



Grand Arcade

What chance of a cycle contraflow in Corn Exchange Street?

Accident reduction

New schemes implemented

Crime prevention

Denying criminals use of the roads

Grime prevention

Cycle bridge still filthy

'Super-wardens'

Fleeing motorists?



Cherry Hinton Road: a new Toucan crossing by Cherry Hinton Hall – see page 6.

City centre cycle ban should be reviewed

Says report from Government body – see page 4



If you like what you see in this newsletter, add your voice to those of our 700 members by joining the Campaign.

Membership costs are low: £7.50 individual, £3.50 unwaged, £12 household. For this, you get six newsletters a year, discounts at a large number of bike shops, and you will be supporting our work. Please get in touch if you want to hear more.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign was set up in 1995 to voice the concerns of cyclists. We are not a cycling club but an organisation for lobbying and campaigning for the rights of cyclists, and for promoting cycling in and around Cambridge.

Our regular stall on Saturdays outside the Guildhall is the public face of the campaign; volunteers are always welcome to help. And don't forget our meetings, open to all, on the first Tuesday of each month, 7.30 for 8.00 pm at the Friends' Meeting House, Jesus Lane, Cambridge.

Elected Officers 2003–2004

Co-ordinator – Martin Lucas-Smith

Liaison Officer – Clare Macrae

Membership Secretary – Dave Earl

Newsletter Editor – Mark Irving

Treasurer – David Dyer

Stall Officer – Paul Tonks ☎ 07870 441257

Press Officer – James Woodburn

Officers without portfolio

Jim Chisholm, Nigel Deakin, Richard Taylor, Lisa Woodburn and Wookey

(Non-committee) Secretary – post vacant

Contacting the Campaign

Cambridge Cycling Campaign
PO Box 204
Cambridge CB4 3FN

Telephone and fax ☎ (01223) 690718

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

E-mail ✉ contact@camcycle.org.uk

This newsletter is printed on recycled paper by Victoire Press, Bar Hill.

Progress on Grand Arcade cycle access

Much has happened since our article on the Grand Arcade development in *Newsletter 51* in November. In that article we showed how necessary the long-planned cycle contraflow in Corn Exchange Street is for effective access to the proposed 511-space cycle park to be constructed as part of this very large city centre development. As the *Newsletter* went to press, we heard that the plans for the proposed cycle contraflow had failed a safety audit and that the transport authorities at Cambridgeshire County Council had decided that the contraflow could not be installed.

The final Planning Application for the development came before the City Council's Planning Committee on 3 December. We wrote to all the members of the Planning Committee before the meeting and then spoke at the meeting urging that planning permission should not be granted because cycle access to the cycle parking area, and to and through the development more generally, depended on the Corn Exchange Street contraflow. The cycle park was, in any case, too small – much smaller than the City Council's own mandatory Cycle Parking Standards required.

Many of the Councillors on the Planning Committee are active supporters of cyclists and cycling and, after much discussion, a clear majority agreed with the Campaign's case. They took the decision to reject the Council Officers' recommendation and voted to defer consideration of the planning application so that the cycle access issues could be examined in more detail.

The City Council then arranged a 'Workshop' on 17 December on cycle access to the Grand Arcade which was attended by City Council and County Council officials, by Councillors, by representatives of the developers and by representatives of the Cycling Campaign. Discussion focused on the proposed cycle contraflow.

We were given the opportunity to present a detailed document that we had prepared showing the necessity for the contraflow and suggesting ways in which it could be safely

installed. Here are the main points that we put forward.

- The proposed cycle park and the proposed contraflow are interlinked. Without the contraflow the cycle park would be considered remote and inaccessible and would be likely to be underused.
- The contraflow would at the same time increase the permeability of the city centre for cyclists by providing a new southbound cycle route from the Guildhall and Market Hill area to Regent Street and beyond.
- Corn Exchange Street is at present drab, gloomy and car-dominated. Its character should be changed to reduce vehicle speeds and to make it attractive to pedestrians and cyclists like the rest of the city centre. If the character of the street is changed to make it less car-dominated, the provision of contraflow cycling becomes much simpler.
- Speed should be restricted to 20 mph and perhaps to 10 mph at the junction with Wheeler Street.
- In Wheeler Street and the northern end of Corn Exchange Street, which are heavily used by pedestrians, a formal contraflow lane is unnecessary. As in nearby Bene't Street, contraflow cycling should be permitted without any demarcated contraflow lanes. This whole area should be re-paved with something other than black tarmac. Raised tables should be used to slow down traffic. Loading restrictions should be introduced requiring vehicles to unload in Peas Hill rather than in Wheeler Street.
- Along the middle section of Corn Exchange Street, where the Grand Arcade building is to be constructed, a mandatory, red-surfaced, contraflow cycle lane, 1.5 metres wide, should be installed. The marked-out lane is needed here to give the clearest possible indication to motorists turning right into the car park that contraflow cyclists are legitimately present and entitled to priority.
- The southern end of Corn Exchange Street along the side of the Crowne Plaza Hotel is already a two-way street used by cyclists as well as motorists. We do not believe that a segregated cycle track is necessary or appropriate here. But changes are

needed to the car park exits to ensure that cyclists travelling towards Downing Street are given priority over cars coming out of the car park. The raised footway in the centre of the road should be removed as it is no longer useful now that the street-level footway on the Grand Arcade side of the street is to be replaced by a high-level walkway. This would allow the stop line in front of the car exits to be brought



Grand Arcade development: if the entrance to a big cycle park is to be off Corn Exchange Street, it needs to be accessible from both directions.

forward, so motorists can see contraflow cyclists more clearly. The car park exit barriers should be moved back into the car park so that drivers have to make separate decisions about going through the barriers and going onto the public highway. The present traffic light system should be changed because the green light wrongly suggests to motorists that they have priority when they go out onto the street.

Our suggestions were very well received at the workshop and there was general agreement that they provided a way forward. The developers were obviously in favour of installing the contraflow and made some very useful suggestions, particularly about the car park exits. The developers and the transport experts at County Hall will now look at the issues in detail and try to take matters forward.

On 7 January the planning application came before the Planning Committee again and this time it was approved. There was no doubt about the determination of Councillors to ensure, if at all possible, that the contraflow will be installed. There is no guarantee that it will be, but we are hopeful that the current impetus will be successful.

However, Councillors were not willing to require that the developers increase the number of cycle spaces in the cycle park up to the number specified in the Council's own Cycle Parking Standards.

The contraflow issue will now come before the Transport Area Joint Committee, which has both City and County Councillors as members, on 26 January. If they give their strong backing to the contraflow proposal,

the chances of eventual success will be much greater. People are keen that the matter should, as far as possible, be resolved before the public enquiry into the Grand Arcade compulsory purchase orders opens on 20 April.

Members of the Campaign have put much time and effort into campaigning on this issue and have learned much about the operation of local government decision-making in the process. We are reasonably hopeful that we will in the end obtain a contraflow but we are unlikely to know for certain for months, or maybe even until construction starts in some years' time.

