December 7, 2012

Our ref: Ch13002

Adam Coffman
<coffmana@parliament.uk>,
All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group (APPCG)

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 Mr Coffman,

'Get Britain Cycling' inquiry

Cambridge Cycling Campaign would like to provide the following written evidence to your inquiry[1] "Get Britain Cycling". Cambridge holds a unique position in the UK with the majority of people cycling at least once a week. This position does cause some problems: we have the highest rate of cycle theft in the UK, and already experience some bicycle congestion at peak times.

We would like to give oral evidence to the Inquiry also in due course.

[1] http://allpartycycling.org/inquiry/

1. Introduction

Cambridge Cycling Campaign is a volunteer-run charity formed in 1995 principally to work for improved conditions for utility cycling. We have over one thousand members and are the largest such organisation in England outside London. We try to work constructively with local organisations, and produce publications including a bi-monthly newsletter, which we hope of use to people elsewhere in the UK. Cycling has huge benefits as it improves physical and mental health, creates independence for those without access to a car and reduces congestion and air pollution. Cycling infrastructure is cheap to provide and cheap to maintain compared with that for other modes. Cambridge has the highest levels of cycling of any local authority in the UK, with 25% of commuting trips within the town being by bike. Recent other figures suggest that over 50% of the people cycle at least once per week[2].

We work "*for better, safer and more cycling in and around Cambridge*".

An ordinary activity in Cambridge http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/14130,36889,36884,36831/

[2] http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/104/article2.html

2. Leadership – the need for a strategic cycling body in government

There is a clear and urgent need for a dedicated, strategic cycling body within Government. A change in culture in the way that cycling is implemented in the UK means that, for the next 5 years at least, a set of trusted experts is needed.

We strongly lament the loss of Cycling England, and we ran a campaign on this[3]. Our concerns remain. This body provided a genuine 'localism' approach by assisting Local Authorities at a very local level. The lack of any central body now co-ordinating cycling initiatives and providing such assistance means that, despite funds going into cycling, there is a lack of practical leadership at DfT level. One of our key messages is that we think Parliament must reinstate such a body.

Related to this, the idea of 'leave everything to Local Authorities' localism approach for cycle planning will be a failure. Most LAs do not have the skills to implement world-class cycling measures or the political will to do so. Again, the need for a Cycling England –style body must be very high on Parliament's agenda for cycling.

Accordingly, we suggest that a new body, 'Cycling for England' should be established within the Department for Transport by Summer 2013.

We also think there needs to be an end to the continual treadmill of studies on cycling. All these tend to do is continually delay actual changes on the ground. The solutions are now well-established, not least simply by looking to northern Europe. What instead is needed is action, funding, and political will.

3. Joined-up Government

There are multiple levels of government for which we would like to address the issue of cycling. At the highest level of the UK governments, cycling is typically considered a minor issue for the Department for Transport. However, given the well-known health benefits of cycling, it would be entirely logical that cycling could be considered under the Department of Health. It should also be recognised that the productivity gains for company employees who cycle to and from work of approximately 15% could also mean that cycling should be considered by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills as a significant way to boost the productivity of the economy as a whole. We are not aware of similar studies for school-age children, but would expect that similar results would be found.

We therefore would suggest that even if cycling is primarily funded from the Department for Transport, contributions to this funding should be considered from the health and business budgets.

At the local level, Cambridgeshire County Council must be commended for the work that they have been doing in the recent past promoting and funding both infrastructure and other cycle measures. A big problem is that funding has been highly variable, meaning that the staffing levels at the County level vary from year to year as different levels of funding sources are found. This means that the valuable experience and knowledge of staff who understand the issues faced by people who

[3] http://www.savecyclingengland.org/

cycle may be lost. Whilst the Local Sustainable Transport Fund has provided funding for cycling and other sustainable transport, it is still a very short term funding source that does not provide the long term planning that motorised transport infrastructure can be assured.

The critical issue here is that without any funding, most transport authorities will not fund or even plan bicycle infrastructure, and when funding is secured the infrastructure that can be provided is what can be provided quickly, and may not be the most strategic infrastructure. The obvious way to solve this is to provide a consistent funding source for bicycle infrastructure to all transport authorities such that they can plan the best strategic infrastructure for their areas.

