to loss of parking revenue. In our view this is an unacceptable dereliction of duty to promote sustainable transport, and is not economically beneficial. More cycle parking increases the visitor intensity of the city centre, meaning that more people can shop but park in the same amount of space. In general, it is extremely disappointing that a mere 10 spaces are being argued over in the context of a city that will see thousands of new people wanting to access the city centre as housing growth takes effect.

We have long been strong supporters of access controls within Cambridge. These controls have generally prevented conditions becoming worse for cycling and walking in the City Centre. We would strongly welcome extensions to such controls as a way of preventing private car traffic creating congestion and pollution in Cambridge.

4E: Freight movements and servicing

We would like to see transshipment ('consolidation') facilities to avoid the need for unsuitably large lorries entering the streets of Cambridge.

In terms of driver training, we think Cambridgeshire should increasingly mandate (or, if not legally possible, strongly and publicly promote) that businesses apply the same requirements that Transport for London now applies for safer lorries within its contracts⁶. This involves an Safe Urban Driving CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence) driver training programme involving drivers cycling on the same streets where lorries are present, stipulating checks to be made on a driver's record, listing safety features that every lorry must include (ranging from a full set of six safety mirrors to side-guards and close proximity cameras or sensors), and other measures.

4F: Smarter Choices

We would like to see increased funding and support for the Travel For Work programme and extensions of schemes such as Travel Plan Plus in the Science Park area to other areas such as Addenbrooke's and the NW Cambridge site.

A much more robust approach is needed to the monitoring and implementation of Travel Plans. At present, it appears that some of these are basically written documents that are ignored in practice. In particular, advice given to the District Councils must now ensure that Travel Plans must never be seen as an alternative to actual infrastructure that a developer

should be providing. For instance, the Lion Yard extension planning application did not require the developer to increase cycle parking (despite the Cycle Parking Standards requiring this), yet at the same time it implemented a travel plan that would clearly create the demand for it.

We would like a firm commitment that cycle training will continue, to Bikeability standards (i.e. not the poorer Safer Cycling scheme approach), and delivered by professionals. In our view, cycle training – while not detracting from the clear need to improve physical infrastructure – is important in getting children to start cycling and giving them greater confidence where street layouts have not been upgraded to the best of continental standards that would practically eliminate risks.

We think a ‘Cycling in Cambridge’ brochure, custom-written for Cambridge, should be distributed to every new resident of the new developments, and indeed to existing developments. We would be delighted to create such a brochure if funding were to be available.

4G: Streetscape and environment

We support measures to improve the streetscape. In particular, we think that continental standard cycle provision provides a massive opportunity to make more attractive streetscapes that avoid the need for most cycle signage, e.g.:

<http://assen.cyclestreets.net/location/28580/>

We support the Eastern Gate SPD, but are concerned that Section 106 funds from the myriad new developments in the area seem not to be going to this much-needed change that would positively transform this part of the city.

5: The high level programme

We think this section should again include a high-level strategic highlight, noted above, namely: “Creating the leading cycle network in the UK, matching Dutch standards, with 40-45% of all trips in Cambridge made by bike”. This should be considered as major an objective as, say, the A14 changes. It would bring considerably more transport choice to very many people.

Accordingly, figure 5.2 should have the words “to the best of continental standards” added at the end of “Development of a comprehensive, high quality cycling network” (with walking split off as a separate item as we outline above).

In terms of the Ely/Waterbeach corridor it is vital that any improvements in this corridor, in and expanded Waterbeach or adjacent villages or commercial developments, meet the highest standards.

For the Royston to Cambridge A10 corridor, we strongly support calls by the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign to provide a cycling improvement here that would be suitable for people of all ages and abilities.

For the Northstowe to Cambridge corridor, our principal concern is that the level of cycle provision proposed for the Northstowe development is failing to reach continental best practice. This is a challenge that needs to be addressed urgently as this development is planned. Not to do so will leave a legacy of 50 years of poor transport patterns, which is entirely avoidable.

The Smarter Choices package

We support this programme. In particular, targeted in-household meetings to discuss travel options can be very successful in increasing awareness of alternative means of travel, with a consequent opportunity for traffic reduction.

In terms of a new travel website, we would like to see increased promotion of the cycle journey planner that we helped set up, CycleStreets, and to see CycleStreets routing being provided within any integrated planner rather than the alternative offering of Transport Direct. CycleStreets offers the benefit of more local knowledge of cycle improvements and is being kept updated.

We think teleworking opportunities are likely to increase in the coming decades, and that the opportunity of traffic reduction it creates should give added emphasis on reallocation of roadspace in Cambridge.

