

Transport Summit on Friday, 14th November

CTC and Cycle Basingstoke (CB) views on the Local Plan

Lack of sustainability

CTC and CB believe that the proposals for transport in the Local Plan are unsustainable as there are no active measures to provide realistic alternatives to the motor car. The latest report from the Climate Change Panel says that we need to reduce carbon emissions to zero. Walking and cycling are obvious answers. Long term underinvestment in cycling is a major barrier.

Why cycle routes have not worked

Providing cycle routes within new developments and connecting these to existing routes adjacent to the developments is insufficient. The only standards required are that they should have an appropriate surface and be lit and not cause conflict with other transport users. The council has been doing this for the last 20 years or more and it has not worked. To-day there is not a single cycle route which is fit for purpose or which connects to the station or the town centre. Roads meanwhile continue to be built or traffic managed whilst ignoring the needs of cyclists. **Both cycle facilities and all roads need to be cycle friendly.** Officers have done their best with the resources provided, but they are also not trained in what is good design.

55% of the population own a bicycle, but they do not use it, others have no cycle as they see no point. The Olympic legacy means that many people want to cycle, but don't, they do a risk assessment and decide the roads are unsafe. The council has a duty of care to ensure that the highway network is safe to cycle. CTC has a presentation showing the economic benefits to retailers of increased cycling and another one on how to design infrastructure which is cycle friendly.

What is the solution?

The Cross Party Parliamentary Cycling Group have made 28 recommendations. **The top priority is political leadership, targets, funding and monitoring.**ⁱ This sends a clear message, action is intended, not just a lot of wishful thinking. Secondly we need to identify what is needed. CTC and CB have already done this, a list below is given. CTC has already submitted a proposed cycle policy which would give some details on standards, Transport for London has published its Cycle Standards document for consultation. There will always be conflict between transport users if there is insufficient SPACE for cyclists, no cycle lanes or too narrow on the carriageway and cycleways with not enough SPACE designed for walking not cycling. Investment of at least £10 per head is needed.

Infrastructure Requirements

	Principles	Implementation
a	<p><u>Connectivity</u>,</p> <p>Cycle routes must be Complete, continuous, convenient, direct, convenient, comfortable, coherent, safe, signed, maintained, accessible</p>	<p>Routes already listed in BEST (1999) have never been implemented</p> <p>Ensure that everywhere, esp. new developments, is connected to the town centre and the station</p> <p>State what types of cycle routes if any are needed within new developments (i.e. beside the distributor road)</p> <p>Complete “Missing links” and identify others (use a cycle map see below)</p> <p>List type and location of defects, timetable remedial work</p>
	<p><u>Safety on cycle routes</u> (bollards, barriers, blind corners, transition between carriageway and cyclepath or cycleway, crossing of side roads, kerbs, narrowings)</p>	<p>List dangers and location and timetable remedial action.</p> <p>Use a set of standards to ensure that cycle routes are safe</p>
B	<p>Permeability (cut throughs, dropped kerbs, virtual cul-de-sacs)</p>	<p>Time table this in minor works</p>
C	<p>Permeability – cycling in parks and open spaces, Top of Town</p>	<p>TRO and byelaw changes. Timetable this</p>
D	<p>Permeability – cycling in pedestrianised areas. Shared space</p>	<p>Trial this. TRO. Timetable this</p>
E	<p>Permeability – one way streets</p>	<p>Provide contra flow cycling, change some of the one way streets – consult with CB</p>
F	<p>Permeability – barriers such as junctions and roundabouts. Provide space for cycling alongside busy narrow roads</p>	<p>Provide cycle facilities both sides of busy roads and alternatives across busy junctions and roundabouts. E.g. Thorneycroft rbt cycle facilities highly dangerous, need some sort of protection to cross these multi lane roads. Black Dam roundabout –nothing – no alternative to the car</p>
g	<p>Cycle parking and security</p>	<p>Recommend locations and standards as per (Cambridge cycle parking policy and Exeter cycle policy. Timetable new parking in retail areas, esp. Top of Town</p>
h	<p>Signage</p>	
i	<p>Information, mapping</p>	<p>Create a revised map. CB or/and HCC Design cycle map along Cheltenham lines – this will indicate which roads need to be made safer for cycling. It will also provide a baseline and monitoring tool</p>
j	<p>Maintenance, on roads and cycle paths. Potholes can kill or maim. Use maintenance as an opportunity to install cycle lanes when retarmacing the carriageway e.g. on</p>	<p>Important that planting is designed so that it does not grow over cycle route e.g. foot/cycle way on Alencon Link. May need to get volunteers involved.</p>