4. Principles of Cycle-Friendly Planning and Design

It is simple – you could write a book about this. In fact, the Dutch have.

We would therefore suggest that, instead of us providing the details here, we just point you to CROW-25[4] and suggest that this becomes official UK government policy.

Cycling and cycle parking in The Netherlands http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/34286,29371/

5. Funding and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund

The biggest problem for funding of cycling is that it is erratic. If the levels of cycling that are currently evident in Cambridge are to be replicated throughout the rest of the UK, a significant investment in high quality infrastructure will be needed. Frankly, this will need more than the odd few millions of pounds sprinkled around interested transport authorities. We therefore have two suggestions:

1. Provide consistent background level of funding for cycling to all Highway Authorities. This would allow for both strategic and “easy” infrastructure to be designed and built.
2. Provide individual scheme-based funding for strategic, and likely expensive, bicycle infrastructure. This would allow expensive infrastructure, for example providing bridges or tunnels over or under roads, railways and rivers.

[4] http://www.crow.nl/nl/Publicaties/publicatiedetail.aspx?code=REC25

It is important to consider that most bicycle infrastructure projects have anywhere from 6:1 to 33:1 cost benefit ratios. No other transport infrastructure project proposed would have such a benefit for the UK. This investment would help reduce the cost of the NHS due to fitter and healthier people using bicycles, increase the productivity of the employees, increasing tax revenues for the government and making the UK more competitive against our European partners. This investment would also provide design and construction jobs locally, decreasing unemployment.

A major problem with road infrastructure today is that it has been primarily designed to speed the movement of vehicles and not people. A single bicycle traffic lane can carry seven times as many people as a single motorised traffic lane[5]. Converting a car lane to a bicycle lane therefore significantly increases the capacity of a roadway. A project in Cambridge converted a four lane road to a three lane bridge with a cycleway on either side. The capacity of this bridge has increased, and car-traffic congestion has not changed. Unfortunately, we now have bicycle congestion further along this road and therefore additional investment is needed to resolve this.

6. Leadership, Commitment and Capacity in Local Government

Very simply, local government must be incentivised to invest in bicycle infrastructure. This could be done by either having a separate budget for bicycle infrastructure in the highways agency, or by setting a minimum proportion of highways funds at the highways authorities that must be spent on bicycle infrastructure. It is suggested that a low figure like 10% should be sufficient to create a significant change in the proportion of people that can feel safe using a bicycle.

Another significant problem is that “traffic junctions” are typically designed for moving cars and not people. We would therefore suggest that a modal split of traffic in 20 years’ time should be set and all new infrastructure must be designed to move these proportions of traffic. In most of the UK, this could require 30% of traffic to use a bicycle, 30% of traffic to use public transport, and 30% to use a private motor vehicle. A traffic junction would therefore need to prove that it can safely accommodate such traffic flows. Therefore, we would suggest that all highways authorities provide a target level of bicycle traffic in their area, both as a background bicycle traffic level (for example, this is approximately 20% in Cambridgeshire), and an urban bicycle traffic level (for example, this is approximately 36% in the Greater Cambridge area). Hilly areas would naturally need to be lower. Target levels below what Cambridgeshire has proven is possible in the UK should be rejected.

7. Behaviour Change

Soft measures are just as important as building infrastructure. To provide a significant model shift from motorised transport to self-powered transport the average person needs to understand the benefits that cycling provides. These benefits are not just increased health, increased productivity, and decreased congestion for those that are unable to make such a shift, but also include safer roads. This safety benefit comes from two major changes in the mix of traffic: first it

[5] Cycling: the way ahead for towns and cities' (European Commission) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/cycling/cycling_en.pdf

has been proved that the more cyclists there are the more likely a car driver will be used to cyclists being nearby and therefore will take extra care to look for cyclists; second is that in Cambridge, where 58% of car drivers also cycle, there is better safety because those car drivers also understand how the person who happens to be on a bicycle may react.