James Woodburn

Contents

- 2 Progress on Grand Arcade cycle access**
- 3 Do you have experience setting up an e-mail listserver?**
- 4 Bells for Cambridgeshire?**
County Council is jeopardising getting more people to cycle, says Government Body
- 6 Some recent accident reduction schemes**
- 7 Local Authority Parking Enforcement**
- 8 Bridge still filthy**
All abilities cycling, again
- 9 City centre cycling**
One-way streets and misunderstandings
- 10 Cutter Ferry Bridge**
Cycleway signs
- 11 All criminals are motorists (discuss)**
How following up apparently minor motoring offences can help detect more serious crimes.
Station developments
- 12 The 'super-wardens' bill**
- 13 Cycling in Vehicle Restricted Areas (VRAs)**
Shorts
- 14 Save 4.5 million tons of CO₂**
Says The Local Transport Plan
Letters
Helmet law; the guided bus
- 15 Campaign Diary**
Cities for cyclists
- 16 Your streets this month**

Do you have experience setting up an e-mail listserver?

For many years the Campaign has made heavy use of e-mail list facilities provided by Yahoo! Groups. We now have around ten such e-mail lists, e.g. members' discussions, subgroups such as the Cycle Parking Subgroup, and the heavily-used Committee list.

Recently we have had a few problems with archiving messages, including the non-archiving of attachments (mainly the Committee list). As a result, we would like to bring the running of e-mail lists in-house.

Although this would result in a small increase in costs due to the purchase of additional hosting, it would give the Campaign more flexibility and control in the running of its lists. It would also ensure we do not remain hostage to whatever Yahoo! wish to do with their facility. Indeed, we are surprised that they have not yet started charging.

Ideally we require an open-source or freeware Linux-based listserver, with web-based administration tools, posting security configuration and a web-based searchable archive. The proposal would be to set up an additional subdomain on new hosting, and to import the 15,000 or so archived messages from the existing lists into the new list system.

If you have experience in setting up and running a listserver, or can offer advice, please do get in contact with me via our usual contact details.

Martin Lucas-Smith, Co-ordinator

Bells for Cambridgeshire?

Several years ago in National Bike Week, the Cambridge Cycling Campaign awarded 'Golden Bells' for local schemes that helped cycling and 'Chocolate Chains' for those that were a hindrance.

Last year, as reported in *Newsletter 49*, the Government's (English) Regional Cycling Development Team (ERCDT) 'scored' each Local Authority on a range of issues. These results were reported to individual Local Authorities and to the National Cycling Strategy Board, but they were not published. However, the summary comments were published, as was the basis on which scores were made. We have heard rumours that many scores were not good, even in places with high levels of cycling. Performance was measured in 10 areas:

- A. Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2000/Cycling Strategy
- B. Annual Progress Report (APR 2002)
- C. Council Commitment
- D. Infrastructure
- E. Cyclist Training
- F. Cycle Promotion
- G. Stakeholder Engagement
- H. Wider Engagement
- I. Planning for Cycling
- J. Targets and Monitoring

Looking at some extracts from the Cambridgeshire report, how do we think they might have scored?

Summary:

Travel mode use in Cambridge is the envy of many other towns and cities in the UK. Cycling is about 26%. The Local Authorities are committed to creating a people-friendly environment within the city centre and are prepared to restrict and manage the car. The lack of Cycle Audit procedures should be remedied. ...Consequently, getting more people to cycle is being jeopardised.

A: Local Transport Plan/Cycling Strategy

[Note: the LTP reviewed has in Cambridgeshire been superseded] Although Cycle Audit and Review are alluded to, there is no commitment to use the techniques.



At about 26%, cycling in Cambridge is the envy of many other towns and cities in the UK.

B: Annual Progress Report

The 2001/02 APR reports much on-the-ground project and initiative progress that contributes to a better cycling environment.

C: Council Commitment

Commitment to cycling is relatively good. The role of cycling and making changes to the transport network that encourage and provide for the bike is generally consistent. However the existence of a central area cycling ban is an anomaly in the UK's premier cycle-friendly city. A review may now be appropriate.

Some elements of

development control also need review. Bad practice is being allowed in the name of new development – this may partly be a problem of staff resources and the lack of a formal Cycle Audit procedure.

D: Infrastructure

There is much on-road provision utilising cycle lanes, ASLs, cycle slots and other useful, cost-effective measures. Off-road facilities are of mixed quality – the usual problems of loss of priority at side roads and detailed issues like dropped kerbs persist.

The local cycling campaign group has concerns about a proposal to remove on-road lanes in favour of off-road provision (Hills Rd Cambridge). This appears, on the face of it, a retrograde step.

E: Cycle Training

51% of primary children receive training (mostly on-road) No training is offered at secondary level.

F: Cycle Promotion

Cycle promotion is taken seriously by the Local Authority. Bike week type opportunities are supported. City maps and other guides are available. The appointment

The Government body responsible for monitoring cycling nationally says Cambridgeshire

- Is jeopardising getting more people to cycle
- Should review City centre cycle ban
- Road Safety Department seems to have wrong approach
- Needs to listen to everyday cyclists

of a 'Cycling Promotions Officer' is being considered.

G: Stakeholder Engagement

Engagement with local cyclists is generally good. There is, however, a concern about how the relationship with the local Cambridge Cycling Campaign and the County is developing. Currently there is a rather negative feeling from the Cycling Campaign which is unhelpful. Wider engagement with 'every-day' rather than 'campaigning' cyclists would be beneficial.

H: Wider Engagement

There is a general coherence about encouragement. Good examples include work with employers, schools etc. The progress with Addenbrooke's Hospital and the ambitious travel plan is to be commended. The Road Safety side of the Local Authority still however tends to dwell on the negative side of cycling.

I: Planning for Cyclists

Recent audits suggest that best practice is not consistently secured or enforced in connection with new development. The existence of a good, well-established cycling culture within the Local Authority no doubt helps to reduce the problem. Cycle Audit is not used – this should be rectified and best practice approach adopted. The production of a cycling specific design guidance combined with awareness training for appropriate staff should be considered.

J: Targets and Monitoring

Cambridge appears to be under reporting its achievements.

Here are some points from other reports for comparison:

Luton: (C) Documentary evidence suggests that LBC are yet to be convinced of the

transport value of cycling. (E) uptake is very low with only 50 children trained.

East Yorkshire: (B) The APR reports...7 new cycle stands, Advanced Stop Lines at 1 junction.

Hull: (A) Cycling is seen as having a major role to play in reducing traffic congestion and improving the environment. (C) The Council spends around £500,000 (on cycling) a year. (D) The high number of 20 mph zones has led to improved cycling conditions in large areas.

Oxford: (A) The LTP states that the Hierarchy of Solutions has been adopted. Policy CS4 seeks to avoid conflict with pedestrians by following the general principle that pavements are for pedestrians and carriageways should be made safe for cyclists. (G) Neither LTP nor Cycling Strategy mention consultation with cycling groups. Nothing has been established to replace the City Cycle Sub-Committee.

York: (A) York's LTP shows good evidence of encouraging and promoting cycling. (D) York's infrastructure shows substantial

evidence that cyclists are taken seriously. (E) The Authority excels in all areas of practice. (J) Cycles parked in the city centre and station are counted twice a month. Cycle casualties have fallen which when compared to the increases in use is encouraging.

Going back to the Cambridgeshire report, both the County Council and the Cycling Campaign are criticised. They say that we have a rather *negative approach*. In defence, many active members of the campaign have said how demoralising it is spending so much time preventing conditions getting worse, and this review came at just the time when nearly all our efforts were being spent campaigning against the Hills Road bus lanes.

It suggests wider engagement with *ordinary cyclists* (rather than 'campaigners'). We requested that 'ordinary' cyclists should be stopped and questioned in the survey on city centre access, but were told it was not legal to stop cyclists. Again we've asked that cyclists be treated as 'customers' as are car park users, bus passengers and 'park and ride' users. We would really like to know what the three thousand people who cycle

from 'necklace' villages into Cambridge each day think of their trip, and of the lack of parking space in the central shopping area.