Failures in the modelling exercise

We have great concerns about the apparent lack of rigour in the modelling exercise. We also believe that the reasons for and effect of behavioural change need to be explained. 'Do something' is more than just building new roads and guided busways.

There is no reference to health benefits in the modelling report. Much of the economic benefits of an increase in 'Active Travel' comes from improved health. To omit any reference to such benefits in the modelling activity suggests the consultants are still stuck in the 1960s.

Unlike many other urban areas of similar size, private car transport does not dominate and is in a significant minority for internal trips in Cambridge where cycling and walking dominate. For trips from the fringes into Cambridge public transport figures are rising, especially if P&R is included. Multimode trips and not just P&R are also high with many local rail trips involving significant cycling at one end or the other if not both. Despite difficult conditions many already cycle regularly into Cambridge from necklace villages. Improvement for cycling on some routes has resulted in large increases in cycle use.

For this reason, and the fact that different modes have vastly different space requirements (as shown so well by pictures on page 2-8 of the TSCS) assumptions about modal split can make vast difference to the results.

We are extremely concerned that a number of very well used cycle routes in the urban fringes are not even shown. Figure B3 Appendix B page 4 neglects to show any of the cycle routes adjacent to the Guided Bus route.

Although there are many pages showing average journey time differences for Do Nothing and Do Something, there is no detailing of modal split, apart from that for projected new developments.

Was any allowance taken for 'reliability' of trip time?

Many transport studies assume people will not walk more than 1km or cycle more than 5km because of average journey time. This discounts two significant factors:

- Many use 'active' travel as a way of achieving a good level of daily exercise. Not only does this mean that as individuals they don't count the extra time as 'wasted' but such active travel has a high return in 'Cost Benefit' for the community⁷

- Because of the utter reliability of cycling and walking time, a far later departure time can be achieved when, for example catching a train, compared with car or bus over not insignificant distances. For such trips it is probably the 97.5 percentile time that is important rather than the crude average.

We see nothing in the presented modelling paper to show how well the model fits current travel patterns and modal split. Nor do we see anything that explains how raising levels of walking, cycling, and public transport use by behavioural change, would create benefits by significantly reducing congestion in the absence of major infrastructure change.

We believe this would be easy to demonstrate using the 'idea' of a 'No Cycling Day'. Model the congestion effect of say 25% of those cycling using a car instead, and similarly model the effect of say 10% of car drivers within 10km of Cambridge cycling instead of driving. This sort of sensitivity analysis would be standard practice in many fields.

If such benefits were well-explained in the final report, we think the majority of the population would understand why expenditure on major road infrastructure was poor value for money compared with such items as removing free commuter car parking, and improving conditions for sustainable modes.

Sustainable modes should include multimodal trips by cycle and public transport. Such a change away from car dominance will create further opportunities to improve conditions for cycling and public transport at minimal cost. This in turn should create further modal change and reduce congestion for those essential users of motor vehicles, and public transport. (The win-win-win effect).

Summary

Our key messages are:

- That the cycleway network in Cambridge needs to be developed to standards equivalent to those found in the Netherlands and Denmark, with particular emphasis on the main roads achieved through roadspace reallocation.
- Together with demand management measures to control parking, this would create the conditions where some 40-45% of trips in Cambridge could be made by bike. We wish to see an end to compromise schemes that fail to create modal shift because of concerns about short-term increases in local congestion.
- The easiest opportunities for increase in cycle use are (i) improvements along the main roads, as noted above, and (ii) for those who live in areas of South Cambridgeshire close to Cambridge; such a modal shift would also have the greatest effect on reducing congestion within Cambridge.
- Altogether, this will increase the total carrying capacity of the street network to cater for the massive housing growth that is now happening, hence enabling cycles, buses, and essential users of motor vehicles to move in a far less congested network.

Yours sincerely,
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign,

Martin Lucas-Smith, Chair, and
Jim Chisholm, Committee member

¹ <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/EB08D121-811E-4DB9-B83D-6987D67F3E31/0/20130721TSCSCv20WebConsultationDraftMain.pdf>

² <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/campaigning/issues/hillsroad/>

³ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/103/article4.html>

⁴ <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/108/article5.html>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/setting-local-speed-limits>

⁶ <http://lcc.org.uk/articles/transport-for-london-has-tough-safer-lorries-conditions-in-all-transport-supplier-contracts>

⁷ See www.heatwalkingcycling.org and <http://www.cedar.iph.cam.ac.uk/resources/evidence/eb-why-active-travel-web/>