To many people, being a cyclist means wearing Lycra, having a drop handlebar bicycle and riding as fast as possible. However, to people in a cycling city this is so far from reality that it is laughable. A “step through” bicycle with a wicker basket and flowery panniers are probably more common. This requires education and serious marketing. Promotion of bicycles must not include pictures of “sport cyclists” unless the promotion is for a velodrome. Instead, regular boys and girls, men and women on everyday bicycles with their shopping, school work, laptop computer bag, etc. should be the standard picture. This will allow people who don’t want to wear Lycra, or look like a sportswoman or sportsman to identify. Everyday cycling means anybody can use a bicycle using any clothes.

We support soft measures such as marketing, promotion, transport planning services and training. These have been used successfully in Cambridge in both new developments and by existing business areas and employers to reduce the number of people using cars. Funding for these measures however is inconsistent.

8. Health

We were extremely pleased to see the very recent publication by NICE on Walking and Cycling. It is very clear that future health budgets could be significantly reduced if those who take little or no exercise could be encouraged to walk or cycle. With the transfer of Public Health to local government control it should be even clearer how improving conditions for cycling, especially those that encourage the least active to cycle, or walk will pay back the investment. Only by encouraging active travel can we reverse the increasing costs in our health system. It does not need to be 30 minutes of vigorous exercise; just replace the car trip to the local shops, health centre or school with a gentle walk or cycle.

Children cycling to school in the Netherlands http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/34287/

9. Data Collection

There have been a number of recent bicycle infrastructure improvements which have been implemented that together have increased the number of people using a bicycle in and around Cambridge. However, before and after data collection has been limited. It would have been interesting to look at an individual scheme and monitor the changes in the volume of bicycle traffic from before the change to after the change. Given the different types of schemes that were implemented, this could have provided valuable data for other local authorities to understand the costs and benefits for bicycle infrastructure.

10. Training

We are slightly encouraged that Bikeability training funding is secure until the end of this parliament. However, local authorities or schools do not always take up this funding. We would therefore suggest that Bikeability training becomes part of the school curriculum. We would also suggest that grants for secure bicycle parking at schools also be provided, and that teachers get a bonus if they cycle into work.

Workplaces are different. Many people have the ability to make a modal change towards active transport when they move house or job. However, many employers provide no travel planning services or training. We would therefore suggest that companies should provide adult bike-ability training. How this can be achieved is an interesting question.

We have had a number of instances of adults, who may have children at school who are being training to ride a bicycle safely but have never ridden a bicycle themselves, or only did so 20 or more years previously. Adult cycle training should therefore be encouraged.

The idea of making cycle training to be a compulsory part of the driving test should be considered.

11. Safety

It is generally held that life is dangerous. At some point in your life you will die. It is unfortunate that the debate on the use of bicycles is however dominated by the use of hi-viz and helmets. Given that somebody who regularly cycles has statistically a longer life than somebody who drives everywhere, even taking into account a slightly higher accident risk of using a bicycle on the road, we would not wish to frame any discussion on the increased use of bicycles around “safety equipment”.

Rather, the biggest factors that people have for not using a bicycle are:

- Fear of traffic
- Lack of bicycle parking at their destination
- The stigma of being “a cyclist”.

Building bicycle infrastructure that places different speeds of traffic in different times and places can easily solve the fear of traffic. We already design roads this way for pedestrians and cars; providing safe pedestrian crossings by stopping all motorised

traffic. A simple change would be to consider that traffic consists of three main speeds:

- Slow speed people who are walking or running,
- Medium speed people who are using a bicycle or rollerblading,
- High speed people who are using a car or a goods vehicle.

It is this separation of people by speed which gives people the feeling of safety. All road junctions and new roads should be designed with these three types of traffic segregated in time and/or space.

Examples of such designs can easily be found in The Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden.

Lack of bicycle parking is a major deterrent. Developers will not want to put in decent cycle parking because they don't understand the benefits that such infrastructure can provide. Councils are reluctant to even enforce their own bicycle parking policies, if they have them.

Simply put, bicycle parking should outnumber car parking spaces. There are simple economic reasons for this. People on bicycles have more disposable income, spend more in shops, and shop more frequently. These spaces should be more convenient than the car parking spaces, and must be secure.