On a more positive side the Campaign has done much to support the County's plans to restrict access of motor vehicles to the City Centre, and Clare, our hard working Liaison Officer, spends much time representing us on a wide range of council and other committees.

What of the criticisms of the County Council?

We have been working over a significant number of years to get Cambridgeshire to produce a 'Design Guide' and to formally adopt 'Cycle Audit and Review', the guidelines for which were published over five years ago. A draft for a design guide was produced but seems to have disappeared without trace, although it now gets a mention in an appendix to the 2004 LTP.

On 'Planning and Development', we are concerned that standards in the Local Plan on cycling are neglected, and that road changes made under section 106 agreements (planning gain) appear without scrutiny by either the Cycling Campaign or even 'Area Joint Committee' councillors.

The report describes Cambridge as the UK's 'Premier Cycle Friendly City', but recommendations include:

- Allocate more staff time to developing and implementing the cycling programme.
- Allocate resources to apply Cycle Audit.
- Re-examine central area cycle ban – try to 'design' for cyclists.
- Set targets to increase level of training for both child and adult cyclists.
- Ensure that new developments contribute to realistic, best practice cycle access and routes – both on-site and off-site.
- Consider producing good practice cycle design guide to replace standard, out of date guidance.
- Improve involvement of and relationship with local cycling campaign.

If Cambridge is to remain the 'Premier' Cycle City in the UK we must work with the Local Authorities to ensure these recommendations are followed, otherwise we may lose the crown to the other place (Oxford), or, heaven forbid, to a town north of the Trent such as York or even Hull.

We'll be asking the County if they accept the assessment by ERCDT and if they will make their scores public.

Jim Chisholm

UNIVERSITY CYCLES

9 Victoria Avenue
Cambridge
01223 - 355517



If you want to know more about these reports they are all available, complete with details of the methodology, at:
www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk/local_authority_performance.html.

Cambridgeshire's report is:
www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk/assets/go/Eastern/Cambridgeshire.pdf.

Some recent accident reduction schemes

The accident reduction schemes which we reported last year in *Newsletters 47 and 49* have now been largely completed. We were critical of quite a few aspects of these schemes, especially those aspects intended to help cyclists. Part of our criticism was about the consultation and decision-making process. Our submissions, and those from others, were largely ignored or rejected. Now that the work has been done, we thought it was time for review.

Mowbray Road–Queen Edith’s Way roundabout

At Mowbray Road and Queen Edith’s Way, there have been some minor changes to the roundabout. These include the now familiar black and white chevrons built into the fabric of the island. Regular users of this junction will be familiar with the tyre grooves which used to be ploughed across the centre of the island from time to time, though quite how drivers could fail to see it is a mystery. It should now be more distinct, though the consequences of the harder surface and higher walls might make any crash more severe. However, the changes are relatively minor and really don’t address the main problem for cyclists: the Mowbray Road entry to the roundabout is too obscured and too close to Queen Edith’s Way, making it difficult to see if it is safe to join the roundabout westbound from Queen Edith’s Way.

Cherry Hinton Road

On Cherry Hinton Road, the Pelican crossing by Cherry Hinton Hall has been replaced by a Toucan and the off-road approaches to it



Cherry Hinton Road: red surfacing is only across southern side roads.

made more cycle friendly. This legalises an already common manoeuvre and especially benefits students at Netherhall School. Red strips have been laid across the mouths of side roads to emphasise the presence of cycles on the road, and anti-skid road surfaces have been installed. We expected that red surfacing would be applied on both sides of Cherry Hinton Road, but none has been applied on the northern, Cherry Hinton Hall, side.



Narrow cycle lanes in Coldham’s Lane help pass queues but bring cyclists close to cars in parking bays.

More strangely, small signs saying ‘Think Bike’ have gone up along the road. The council committee which approved the schemes expressly asked that this should not be done, and rightly so. It has been done anyway.

Coldham’s Lane

We were most critical of the scheme on Coldham’s Lane, where advisory cycle lanes have been installed. We said that they were too narrow. Whilst 1.2 metres might have been all right at a pinch in some places, the problem here is that they run alongside parking bays. This means that the lane forces the cyclist into the path of thoughtlessly opened car doors.

We are still worried by this aspect of the scheme now it is complete, though the lanes do feel somewhat wider in use than we had expected. Putting the safety aspect aside, we have to say that the lanes enormously improve convenience for cyclists on Coldham’s Lane. It is now possible to bypass the traffic

queues which often form all the way from the Brooks Road roundabout near Sainsbury’s to Coldham’s Lane bridge and vice-versa. Journey times by bike are much improved, but great care is needed to watch for car doors opening into the lane.



Councillors, concerned about sign proliferation, rejected these signs.

The Cherry Hinton Road arrangement of red surfacing across side road junctions is what we would have preferred on Coldham’s Lane. Queuing traffic would keep away from the side of the road so that bikes could get through without a formal lane which leaves too little room alongside the parking bays.

Perne Road

On Perne Road, near the Brookfields junction, misleading pavement markings remain. We have heard that the cost of removing the long-standing obstructions on the cycle path means that we almost certainly will still have to give way to a phone box!

King’s Hedges Road

Problems with electricity cables have arisen over the King’s Hedges Road scheme and it has not yet been implemented.

Barton Road

On Barton Road, the installation of a Toucan crossing close to the junction with Grantchester Road is welcome, but some of the details of the associated work on the southern pavement are a problem. The



Cherry Hinton Road: a new crossing by Cherry Hinton Hall allows Netherhall students to cycle across.

pavement surface outside No. 71 should be red because cyclists need to use the dropped kerb there to access the crossing. No blue shared-use signs have been put up yet to indicate that cyclists are entitled to cycle on the pavement near the crossing nor have any bicycles been painted on the pavement surface. The dropped kerb on the town side of Grantchester Road is not truly flush with the road and is at an awkward angle for cyclists using the crossing and turning into or out of



Barton Road: a new crossing helps getting to and from Grantchester Road, but the angles off the paths are wrong.

Grantchester Road. Cycling over a kerb that is not flush at an oblique angle is unsafe. It should be made flush and extended for an additional metre or two along Grantchester Road. Work on the verges should be completed as much mud is spreading onto the shared-use pavement.

We are very pleased that one of our suggestions appears to have been accepted.

Councillors asked that the proposed build-out at the entrance to Grange Road should be reconsidered and it has not been built. We had argued that a build-out there would be dangerous for on-road cyclists. But we are sorry to see that obstructions remain which obscure traffic approaching along Barton Road for road users coming out of Grange Road. Councillors had asked for removal of these obstructions to be

only two houses should all be urgently removed from the grass verge on the out-of-town side of the Grange Road junction before they cause an accident. It would also be sensible to remove a couple of on-road car parking spaces to give a clearer view of on-coming traffic.

All of these schemes are intended to remedy high accident rates at these locations. We urge the adoption of the suggestions we make here for Cherry Hinton Road and Barton Road as these would, we believe, make a low-cost contribution to accident reduction.

David Earl and James Woodburn

Local Authority Parking Enforcement

We mentioned in *Newsletter 46* that some local authorities have, with Government approval, started schemes whereby civilian staff rather than police or traffic wardens enforce parking restrictions, and that this is being considered for Cambridge.