	Winchester road between Winchester road roundabout and Hill View no cycle signs painted	
k	Prioritisation of cycling (hierarchy of users and provision) esp in new road layouts/traffic management schemes	Ensure this is a condition in all new developments. Measure success by number of sites where this is done or stakeholder satisfaction.
l	Safety/cycle proofing on the highways Road narrowings, islands and buildouts squeeze cyclists off the road. Motor traffic which passes too close is intimidating – make space for cycling. Often traffic calming measures only reduce speeds by 1 or 2 miles per hour.	List sites which need remedial work. Ensure policies/standards make this happen (e.g. new road measures for Tescos application focussed on increasing capacity at roundabouts whilst failing to meet the needs of cyclists and pedestrians). Safety audit needs to be independent, if necessary involve cycle stakeholders. Cycle proof all roads
m	<u>Targets, standards and funding</u>	Identify sources of funding, at least £10 per head per annum is needed to implement a cycle strategy which has any hope of success. Targets show you mean action, but they must be meaningful. Adopt a cycle standards, policy, strategy. Create an implementation plan with timing and monitor. Ensure that developers understand what is required to make cycling possible – a cycle SPD, policy, standards, unfortunately the devil is in the detail.
n	Road closures New developments must not obliterate roads used by/needed by cyclists e.g. John Hunt school built over Sherborne road. Cycle routes must be provided through round building sites.	Ensure this is required in planning applications
o	Reduce/abolish car parking on the road	Ensure there is sufficient car parking either public or private OFF road. On road car parking reduces the efficiency and capacity of the road system as well as making it dangerous for cycling
	Rail and bus integration, incl. effect of level crossing closures	
	Speed limits 20 mph zones	
	Training of officers	
	Consultation with stakeholders and neutrality of safety audits	The provider and the auditor of schemes are the same people or body
	Cycle facilities need to be non discriminatory. many disabled are cyclists, specially adapted vehicles are usually excluded.	

Changing attitudes, beliefs and behaviour

Marketing, publicity, behaviour change and engaging with people is the second part of ensuring that the infrastructure provided is used. The LSTF and transport plans by business, schools and developers are beginning to address this. More guidance on transport plans in planning applications is needed. Transport plans across educational establishments and other bodies need to be comparable so their success can be measured in percentage of journeys by bike and the increase in cycling either by trip or numbers of people or both.

Funding – Community Infrastructure Levy

There needs to be a much stronger cycling element in the CIL. Junction treatment must take into account the effect on cycling and walking. Manydown must be connected by cycle to the town centre (this is not stated in the Local Plan). The proposed cycle route along Roman road connecting West Basingstoke with the hospital appears to have been ignored, possibly dropped from county implementation plans. The Basingstoke golf course needs to be connected to Dummer and North Waltham as well as the town centre via both the A30 and the Western Greenway. The new hospital at North Waltham needs to be connected by bike to the town centre. Blackdown roundabout has made it worse for cycling and there is NO CYCLE element here. There was a lost opportunity to improve nearby cycle paths.

<http://pedaller.org.uk/2014/11/13/highways-agency-admits-basingstoke-roundabout-unsafe-for-cycling/>

Infrastructure to be funded from CIL receipts
Improvements to junction at A3010 Churchill Way / Victory Roundabout
Provision of A33 link to Cufaude Lane / Chineham distributor road
Improvements to junction and signals at A30 Ringway South / A339 Hackwood Road Roundabout
Improvements to M3 junction 7
Improvements to junctions on B3400 throughout Laverstoke and Freefolk and improved pedestrian and traffic management
Transport and access improvements at Basingstoke Top of Town
Construction and implementation of Chineham railway station
Improvements at Basingstoke and Overton rail stations (including car and cycle parking)
Bus network infrastructure, including bus lanes, bus stops and passenger information
Manydown and Basingstoke golf course sites

ⁱ (examples: Oakley cycle path installed because of 100% councillor and officer support after only a few years after it was requested. Alencon Link cycle facility was installed after over a decade of requesting but it only suitable for walking. Cyclists complain it does not go to the station – the designers did not consider the purpose and function of the facility. Hackney borough council has 100% officer support for cycling, a cycle strategy and standards and 37% of trips by bike)