We would suggest that doctors, health clinics, hospitals and other National Health Service buildings would be a good place to start. Addenbroke's hospital, an outstanding clinical facility has just built a huge multi-storey car park yet has insufficient bicycle parking. They, and similar institutions, should be required to provide bicycle parking commensurate with the car parking provision.

Safety in Cambridge itself is relatively good. This is because of the high level of awareness of cycling. However, there are many roads and junctions within the city and surrounding area that have very poor safety records.

12. Dangerous Roads & Junctions

We believe that funding should be provided to install the standard junction safety measures that are already proven in The Netherlands and Denmark among other places. These include:

- Advanced traffic lights for bicycles – traffic lights further ahead from the main motorised vehicle traffic lights
- Advanced starts for bicycles – using the above separate traffic lights allows the bicycles a few seconds head start to safely cross the junction. In one junction in Copenhagen this cut deaths from 15 a year to just one a year.

- Priority for people riding bicycles across all minor side roads when on off road paths. This is the main reason that some cyclists stay on the main carriageway.
- Roundabouts should have a separate bicycle circle outside of the car traffic. The car traffic should have a tighter turning radii to reduce their speed, and the bicycle traffic prioritised over traffic entering and exiting the inner motor roundabout.

A major barrier is the existing infrastructure and beliefs by people that the only way to solve congestion is to build more traffic lanes to enable the increase in the movement of vehicles. We would suggest that traffic junctions should be designed to increase the number of people that can cross the junction, whether in a car, on a bicycle, in a bus, or walking. Any traffic junction that does not achieve this ought to be rejected.

For roads, the solutions are simple and effective, yet require political will to implement. These are:

- A minimum cycle lane width of 2.1 metres – tarmaced in a different but consistent colour for an area (e.g. red) – without the ability for cars to stop (similar to red routes in London) or park.
- Better still would be a hybrid cycle lane with a minimum width of 2.1 metres which has a kerb segregating cyclists from motorised traffic, such that drivers will feel through their steering wheel they are just about to illegally venture into that lane.
- Even better would be a fully-segregated cycle track with priority over all side roads, constructed to a Dutch design.

Dutch cycle paths: (l) segregated and (r) hybrid http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/14644,14234/

Note, we do not support shared use of space for pedestrians and bicycles along busy routes.

13. Traffic Law and Enforcement

The traffic law is for everybody, yet we feel whilst cyclists are routinely vilified for adopting the safest possible stance on the road, motorists are breaking the law *en messe*. Speed is one of the biggest contributors to death on the roads yet we are not enforcing speed limits effectively. 70% of HGVs for example break the speed limit on single carriageway roads. The solution is simple. We should enforce the actual speed limit. Today, ACPO suggests that you cannot even give a warning to drivers in

a 30 mph limit unless they are doing at least 35 mph. In Australia they have introduced a zero tolerance for speeding. You can get a fine for doing just 1 km/h over the speed limit. Some may argue that this places too high a burden on monitoring your speed – we would argue that by reducing the speed of traffic we can easily reduce the numbers of killed or seriously injured vulnerable road users.

Parking in a mandatory cycle lane is illegal, yet has to be enforced by police, who, by and large, fail to do so. We believe that this should be changed to make it enforceable by civil enforcement officers. This easy change would reduce the costs of enforcing the law.

Vehicles in cycle lanes cause road danger http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/25296,10626/

We would also suggest that companies that persistently break the law in the same location should be treated differently to those that break the law just once. For example, some see a parking ticket as the cost of doing business, even if they make the road environment less safe for people on bicycles. Therefore, we suggest that repeat offenders of the same offence at the same location should be treated with much harsher fines or other sanctions until they realise that the law does apply to them.

We fully support the enforcement of all traffic laws, whether driving a car or riding a bicycle with defective lights, driving while holding a mobile phone, or other offences. However, society still has a problem getting the police to treat dangerous driving as that. A simple rule under civil law should be that liability is 'proportional' both to 'blame' and the 'dangerousness' of the vehicle. Hence with equal blame a rider of a cycle would be more liable in a crash with a pedestrian but far less so with a car, and even far less so with a heavy goods vehicle. This means that the more likely you are to create injury to others with your vehicle the more responsibility you have to take reasonable care. It should not be acceptable to say “sorry mate, I didn’t see you” – that should instead be an automatic acceptance of driving without due care and attention.