A few months ago, Cambridgeshire County Council issued, on behalf of the Environment & Transport Area Joint Committee, a consultation on Local Authority Parking Enforcement. This has subsequently led to the approval by the council's Cabinet of a formal application to the Department for Transport in December 2003. The County Council has the support of the Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

The County's proposals can be viewed on their website at www.cambridge-lape.co.uk.

We wrote to the County Council to put on record our support for the proposals, as we believe it will lead to an increased level of enforcement of cycle lanes and parking restrictions.

If this is so, it will be helpful in reducing some of the problems which many cyclists currently face, such as illegally parked vehicles and blocked cycle or bus lanes, as well as assisting the wider objectives of the County's transport strategies.

Martin Lucas-Smith, Co-ordinator



Enforcement of parking restrictions in cycle lanes might be done by the Council rather than police or traffic wardens in future.

considered. We believe that the large sign saying Traffic Calmed Area, the newly-planted tree and the telegraph pole serving

HOWES CYCLES

WHY SHOP WITH US ?

BECAUSE WE ARE IN TOWN

BECAUSE WE HAVE A GREAT RANGE OF PRODUCTS

BECAUSE WE HAVE THE BEST WORKSHOP AROUND OFFERING HIGH QUALITY REPAIRS AND SERVICING

BECAUSE ON TOP OF ALL THIS

ON PRODUCTION OF YOUR CURRENT MEMBERSHIP CARD

WE WILL GIVE YOU A 10% DISCOUNT

104 REGENT STREET
CAMBRIDGE
CB2 1DP

TEL. 01223 350350
FAX. 01223 460883

Bridge still filthy

Lisa Woodburn wrote to Ruth Bagnall, the City Councillor quoted in a recent article in the *Cambridge Evening News* which reminded us that the trials of new materials for the bridge over the railway (see *Newsletter 48*) had not gone ahead. Lisa asked:

- What will these trials (when they take place) consist of? Will just a few small panels be replaced or will a large part of the bridge covering be replaced?
- Are we likely to see a new covering for the bridge within the next five or ten years?

The questions were passed on to Gareth Guest, Area Bridge Engineer at Cambridgeshire County Council, who replied:

'Due to a collapsed bridge near Ely, funds were diverted from several schemes to enable a new bridge to be designed and installed to reopen a road to various villages. Carter bridge was one of those schemes that were cut from last year's budget. It is in the 2004–2005 budget, but again it could get

cut if other bridge priorities emerge, because we only have allocated a limited bridge maintenance budget.

'Should the work take place we intend to replace a 30 to 40 metre section of glazing and flooring at the Rustat Road end of the bridge. This work does not affect the railway or car park and should therefore keep costs to a minimum. We have opted for the latest technology for polycarbonate and a new lightweight

composite floor to replace the old timber sheets. We need to see how these materials behave in situ and in use to judge how well they perform. Sunlight degradation and chemical attack happened to the old glazing over a short period. I envisage that we will take stock after two years. It is our intention to replace the glazing and flooring over the



If nothing more urgent crops up, maybe the grime can be cleaned off part of the bike bridge soon, but not the section over the railway.

entire bridge but the expense and time constraints imposed by Network Rail mean that the railway spans will be difficult and expensive. Budget restraints and other priorities will dictate how much is done each year, and as yet I cannot say how long this project will take.'

All abilities cycling, again

Since the article in *Newsletter 48* on cycling resources for people of all abilities, another very good guide has become available from *VeloVision* Magazine. The eight-page Buyer's Guide, plus an extra two pages of related content from past issues, gives an overview of the Special Needs cycling field. It runs through all of the different types of bike available, gives examples, and lists resources for further information and advice.

www.velovision.co.uk/cgi-bin/show_comments.pl?storynum=559

(If you are thinking of subscribing to *VeloVision* magazine, note that they kindly offer a discount to Cambridge Cycling Campaign members.)

Clare Macrae



CAMBRIDGE STATION CYCLES

HIRE  SALES

New Secure Cycle Park

*** Valet Cycle Parking ***

1 day £1.50

1 week £6.00

Opening Hours

Weekdays 7am - 8pm

Sat 9am - 5pm, Sun 10am - 4pm

**Next to Cambridge Railway Station
Cycle Repair, Hire and Sales**

Tel. 01223 307125

City centre cycling

As long ago as February 1998 (*Newsletter 16*), we reported misunderstandings over the exact details of the city centre cycling restrictions after a flurry of reports from cyclists riding legally along St John’s Street and Trinity Street who were berated by pedestrians accusing them of breaking the law. These streets are not included in the 10 am–4 pm Monday to Saturday cycling ban, but they *feel* the same as other streets where cycling is restricted.

The number of incidents was enough to prompt us to distribute a wallet-sized copy of a letter from Cambridgeshire County Council confirming that cycling along St John’s Street and Trinity Street (in the direction of the one-way street, of course) was legal all the time. That letter is still available online¹.

It’s not just members of the public who sometimes get this wrong: in March 2000 a police press release muddied the waters further by stating that ‘cyclists are forbidden from riding in busy shopping areas between 10 am and 4 pm Monday to Saturday’ without mentioning the



In the past some bus drivers and police have not understood that cycling is allowed in both directions in St Andrew’s Street.

exceptions (see *Newsletter 30*). During most years we receive at least a couple of complaints from cyclists who have been told, wrongly, by a uniformed police officer that that they should not turn right from Market Street into Sidney Street (near the Next shop which has replaced Woolworth’s). And then there are the few bus drivers who are convinced that contraflow cycling on St Andrew’s Street (in front of Bradwell’s Court) is wrong: it isn’t.

More recently, now that contraflow cycling is permitted on Bene’t Street, we received a

Cambridge Community Safety Partnership
Cycle Theft Reduction

City Centre Cycling

The map shows which way cyclists can ride along the main streets in the centre of Cambridge.
 Dated 20th November 2003

One Way Streets (incl. Bikes)
 (Direction indicated by arrow)
 St John’s St and Trinity St Southbound
 Corn Exchange St, Northbound
 Round Church St, Eastbound
 Part of Sidney St, Northbound, from Market St, to Jesus Lane
 Part of Bridge St, Northbound, from Jesus Lane to St John’s St
 Wheeler St, Westbound
 Green St Westbound
 Market St Eastbound
 Market Hill Clockwise

Cycle Contraflow
 Malcolm St, Hobson St, Downing St, Pembroke St, St Andrew’s St
 Part of Sidney Street from Market St to Hobson St

Cycling Restriction
 10am to 4pm Mon - Sat
 Market Street, Market Hill and Sidney Street

No Cycling
 All Saints Passage
 Rose Crescent
 Petty Cury
 Sussex St

No Cycling
 10-4 Mon-Sat
 Market Hill

No Cycling
 10-4 Mon-Sat

Contact Simon Nuttall at Parkside Police Station, Cambridge CB1 1JG
 Tel: 01223 823478 Email: simon.nuttall@cambs.pnn.police.uk Web: www.cambs.police.uk

report of a police officer telling cyclists (again, wrongly) that they were breaking the law.

When Simon Nuttall in his role on the Cycle Theft Reduction Project at Parkside Police Station heard about this last incident, he designed a very useful pocket map and guide showing where and when cycling is permitted in the historic city centre. He produced the guide for use by police officers and traffic wardens, but we thought it was

so useful that it was worth distributing much more widely.