We wish to see that police officers in areas with high levels of cycling are adequately trained in the law relating to cycling, and that Bikeability training is offered. We consider that any officer required to investigate a serious crash involving a bicycle, should be required to be trained to Bikeability Level 3. We constantly see that

officers reporting on cycle crashes fail to understand the sections of the Highway Code relating to cycling[6].

Hatred towards people who use a bicycle, as exemplified by the @cyclehatred Twitter feed, should be treated as a crime, in the same way discrimination of other groups is managed.

14. Civil Enforcement and the benefits to all those who legally use the roads

The introduction in many cities and towns of Civil Enforcement of waiting and unloading infringements has resulted in safer and more pleasant cycling and less congestion for all, due to better enforcement.

A wider range of powers, including some for moving vehicle offences, and the ability to issue penalty charge notices (PCNs) from approved camera evidence by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) is available in London.

The Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 (Part 6) extended similar powers to areas with Local Authority Parking Enforcement (LAPE) but these have not been enabled through secondary legislation. Such action was listed for 'next year' in the Department for Transport's 'Cycling and Walking Action' plans in 2007-2009.

Stopping or driving in mandatory cycle lanes (MCLs- those defined by a solid 150mm white line) bus lanes, yellow-box junctions and certain access restrictions are all covered.

Cambridge has significant lengths of MCLs in streets busy with cycles. At some locations such lanes are used as 'penalty free parking and unloading'.

Of course such offences are still the responsibility of the local police to enforce. Unfortunately such enforcement action is seen as a very low priority, assuming that the officer does not, incorrectly, believe it is covered by civil enforcement. In fact we have recently seen a FOI reply[7] from Cambridgeshire Constabulary saying that stopping or driving in a cycle lane is not an offence.

We have had significant correspondence on this issue over many years with the DfT, DSA and Cambridgeshire Constabulary. Mandatory cycle lanes are provided at places with high cycle flows where conflict with motor traffic is likely. To make cycling safe and pleasant they need to be enforced, with action targeted at prolific offenders- some delivery vehicles stop almost every day at the same location.

We have determined via an FoI request to the DfT that many local authorities wish TMA 2006 Part 6 to be enabled[8]. Enabling Part 6 would enable CEOs to effectively enforce not just MCLs but a number of other offences that obstruct all forms of legal traffic. Better enforcement is not a war on the motorist, but reduces congestion and makes life safer and more pleasant for all road users.

---

[6] http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/77/article16.html
[7] http://www.cambs-police.co.uk/about/foi/disclosure/PUB0503-2012.pdf
[8] http://www.camcycle.org.uk/campaigning/issues/mcls/

15. Professional drivers and large vehicles

We have concerns over the standards of many drivers, some of whom seem to fail to understand their responsibilities under the law and the Highway Code.

Steps are being taken to give extra training to some drivers, and the CPC course 'Safe Urban Driving' being offered in London is a huge leap forward. We consider that such a course should be a requirement for all professional drivers regularly working in areas with significant numbers cycling. By professional drivers we mean those whose income is gained almost exclusively by driving, and should include delivery, taxi and bus drivers.

Like others we are particularly concerned by crashes involving large vehicles. It is the available vision of the drivers together with the off-tracking that concerns us.

As these vehicles have become larger, the cabs have become higher, meaning that that both the forward and side visibility has reduced. The health and safety of the driver means they are sat further back from the windscreen, compromising the health and safety of surrounding vulnerable road users. If a car or light van were driven with such restricted visibility to both the front and the side, the driver would render themselves likely to prosecution.

The demonstration by the Mineral Products Association[9] clearly shows this restricted visibility. We consider it unacceptable that vehicles can be driven on busy urban roads with such poor visibility of other road users. It seems that visibility is restricted in just such places as cycle approach lanes and advanced stop boxes. In fact the diagram produced[10] seems to bear a striking similarity to an Advanced Stop Box and associated approach lane.

The off-tracking of large rigid and articulated vehicles, and especially the recent permissions for trailers over 13.5 metres is of great concern. It seems that the blame in crashes with those on cycles is out of kilter with normal expectation.