We are reproducing it here, for people to photocopy, and if you receive a paper copy of the *Newsletter*, you should find it as an insert. As with the Trinity Street letter, we hope you don’t need to use it (for the education of shoppers, police or even bus drivers), but it might be worth carrying a few spare copies around just in case.

Clare Macrae

1 The letter can be found at www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/map/streets.html.

Cutter Ferry Bridge

We asked Gareth Guest, Area Bridge Engineer at Cambridgeshire County Council, to explain why this bridge is closed and what might happen to it next.

Earlier in 2003 Cutter Ferry footbridge was subject to a Principal Inspection. These inspections are carried out on our behalf by Atkins and they are programmed for every six years. This report identified a deflection to the top of the steel chord and also confirmed what we already knew, in that the timber decking was becoming unserviceable and increasingly difficult to repair.



Cutter Ferry Bridge is closed because it is structurally unsafe.

A bid was made to include Cutter Ferry footbridge in a package of works to redeck and refurbish six Cambridge footbridges. So as part of this refurbishment work our consultants were asked to fully assess the bridge for the loading of the new ekki timber deck. It was this assessment report that identified a 120 mm deflection to the top chord of the footbridge due to inadequate cross bracing. The calculations also indicated that under normal pedestrian loading conditions the top

chord could become over stressed and the deck would twist and catastrophically fail. The risk of this occurrence was high and therefore with this knowledge we had no other option but to close the footbridge in the interests of public safety. In liaison with the police, a diversion route was set up via the dual use paths on Elizabeth bridge just along Cutter Ferry path. This ensured there would not be any potential crowd loading or congestion on the other nearby Fort St George footbridge.

From the date of closure our consultants were then asked to undertake a full study of the footbridge to determine the actual mechanism of failure. This can then be used to determine if a cost effective repair could be carried out. However, the structural analysis of the steel footbridge to BS5400 and current DfT standards is an involved operation. Temporary scaffold propping was not the answer, as what is required is bracing to the top chord of the bridge at all node points, including the ends where of course we need to maintain a headroom.

So a permanent bracing system is now being designed, costed and evaluated against a whole replacement new span across the river, to ensure the prudent use of the limited bridge maintenance budget that we are allocated. Of course we recognise that should a new span prove the best solution, then we should consider constructing this and adapting the existing bridge to current cycleway standards, to further enhance this valuable crossing of the River Cam.

The results of this study, and if funds are made available for this work, should be known towards the end of January 2004. A press release will be issued and the web page¹ will also be updated.

Gareth Guest, Area Bridge Engineer, Cambridgeshire County Council



Repairs will be expensive; surely this is now the opportunity to make it properly cycleable?

Cycleway signs

Since last May, Simon Nuttall (at the City Council) has been developing a proposal to replace Cambridge's ageing network of blue cycleway signs.

When the current collection of signs was planned, the philosophy was basically 'all routes go via the City Centre' which worked well for the cycle network at the time. Since then, Cambridge has expanded somewhat, and there are plenty more useful links to be signposted.



Cycle direction signs to be redesigned.

There has been a series of meetings involving officers from both the City and County Councils, and Cycling Campaign representatives. It quickly became apparent that it would be impossible to have signs both *to* and *from* every area of the city. So we concentrated initially on general principles. These include:

- The need to sign radial routes.
- The need to sign shortcuts and useful links. (These signs will also benefit pedestrians.)
- The need for signs to include widely recognisable names.
- The importance of including distances (in miles).
- The need to include National Cycle Network route numbers once routes are in place.

It is hoped that the project will also eventually lead to a new cycle map of Cambridge, and to some information boards and maps being placed in strategic locations around the city.

The next stage will be the detailed planning of the locations and contents of each sign.

Clare Macrae

1 Cambridgeshire County Council's Current Cambridge Transport Projects page: www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/sub/eandt/highways/cambridge/cb_cons.htm

All criminals are motorists (discuss)

Some years ago I read that a high percentage of motorists who park illegally in disabled bays have a criminal record (33%), and that 49% of the vehicles concerned had a history of traffic violations. At the time I thought this was a good counter to motorists who say, 'The police should be out catching real criminals, not persecuting motorists.'



Following up apparently minor motoring offences can help detect more serious crimes.

The report concludes that moving just 1% of officers to ANPR would increase arrests by 10%. It is also worthy of note that many people complain about the lack of 'visibility' of the police, and these ANPR duties could well rectify this, as we're likely to see police vehicles with this equipment on our busier roads.

Will this make our roads safer? I'd say definitely 'Yes.' It will ensure that a much higher percentage of illegal drivers and vehicles are removed from the road, and should lead to a greater respect for the law of the road.

Of course, there are those criminals who use bicycles, but none of us would park in disabled bays would we?

Jim Chisholm

Now I've come across a recent Home Office report *Engaging criminality – denying criminals use of the roads*, on a pilot study into the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) to identify vehicles and their drivers where some offence may have been committed.

The full report can be seen at:

www.paconsulting.com/industries/government_public_sector_consulting/insights/ANPR_report.htm

ANPR has been around for decades, but the costs were huge and it was generally limited to anti-terrorist activities; now the plunging costs of IT and communications, linked databases, and improvements in imaging technology, mean it could soon be as common as speed cameras. The image from a camera in the police vehicle is scanned for a number plate and checked against the many databases. Officers are then informed of any suspected offences.

It is estimated that one million persons regularly drive without insurance, 10% of cars have no MOT, over 1.5 million vehicles have no road tax, and there is no registered keeper for nearly two million vehicles. Historically the police have not focused on such crimes as they were not seen as significant, but the results of this study, and others, means attitudes are changing.

In the pilot studies, police officers were catching **ten times** more criminals than officers on 'normal' duties. Out of some five million 'reads' some 5% were 'hits' but officers only stopped about 12% of these hits, resulting in approximately 3,000 arrests for serious offences. We're not just talking about a little back vehicle excise duty, but stolen cars, drugs, driving whilst disqualified, and other serious offences. In fact the largest number of arrests were not for driving offences but for theft or burglary.

Station developments

It seems years since I first wrote in the Newsletter about proposed major developments in this area. I'm hoping this will be the last dose of mañana, and it is possible that if you are a Councillor you will already have had a glimpse of the proposals.

We've had proposals from Railtrack which bit the dust with its demise, then we had a planning brief which was virtually torn up when the Spillers mill site became available, and now we've proposals from Ashwell Properties in conjunction with the 'Properties' bit of Network Rail.



The proposed closure of Spillers Mill has put the whole station area redevelopment back in the melting pot once again.



Cambridge Station Cycles is now offering 'valet' cycle parking at its expanded shop at the railway station. We welcome this initiative, though it will be interesting to discover how many cyclists are prepared to pay £1.50 (£300 for an annual season) for the extra security, convenience and speed. This compares with £4.00 (£552 for an annual season) for parking a car.

There may well be issues with some of the proposals for improved cycle access that we've put to the developers' transport consultants. These involve some of what is currently 'operational' land (or redundant sidings to you and me), but given the huge developments here, which in the longer term may involve a new platform on the other side, we think nothing should be ruled out. On a more positive note, we do have high hopes for a new cycle parking facility of the type you would expect to see at a similar station in Holland.

Jim Chisholm

The ‘super-wardens’ bill

When we talked about including an article in the *Newsletter* about the Traffic Management bill to be debated in Parliament in January, little did we know that it would be deemed front page news, especially by the right-wing press.

We thought the bill seemed like an obscure but useful bit of new legislation for civil traffic enforcement, following on from civil parking enforcement (see *Newsletter 46*). It transfers the duty of enforcement of things like one-way streets, no right turns, bus lanes and (we hope) cycle lanes from the police to new local authority ‘traffic managers’.