The off-tracking, especially in tight turns often required in an urban area can be both large and counter intuitive. The cut-in can be many metres, and the out-swing at the rear of even just a large bus or coach executing a sharp turn can be over two metres.

We do not think it is reasonable for an ordinary road user to understand the complex geometry involved, especially with articulated vehicles. On the other hand we consider it entirely reasonable that the driver should understand the off-tracking of the vehicle he or she is paid and trained to drive.

Hence it should be the responsibility of the driver to ensure that the envelope around his vehicle is safe and clear.

We are concerned at the number of occasions that the driver of a large vehicle has escaped prosecution because they could not see the cycle that they struck. Notices and some type of proposed warning devices risk just being victim blaming.

---

[9] http://www.camcycle.org.uk/newsletters/105/article7.html
[10] http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/45295/

We have heard from other EU countries how they tackle this problem, especially as some have permitted even larger HGVs. The universal answer seems to be that such vehicles are not normally permitted in urban centres. We witnessed a large articulated vehicle with a 13.5 metre trailer accessing the vehicle restricted shopping streets in Cambridge. It was only delivering a single pallet of books. If self-regulation in the logistics industry cannot do better than this, enforceable legal restrictions are needed. Bulk break depots with onward local delivery by smaller environmentally friendly vehicles, even cargo bikes, or small hours deliveries for larger loads would significantly reduce risks to vulnerable road users as well as reducing congestion.

16. Road Maintenance

The quality of road surface is very important for those on cycles.

Uneven surfaces, poor reinstatement following utility works, even small potholes, and damaged or misaligned manholes or gulleys (ironwork), all have a disproportionate effect on such users.

They make it more likely that someone on a cycle will have an unintended tumble, require them to deviate from the obvious path, make cycling an uncomfortable experience, and just hard work.

Yet those on a bike do little or no damage, and inflict minimum wear on road surfaces. Even a third power law on road damage suggests that a single unloaded double-deck bus would inflict more damage on a road than a million cycles. A single light car paying no VED does more damage than a thousand cycles.

To be safe and comfortable those on bikes do require a good quality surface, far better than for a sprung and comfortable car, yet they are the sufferers from the damage created by others.

Lack of winter maintenance has been of recent concern. Those on bikes are encouraged to use minor roads in towns, paths away from main traffic routes and shared use footways. They are also very vulnerable on icy roads especially if the surface is uneven, or they are required to make sharp turns due to poor infrastructure design. Yet these routes are rarely salted. In the last couple of years Cambridgeshire has extended a program of treating some such routes using a quad-bike. To enable year-round cycling, more such routes need to be treated.

17. Planning and Urban Design

Bicycles can be easily ridden further than most Department for Transport guidance suggests. We would suggest that an average commute of 30 minutes by bicycle at an average speed of 20 km/h would imply that bicycles are suitable for distances of up to 10 km.

We have many new developments within and around Cambridge that have varying levels of bicycle modal share expectations. A development to the west of Cambridge expects 70% of internal trips to be by bicycle, yet a development just 5 km north of this is expecting less than 8%. It should be noted that the background levels of cycling in the more northern development is already higher than that predicted. In

other words, they are designing their development to make cycling worse for the residents not better.

New developments must be designed around the bicycle and pedestrian first, and the car second. Bicycle and pedestrian journeys should be direct, safe, and segregated. Car journeys should be long, indirect, and not provide any through movements. Bicycle and pedestrian movements should be pervasive, cars discouraged.

Cycling offers almost complete reliability of trip time. Use of 'average time' produces a bias against walking and cycling. Car and bus trips have much greater variability of trip time, hence far greater contingency time, and hence an earlier start, is required for many trips.

We would suggest that UK wide guidance for new developments place a requirement that a minimum of 50% of all traffic internal to the development is by bicycle. This implies that safe routes to schools, doctors, offices, industrial estates, public transport should be designed in from the start, and that car traffic should be placed around that.

We do not believe that a car is an essential tool to allow children to be driven to school. We would suggest that no school should have access by motorised vehicle within 250 metres. Children can walk the last 250 metres if necessary, or cycle all the way from home.

It is essential that the design of a street supports bicycles use. Most new developments attempt to squeeze the most dwelling units possible into a given area. To do this they design very narrow roads that are then crowded with parked cars. These streets are incredibly unsafe for riders of bicycles. It would be better to have slightly wider roads, with 4 metres allocated for pedestrians, 4 metres allocated for bicycles, and 6 metres allocated for cars. These streets would therefore be a minimum of 14 metres wide. Assuming that trees, sustainable drainage and car parking are also required, a street of 20 metres wide would be desirable. Unfortunately, this is not happening.

We therefore suggest that urban design guidance for streets that can be safely used by school children – completely segregated from motor traffic and sufficiently wide that a parent can ride side by side with a young child on a bicycle – should be written. We believe that the third sector could produce such guidance but would like assurance that the Department for Transport would publish such guidance before work commences.

It should be recognised that the most successful retail areas are those where cars are banned. This includes huge shopping malls such as Lakeside or Meadowhall. Inside the shopping malls, there are no cars, only people walking. We believe that this model can also work in housing estates. We would therefore suggest that the best way to reduce conflicts between cars and other road users is to only allow cars to be parked in shared parking structures that are near the edge of a development and that the final few metres are travelled on foot (or bicycle).

Bicycle parking should be part of all new housing and flat developments with this parking available on the ground floor in a secure room. We do not believe these

should be called “bicycle stores” as this implies that bicycles are used only rarely for sports activities. For everyday bicycle use, access to these bicycles must be as easy as possible multiple times a day.

Cycle parking – at stations and outside houses http://www.cyclestreets.net/location/34292,20276/

18. Theft

The biggest problem related to theft is insecure bicycle parking, or the complete lack of bicycle parking. Bicycle parking should be encouraged and provided close to the destination of the journeys. This means that all shops must provide bicycle parking closer than car parking. We believe that even large supermarkets and big box stores should provide sufficient bicycle parking.

We would suggest that whenever a car parking space if provided, a minimum of one secure bicycle parking space must also be provided closer to the entrance of the building than that car parking space. We would like to suggest that building codes are changed to make this a requirement for any alterations to a building, even those not requiring planning permission.

19. Cycling outside urban areas

Although much has been said about cycling in urban areas and on the urban fringe, beyond that in the countryside there is still a need to make cycling far more pleasant in order to create a step change in use.

There are three basic types of cycling in such areas:

1. Leisure cycling
2. Commuting cycling to an urban source of employment or education
3. Local trips.

Although much attention is placed on (1) it is changing conditions for (3) that offers significant opportunities to increase cycling levels, and improve the mobility of many. Inappropriate or excessive speed of motor vehicles not only deters many from cycling, but also results in high levels of the more serious crashes. In Cambridgeshire between 2009 and 2011 there were eight fatal crashes involving those on cycles. Seven of those were on roads with 60 or 70mph limits. We now have 50mph limits on a number of ‘A’ class roads due to crash records, but adjacent roads of a lower standard still have 60mph limits. It is on just such minor roads that

cycling and walking are supressed by traffic speeds and volumes. Yet it is walking or cycling on such roads that offer the only alternative to the car, as supported bus services have been savaged. As many have no car access, social exclusion is greatly increased.

Reduced speed limits and better enforcement would improve accessibility for many. Rural shops and school would become more accessible, especially as this often means a trip to an adjacent village.

For leisure and commuting trips better access to and from the countryside can reduce car trips. For these, alternatives to busy main roads are needed. Cambridge has seen significant increase in cycle travel from surrounding villages, since some routes have been improved, and others created. Several are away from main roads. Cycling adjacent to open fields listening to skylarks with only the distant hum of traffic produces a far more refreshing start to the day than being stuck in a motor vehicle in miles of queues. Such routes also give far better opportunities for urban dwellers to make short leisure trips with friends or families into surrounding countryside.

20. International Comparisons

We would suggest that the best international comparison is between the UK and Cambridge, East Anglia. We have similar bicycle use rates to some places in The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and parts of Germany.