How wrong we were. The right-wing press was apoplectic at the idea that traffic law might actually be enforced. (Of course we are used to apoplectic articles about traffic law *not* being enforced when it comes to transgressions by cyclists.) A *Daily Telegraph* column concluded: ‘the price of [the proposed law] threatens to be the lasting resentment of millions of persecuted motorists, whose innate decency is being exploited.’

Persecuted motorists? Just what is it about driving that makes people think that it is reasonable to pick and choose which rules they obey? Driving over the speed limit? – yes fine, so long as it isn’t somewhere dangerous – oh, and I’ll decide where it is dangerous. Go through lights after they’ve turned red? – well you’d never get anywhere otherwise, would you? (but throw those cyclists who do it in prison, I say!)

‘Radical congestion busting’

The bill is promoted by Transport Minister Alasdar Darling as ‘radical congestion busting’. The purpose is to ‘keep traffic moving’ rather than address safety. It doesn’t appear that cycles count as traffic in this respect because enforcement of bus lanes is included but cycle lanes seem not to be.



No right turn signs are among those which might be enforced by dedicated council employees rather than the police in future.

Cambridge MP Anne Campbell spoke in the debate on behalf of cyclists. She raised the issue that has troubled many of us both in these columns and on the road: inappropriate parking, especially in cycle lanes. The Cycling Campaign also wrote to Mrs Campbell about this. The Minister told her in reply: ‘the duty to deal with people who park in the wrong place lies with traffic wardens or, in some cases, policemen. The job of the traffic manager,

who is an official of the council ... is to ensure that the council organises matters so as to give priority to keeping traffic moving. Too often, that does not happen. I agree that many other things need to be done and that councils should pay attention to the way in which people park, which can cause great difficulty not only to cyclists but to pedestrians and others.’

The details

So what does the bill actually include? Focussing on keeping roads clear to keep traffic moving, it has five main sections:

- Traffic management: each local authority will appoint a uniformed Traffic Manager responsible for keeping traffic moving. Traffic managers will have the power to stop people, including, note, cyclists and pedestrians. They can arrange to move abandoned and misplaced vehicles.
- Civil enforcement of moving and parking offences: local authorities will take over certain traffic enforcement roles from the police, such as enforcing ‘no vehicles’ signs. **Note that fixed penalties for the offences covered apply to all road users, including cyclists.** Which things are enforced is obviously important to us. Parking enforcement powers will be strengthened. Most parking rules do actually appear to be covered, including ‘parking a vehicle wholly or partly on a cycle track’ (though that depends on the definition of ‘cycle track’; but quite how this squares with Darling’s reply to our MP is questionable). Bus lane enforcement is specifically included. The remainder of offences are defined in terms of ignoring specified signs: one-way and no-entry, no-

turn and must-turn signs, no vehicles, no motor vehicles and pedestrian zone signs, and box junction markings.

- Control of street works: councils to be given greater control over when and where utility companies carry out street works to minimise disruption. They will have powers to specify which route road works should follow and decide what day of the week and at what times works can be carried out; to prevent roads from being dug up repeatedly, to manage a permit system; and to enforce proper resurfacing.
- Management of motorway incidents: Highways Agency to be able to clear roads quickly after crashes or breakdowns.
- Some London-specific measures.

The proposed keep-traffic-moving law ‘threatens ... the lasting resentment of millions of persecuted motorists, whose innate decency is being exploited.’ – Daily Telegraph

The ‘fleecing motorists’ retort

Attempts to enforce better observance of road traffic law are now routinely met with accusations that their motive is fleecing motorists to bring in more money in fines. The effectiveness of speed cameras is threatened by sensitivity to being labelled ‘anti-motorist’ (i.e. anti-government voter!) Even though it might have been thought that keeping traffic moving would be applauded by the critics, this attempt to prevent selfish individual road users bucking the rules is now being slated.

The ‘fleecing motorists’ argument is a smoke-screen of course, so perhaps it could be undermined by using different punishments. Retraining of road users would make demands on people’s time rather than wallet, and perhaps have some useful side effects. Perhaps one day or one week driving bans or immobilising of vehicles could be tried.

David Earl

Cycling in Vehicle Restricted Areas (VRAs)

The Transport Research Laboratory produces a number of reports each year on nationally important issues. In recent years, most are only available at significant cost, but in a reversal of policy, several relating to cycling have been published as free downloads from www.trl.co.uk

TRL583, published last year, is a study of cycling in a number of areas where vehicle access is severely restricted. These might normally be known as 'Pedestrian Areas', but often cycling is permitted, if only for part of the day.

This study questioned both pedestrians and cyclists, and measured volumes of pedestrians and the flows and speeds of cyclists. The studies were carried out during August and September 1999 in Hull, Salisbury, and interestingly for us, in Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets here in Cambridge.



Burleigh Street: street furniture in the way says TRL report.

The report runs to some 36 pages, including some 16 pages of tables and analysis, so I can only pick out a few key points which, apart from the first, are specific to Cambridge:

- Average cycle speeds fell by half to 10 kph as pedestrian flows increased.

Pedestrians:

- When unprompted pedestrians were more concerned about dog mess and litter than cyclists.
- When prompted only 12% were very much concerned about cyclists and 33% were not at all concerned.
- 65% preferred that signs and markings should be used to show where cyclists can ride.
- 10% said cyclists should only be allowed in for part of the day.
- 83% had never seen or been involved with an incident with a cyclist.

Cyclists:

- The biggest concern was the unpredictability of pedestrians' movements.
- 66% preferred that signs and markings should be used to show where cyclists can ride.
- 35% were very much concerned about having to share space with pedestrians.

It is interesting that when the County Council did a City Centre survey recently they did *not*

question cyclists as it was claimed it was not legal to stop them!

One interesting comment is that neither pedestrians nor cyclists were happy with an arrangement as in Burleigh Street. Street furniture is placed in the centre of the street, meaning that cyclists are more likely to travel close to shop doorways. When pedestrians exit from shops, there is little time or opportunity for cyclists to avoid them.

I haven't even touched on difference of behaviour at times when cycling is illegal or on the effects of age or sex but I will finish with some words from the conclusion:

This report presents objective data on the use of VRAs by cyclists in order to improve our understanding of a topic that can be controversial, and where there are sometimes conflicting needs. It does not take up a position on the general question of whether cyclists should be permitted to use VRAs. Rather it seeks to provide information for practitioners involved with the design and maintenance of VRAs, and others who need answers to these questions. The observations showed that the majority of cyclists in VRAs modify their behaviour by slowing down as pedestrian numbers increase.

Jim Chisholm

For those with an interest in digging deeper, the full report is at www.trl.co.uk/static/dttr/cycling/TRL583.pdf.

Shorts

According to provisional figures there were no fatal cycling accidents on Cambridgeshire's roads in 2003. Thanks to the County Council for that information.

This year, 12–20 June will be **Bike Week**. As in recent years, we'll be working with a number of colleagues from the City and County Councils to organise events. As always, we welcome help and ideas for events. Our first planning meeting happened in January, so there will be more news in the next Newsletter. In the meantime, if you are interested in helping to organise an event

yourself, e.g. at a workplace or school, you'll find useful information at www.bikeweek.org.uk.



Additional cycle parking is to be installed in King Street (near the Champion of the Thames pub) and Eden Street (adjacent to Fitzroy Street) thanks to the Cycle Theft Reduction Project.