It should be noted that the average cycle user in Cambridge has a higher income than the average car driver in Cambridge. People riding bicycles are not poor people. They ride bicycles not because they cannot afford a car. They ride bicycles because it is the quickest, most practical and enjoyable way of getting into and around the city. These people on bicycles are powering the economy and innovating the future of the country. Perhaps the high rates of bicycle use in Cambridge is the reason that the unemployment level is so low, that the local companies are expanding, and that house prices haven’t crashed nearby.

Funding for bicycle infrastructure is best described as variable and haphazard today. Whilst the Local Sustainable Transport Fund provides a small sum of money for bicycle infrastructure it is nowhere near the levels of investment made in mainland Europe. We would push for £10 a person per year of transport investment to be the minimum investment. We would suggest that this background level of investment should be granted to all highways authorities for investment only in bicycle infrastructure along roads, bicycle parking, safer junctions for bicycles, planning bicycle networks, as well as training and the marketing of bicycles to the local population. We would also suggest that larger projects, for example a major bicycle crossing of a motorway, should be funded out of a separate means tested fund. These larger projects should enable the major barriers, crossing roads, railways and rivers, to be funded, as well as large bicycle parking structures to be constructed at major railway stations. We would suggest that an equivalent of £10 a person per year is allocated to these large bicycle infrastructure projects. Total funding would therefore still be below the average of €30 a person in The Netherlands.

21. Public Transport-Bicycle Integration

The bicycle provides an ideal method to increase the vitality of a public transport system by increasing the range of access to it.

Bicycles also rarely have a problem with congestion, allowing a person cycling to a train station to avoid the need to set out excessively early in case of delay en-route.

There are two issues that must be addressed:

1. Bicycle parking at large public transport interchanges must be provided. Cambridge is hopefully about to see a 3,000 multi-storey bicycle parking structure next to the main railway station. We believe that this could be full within a few years of operation. We would therefore suggest that future rail franchises include provision for secure bicycle parking at all stations/stops that would equal 5% of the population within 10km of that station that this serves.
2. Access to the station must feel and be designed to be safe for those on bicycles. This should include segregated bicycle infrastructure up to the bicycle parking; minimisation of conflicts between bicycle riders, taxis, buses, and people accessing a car parking area; fly parking on the approach to stations should also be removed wherever possible.

We consider that station bicycle parking supports both people cycling from home to the station and also from a station near their destination to their destination. Many people have two bicycles, one at either end, and therefore support for the repair and maintenance of bicycles at stations should also be considered essential. For those making occasional trips, the ability to rent bicycles should also be considered an essential component of a railway station.

Cycle park, Cambridge Station (proposed)
http://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2012/12/05/cycle-park-plans-revealed/

The carriage of bicycles on trains and trams should also be encouraged. This may require different styles of railway carriage, but new railway franchises could be awarded based on higher numbers of bicycles being carried.

22. 20mph and default speed limits

We believe there is sufficient evidence available that implies that a 20 mph speed limit should be the default in all residential or urban streets. We would therefore recommend, for safety reasons alone, that the default speed limit for urban areas is changed from 30 mph to 20 mph.

If this were done, then some streets would be able to support a higher speed limit. We believe that this determination should be based on the infrastructure provided for people riding bicycles and pedestrians along this road. For example if segregated cycletracks or hybrid cycletracks exist along a road then a higher 30 mph speed limit could be considered. We believe that the justification for higher speed limits should only be performed if a safety audit confirms that the real and perceived danger to vulnerable road users is minimised.

In Cambridgeshire we have many unclassified roads with a 60 mph speed limit. It is unfortunate that most cyclist fatalities also occur on roads with a 60 mph speed limit in Cambridgeshire. We therefore would suggest that rural unclassified roads have a default speed limit of 40 mph.

Classified roads, A-roads and B-roads, have a highly variable safety record and we would suggest that a more detailed review of these should be conducted. We consider that a default speed limit of 50 mph should be placed on all A-roads and B-roads. Considering the possible confusion of a different speed limit on unclassified roads, we would like to suggest that all speed limits above 40 mph on these roads should be clearly signed with repeater signs at suitable distances.

We do not support the increasing of speed limits for heavy goods vehicles.

We have no position on the speed limits on motorways, as bicycles are not allowed on these roads.

Yours sincerely,
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign,

Robin Heydon,
Jim Chisholm,
and Martin Lucas-Smith