In a welcome safety move, new regulations banning the use of hand-held **mobile**

phones whilst driving came into effect on 1 December 2003. The offence applies to all *motor vehicles*, thereby specifically excluding non-motorised traffic, i.e. bikes. In its summary of responses to the original consultation, the government said "Although some respondents suggested that it should be extended to cyclists, we do not consider this is a significant problem that justifies extending the offence to non-motorised traffic." However, the police still have powers to deal with careless or dangerous cycling.

Save 4.5 million tons of CO₂

Well, that's what it says here! (*Cambridge Local Transport Plan (2004–11)* Appendix 4): 'it has been calculated that the amount of carbon dioxide released into the air could be reduced by 4.5 million tons per annum if 20% of non-walking trips in the UK were made by bicycle.'

The LTP runs to some 177 pages with the Appendices having a further 300+ pages, so I'm not even pretending to have digested them all. What I hope I have done is to skim the documents attempting to look for the bits most relevant to cycling. Inevitably I always start with such documents at the appendices as that is the bit they don't want you to read, and they contain the real details and even some amazing facts!

What is worrying is how few really binding commitments have been made. In other sections of the LTP (e.g. bus passengers and road casualties) government grants WILL be lost if targets are not met. In the cycling section there is a commitment to raise the modal share of trips by bike from 14% to 17% in Cambridge, but of course elsewhere (see 'No Bells for Cambridgeshire?' article on page 4) it is suggested that in Cambridge such trips are currently being under reported.

Appendix 4 (Table A4.3- Action Plan) says that a local guide for cycle facilities based on *Cycle Friendly Infrastructure* will be established, and that 'Cycle Audit' of all new schemes and significant alterations to the highway will be undertaken. We've been asking for this for years, and it's been promised for years, but without significantly greater staff resources, I'd say it is not achievable. This is a commitment from Year 1. Mr Smith (Director E&T) and Councillor Johnstone, let's see some real action on which we can congratulate the County Council. In June 2001 we even had an email from the then Cycling Officer, about the Cycle Design Guide, saying 'Expect something more formal shortly.' Although the walking strategy has two items referring

to extra staff resources, there are no such commitments for the cycling strategy.

Given the commitment to the government-backed publication *Cycle Friendly Infrastructure*, it is particularly worrying to see that 'Cyclists' are at the bottom of the heap (hierarchy) on main roads with priority being given to pedestrians, cars, commercial vehicles, and public transport. In urban and rural areas cyclists are given greater priority, second after pedestrians. Histon Road, Barton Road and Shelford Road are all shown as 'main roads' outside the urban area. (Map 5.3 & Table 5.4)

I'd thought table A4.3 saying 'Establish the key physical barriers to cycling and develop a long-term programme to overcome them' was more positive until I realised they don't even start doing that until 2006!

Under 'school policies' the only item is 'Identify those schools that have a policy of not allowing children to bring bikes to school... and provide conditions for the removal of such policies' but why does this not even start until Year 2?

There is also an action 'Establish the needs and desires of cyclists by asking them.' Having been involved in transport professionally from 1969–1985, I found it very odd, when then moving to the 'Premier Cycling City,' to discover that nobody had asked such questions of cyclists. Nearly 20 years later they still haven't. The latest excuse for not doing so in the City Centre Survey, where they only questioned pedestrians, was that a policeman was needed to stop cyclists.

Of course the County may say 'Why did not the Campaign make these objections at the consultation phase?' Given the breakneck speed, the unsatisfactory nature of the consultations, and the volume of documentation I'm going to plead fatigue.

Jim Chisholm

Letters

Helmet law

I'm sorry to raise the dreaded H-word here and hope it will not start the usual flame war but there is an important legal development cyclists should be aware of.

Can I draw people's attention to a Private Member's Bill by Eric Martlew MP in this session of Parliament to make cycle helmet wearing compulsory for the under 16s. The Bill follows from an Early Day Motion by Alan Meale MP last session and is based on the campaigning of the Bicycle Helmet Initiative Trust. This has used misleading information to present the case for compulsion stating in the EDM, for example, that 'every year in the UK approximately 28,000 children under the age of 16 years receive a serious head injury as a result of a cycling accident'. In fact the figure is 1,200, and 90% of those are in off-road play where presumably the Government is not expecting to legislate compulsion. Other falsehoods are that 50 children died from head injuries. In fact the figure is 25 and the vast majority of those had other fatal non-head injuries so would have died irrespective of their head injuries.

I am not anti-helmet: my children and I choose to wear helmets.

I am pro choice and anti compulsion as every example of compulsion has led to a reduction of cycling. Experience in Australia, for example, has shown reductions in cycling of between 30% and 60% following legislation to make helmet wearing compulsory.

The one thing we want to do is encourage more healthy cycling by children, not less.

The Bill unfortunately is getting a lot of support. GMTV and the *Guardian* this week alone – so if we want to avoid compulsion we need to get active and quickly. The Bill is expected to have its second reading on 23 April. The CTC has produced a position paper on helmets, and cycle safety consultant John Franklin (author of *Cyclecraft*) has produced a summary of research on the subject which are worth reading. These can be read at:

www.ctc.org.uk/resources/Campaigns/0305_CTHelmetpromo8brf.doc

www.lesberries.co.uk/cycling/helmets/helmets.html

If you've the time, the 500+ pages are on the web at www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/sub/eandt/planning/trplan/2004/ Appendix 4, Walking and Cycling Strategy, is at www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/sub/eandt/planning/trplan/2004/ap04.pdf

If you feel strongly about this as I do, can I urge you to raise it with your MP and make sure that cycling colleagues and other campaign groups are alerted to the Bill. There is a reasonably good chance that this Bill will become Law unless enough MPs can be persuaded to vote against it. It is not easy, as the case against is counter-intuitive.

Tony Raven

SCDC and guided bus

I have to correct the statement in the letter from Tim Phillips, Chairman of CAST.IRON, published in your *Newsletter 51*.

It is not correct that South Cambridgeshire District Council is 'broadly opposed to the guided bus' as the Council has, in fact, been promoting the use of the former St. Ives

railway line for guided bus for many years. The District Council has long recognised that the only economically viable public transport system for this line is guided bus, having considered a number of independent studies. Guided bus was the recommended system which came out of the A14 CHUMMS study which has been accepted by the Government.

Another of the advantages of the guided bus over rail is that the 'maintenance track' alongside the guided bus track can be used as a pedestrian and cycle route, free from other traffic, all the way from Cambridge to St. Ives. This would simply not be available with a heavy rail scheme.

*Michael Monk
Principal Planning Policy Officer, South
Cambridgeshire District Council*

Cities for Cyclists

Cities for Cyclists is a network of cities who are 'working to promote bicycle use in urban areas and encourage the exchange of knowledge'. It was launched in 1991 by five founder cities. There are around 30 members from 13 European countries. The two members from Great Britain are York and Somerset.

The 'Reports' section of the *Cities for Cyclists* website has links to some useful reference material, mostly of Danish origin but all in English, including:

- 'Collection of Cycle Concepts' (The Danish Road Directorate's Catalogue of Ideas)
- The City of Copenhagen's Cycle Policy, 2002-2012
- The European Greenways Good Practice Guide (this is of relevance for the paths across Cambridge's commons)
- A Cyclist's Comfort Guide (The Danish Cyclists' Federation's guide for people who experience pain or discomfort when cycling)

www.cities-for-cyclists.org
Clare Macrae

STOP PRESS

Hills Road and Milton Road proposed lanes

We have just heard that these bus lane proposals will not, after all, be discussed or decided at the meeting of the Cambridge Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee on 26 January.

They are on the Agenda for the Committee's meeting on 19 April. We will prepare our petitions and census results for the April meeting.

James Woodburn

Campaign Diary

www.camcycle.org.uk/events

February 2004	
Tue 3	7.30 pm Monthly open meeting , Friends' Meeting House, Jesus Lane, at the Park Street junction. (Tea and coffee, a chance to chat, and for us to introduce ourselves to new members for the first half-hour. The meeting proper starts at 8 pm.)
Wed 4	5–7 pm Free cycle security coding at Cambridge Station Cycles, next to the railway station. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
Fri 6	8.30 am <i>Newsletter 52</i> review and planning for 53, over breakfast at Tatties café.
Sun 8	1 pm Leisurely Ride . A countryside ride, at a gentle pace. Meet at Hobbs Pavilion on Parker's Piece. Back in Cambridge around 5 pm. Don't forget your lights.
Mon 16	7 pm Join us for a social gathering at CB2 café 5–7 Norfolk Street.
Sat 28	10–2 Free cycle security coding at Park Street Cycle Park. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
March	
Tue 2	7.30 pm Monthly open meeting , Friends' Meeting House, Jesus Lane. Robin Webb, maker of the film <i>44 Tonne Articulated Trucks and Towns Don't Mix</i> , will present the film and discuss the issues. See also 3 February.
Wed 3	5–7 pm Free cycle security coding at Cambridge Station Cycles, next to the railway station. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
Sat 6	<i>Newsletter 53</i> copy deadline. Please contact the editor if you would like to write an article.
Sun 14	1 pm Leisurely Ride . A countryside ride, at a gentle pace. Meet at Hobbs Pavilion on Parker's Piece. Back in Cambridge around 5 pm.
Mon 15	7 pm Join us for a social gathering at CB2 café 5–7 Norfolk Street.
Wed 24	7.30 pm <i>Newsletter 53</i> Envelope Stuffing at the Baby Milk Action offices, 23 St Andrews Street (between the Robert Sayle main and computer shop entrances, entrance next to Lunch Aid). Help very much welcomed!
Sat 27	10–2 Free cycle security coding at Park Street Cycle Park. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
April	
Fri 2	8.30 am <i>Newsletter 53</i> review and planning for 54, over breakfast at Tatties café.
Tue 6	7.30 pm Monthly open meeting , Friends' Meeting House, Jesus Lane. See 3 February for a description.
Wed 7	5–7 pm Free cycle security coding at Cambridge Station Cycles, next to the railway station. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
Sun 11	1 pm Leisurely Ride . A countryside ride, at a gentle pace. Meet at Hobbs Pavilion on Parker's Piece. Back in Cambridge around 5 pm.
Mon 19	7 pm Join us for a social gathering at CB2 café 5–7 Norfolk Street.
Sat 24	10–2 Free cycle security coding at Park Street Cycle Park. The security code is a deterrent to theft and enables bikes to be traced nationally.
Further ahead	
12–20 June	National Bike Week 2004.

Guided bus or train: which is better for cyclists on the St Ives railway corridor?

All members are invited to our next Open Meeting on Tuesday, 3rd February at 7.30pm. This meeting will have as its main focus the proposals for the St Ives railway corridor – the benefits for cyclists of guided bus versus train. We hope as many members as possible can attend this meeting to join the discussion and let us know their views.

Your streets this month

Bridges Special

Six contenders are competing to design the **Riverside Cycle Bridge** between Riverside and East Chesterton. The deadline for proposed designs is 21 January. The competing entries will then be exhibited at the Guildhall from 3–14 February. The winning design will be chosen in March by a panel of judges appointed by the County Council. One of the judges will be Clare Macrae, Liaison Officer for Cambridge Cycling Campaign. After the design is chosen the County Council has to begin the process of obtaining funds and planning the construction.

Further upstream, the **Cutter Ferry Bridge** between Midsummer Common and West Chesterton remains closed after having been declared unsafe by the County Council in November. It looks as if it will remain closed for some time to come. See the update on page 10.

Many cyclists have been forced to make a diversion to use the next bridge upstream, the **Fort St George Bridge**. This busy bridge has long been obstructed by three sets of pinch stiles which make it difficult to use and impassable for cyclists with wide baskets or trailers. This is to change in a few months' time. All the pinch stiles will be removed and replaced by more cycle-friendly measures to control cattle and protect pedestrians. There will be a cattle grid and pedestrian gate at the southern end and a single central bollard at the northern end. At the blind corner on the southern side there will be an L-shaped railing to help keep pedestrians and cyclists apart, but leaving enough space for cyclists with trailers. The existing 'cyclists dismount' signs be replaced by ones saying 'cyclists give way to pedestrians'.

After a long delay, work has finally started on the construction of a new cycle/pedestrian bridge over the railway alongside the existing narrow bridge on **Coldham's Lane**. The new bridge will be on the city-bound side of the road only, so outbound cyclists will have to cross the road twice to use it.



Construction has started on the bike bridge over the railway at Coldham's Lane.

Construction work continues on the new cycle/pedestrian bridge over the A14 at **Milton**. The bridge span itself is expected to be ready for vibration testing at the beginning of February. This will check that the bridge doesn't bounce like the millennium footbridge in London did. An opening date will then be set depending on whether the tests show additional damping work is needed. We get the impression that this might be two or three months later. Work is also continuing on the construction of cycle tracks and shared-use pavements on the approaches to the bridge.

Newmarket Road

A short length of bus and cycle lane has been introduced on **Newmarket Road** outbound between the junctions with River Lane and Cheddars Lane. The new bus lane, which has a cycle lane marked inside it, has been made possible by removing the parked cars that used to permanently block the

inside lane along this section. We warmly welcome this lane, which allows cyclists to get safely past the traffic congestion that regularly occurs here.

This section of Newmarket Road also has a new signalled junction to serve the new retail park being constructed there. A cycle path from Riverside via Tesco meets Newmarket Road a few yards from this point, but the new junction fails to make any provision for cyclists using that path who need to get to the new retail park or turn right towards the city centre. This means that the path remains of use only to cyclists from the city centre travelling towards Tesco.

The new retail park (it's the one with the new Homebase) offers a new route for cyclists from Newmarket Road to the Beehive roundabout on Coldham's Lane.



The cycle path through the Tins will be closed for a few days for completion. The new path is already partly in use.

The Tins

Completion of the new cycleway and footpath ('the Tins') through Coldham's Business Park is still planned for March 2004, to coincide with the opening of the Next Generation Sports Complex. Work to finish the path as it approaches the railway bridge (see *Newsletter 51*) will still require closure of the path. This is now estimated to take place in February or March; the developers have applied for a two week closure period, but hope to complete the work within three days given ideal conditions. It is disappointing that the revised plans for the bridge approach do not include the sensible increase in width indicated on the original approved plans. Following discussion at the January meeting of the Campaign, we have written to the Council objecting to such major changes.



Newmarket Road: a new bus lane has been installed approaching Tesco from the city. However, in mid January it might as well not have been there – while other bus lanes on Newmarket Road are widely abused, this one was being completely ignored; and had it been observed, the buses would have been blocked before its start by traffic trying to get into the other lane. A new set of traffic lights leading to the new Homebase store is the cause of the extra queue.