

HILLS ROAD AND HUNTINGDON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CYCLEWAYS

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 27th May 2014

From: Graham Hughes, Executive Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

Electoral divisions: Bar Hill, Castle, Coleridge and Queen Edith's

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable **Key decision:** No

Purpose: To note the results of the consultations on proposed cycleways on Huntingdon Road, Girton and Hills Road, Cambridge, and to consider the implementation of segregated cycleways in these areas.

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to approve the following, subject to Traffic Regulation Orders:

- a) the implementation of a kerb segregated cycleway on Huntingdon Road where space permits, and a raised segregated cycleway elsewhere, in accordance with Option 3 in this report;
- b) the implementation of a raised segregated cycleway on Hills Road in accordance with Option 2 of this report;
- c) the introduction of island bus stops on both routes;
- d) the introduction of a cycling zebra on Huntingdon Road in the vicinity of Oxford Road, subject to Department for Transport (DfT) approval: and
- e) the advertisement of the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders.

Officer contact:		Member contact:	
Name:	Mike Davies	Name:	Councillor Ian Bates
Post:	Team Leader – Cycling Projects	Chairman:	Economy and Environment
Email:	Mike.davies@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699913	Tel:	01223 699173

1. BACKGROUND TO CYCLE CITY AMBITION PROGRAMME

- 1.1 The proposed schemes are funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) Cycle City Ambition Grant, which Cambridgeshire County Council and seven other local authorities were successful in bidding for last year. In the bid the County Council proposed to deliver a safe, direct, comprehensive network for cycling and walking, between key destinations in Cambridge and in South Cambridgeshire.
- 1.2 The growth of housing, business activity and the economy generally will put increasing pressure on the transport network. To mitigate the negative impacts of growth, modal shift must be achieved. The provision of high quality cycling infrastructure will make cycling safer for those already cycling, and, crucially, will make cycling an attractive option for those currently not cycling and for people moving into the area. Without the provision of high quality infrastructure, further significant modal shift to cycling is unlikely to be achieved.
- 1.3 The Cycle City Ambition programme comprises seven schemes in total, including Huntingdon Road and Hills Road in Cambridge. Four schemes in South Cambridgeshire are currently being constructed, and will be completed by September. A further scheme in Cambridge is due to be consulted on shortly.
- 1.4 Overall funding from DfT of £4.1million was confirmed in August 2013, and the funding has to be claimed back by May 2015, making for very challenging timescales.
- 1.5 A Stakeholder Group has been established to help develop the scheme proposals. The group is made up of the County Council's Cycling Champion, and representatives of Cambridge Cycling Campaign, Cyclists Touring Club, Sustrans, Babraham Research Campus, Girton Parish Council and officers from Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the County Council's Road Safety and Cycling Projects teams.

2. BACKGROUND TO PROJECTS

- 2.1 Huntingdon Road is a key arterial route into the city that carries 14,900 motor vehicles per day, 2,800 cyclists and 230 buses. Since 2008 there have been 31 recorded personal injury accidents, 65% of which have involved cyclists. New developments on either side of Huntingdon Road at Darwin Green (NIAB National Institute of Agricultural Botany development) and Cambridge North West (University site) are now taking shape. These developments, coupled with Northstowe, will give rise to increased traffic in the future, and indeed more trips by cycle.
- 2.2 Hills Road is the main traffic route between the city centre and Addenbrooke's Hospital. It carries 14,000 vehicles per day, 4,000 cyclists and 680 buses. Since 2008 there have been 75 recorded personal injury accidents on this length, of which 55% have involved cyclists. New developments in the Cambridge Southern Fringe and the Addenbrooke's site are growing rapidly.

- 2.3 The allocated budget for Huntingdon Road is £625,000, and for Hills Road is £1.2 million, though there is some flexibility across projects in the whole Cycle City Ambition Fund programme. The Fund was agreed as part of the Business Plan for 2014/15.

3. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 A wide range of options for the improvement of cycle facilities at each location were considered, in liaison with the Stakeholder Group. The options were also discussed with local members at an early stage.
- 3.2 It was felt that options that utilised segregation of cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles would have the greatest impact in terms of achieving the scheme objectives of providing infrastructure that was safe and direct, but crucially that was perceived as safe as well. Best practice examples from Europe and the UK have influenced the options developed, helped by the County Council's involvement in the European Bike Friendly Cities project and other DfT funded programmes which involve an element of best practice showcasing.
- 3.3 In all options the cycleway will be at least 2.1 metres wide, surfaced in red asphalt and would have priority over side roads. Cyclists would travel on a direct, quick, continuous route, without the need to negotiate obstacles such as parked cars, and there would be no conflict with pedestrians or motor vehicles. Pedestrians should benefit from reduced pavement cycling, and motorists would enjoy the benefit of not having to interact with cyclists.
- 3.4 For both schemes Option 1 (shown in **Plan 1**) comprises segregation achieved by means of a kerbed island. This option would provide the greatest level of safety and perceived safety. Cyclists would be physically separated from motor vehicles by a 600mm kerbed island, other than where side roads or private accesses are encountered. In these instances the proposed red surfacing would continue across, and priority would be maintained. There would be breaks in the segregation where private accesses or side roads are encountered, and bollards would need to be sited on these lengths of kerbed island.
- 3.5 In Huntingdon Road to introduce Option 1 would require the loss of dedicated right turn lanes at Howes Place and Sherlock Road, a pedestrian refuge and subject to detailed design, could require the narrowing of lengths of grass verge and footways. In Hills Road more width is available generally, but introducing Option 1 could mean the narrowing of right turn lanes.
- 3.6 Option 2 (shown in **Plan 2**) is a raised cycleway, below the level of the footway, but above the level of the road, hence segregation for users is achieved by level difference. The raised lane would return to road level at junctions, but priority would be maintained.
- 3.7 The raised cycleway option would allow emergency vehicles to pass more easily than the kerbed segregation option. This option would also be less visually intrusive than the kerbed segregated option. No right turn lanes would

be lost or narrowed, and existing pedestrian refuges would be retained, as would the existing widths of verge and footway in most cases.

- 3.8 In both schemes Option 3 represents a mix of the other two options. In Huntingdon Road Option 3 offers the safety of kerb segregation where the road is wider (the Girton end), and a raised cycleway where there is less road width. This compromise option means that existing right turn lanes, pedestrian refuges, verges and footway widths are all retained whilst offering some kerbed segregation as well.
- 3.9 For Hills Road Option 3 provides kerbed segregation in the city bound direction and a raised cycle lane outbound. Given the importance of Hills Road as a route for emergency vehicles Option 3 allows better passage for emergency vehicles than Option 1, whilst still offering some kerbed segregation.
- 3.10 In all options 'island' or 'floating' bus stops are proposed, as shown on **Plan 3**. The cycle lane goes to the rear of the bus stop to remove conflict between buses and cyclists, but bus users have to cross the cycle lane to reach a 'bus boarder' where they then board or alight the bus. The cycle lane narrows to 1.5 metres at these points and the crossing point for pedestrians is raised. Such stops have been in place in Holland for many years and have been introduced without any reported incidents or problems in Brighton and parts of London.

4. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 4.1 An extensive and thorough consultation was undertaken which comprised a period of pre-consultation, a number of public events and meetings with a wide range of stakeholders.
- 4.2 In November 2013 residents, businesses, residents associations and colleges were contacted to seek their views on making improvements on Huntingdon Road for cyclists. 80 responses were received, and this led to a number of meetings and exchanges of letters, which gave some useful pre-consultation information highlighting issues such as deliveries, visual concerns and access issues. A Cyclists' Breakfast was also held to gauge the early thoughts of cyclists using Huntingdon Road.
- 4.3 The pre-consultation activity in Huntingdon Road raised the difficulties that pedestrians and cyclists experience when crossing Huntingdon Road in the Storeys Way and Oxford Road area. This led to the inclusion in the scheme of a 'cycling zebra', a crossing which allows cyclists to legally have priority at a zebra crossing. Such crossings are expected to be approved next year by the DfT, and so it seemed appropriate and in line with the ambitions of these projects to consider including such a crossing within the scheme.
- 4.4 Bike maintenance events were held in November 2013 at Long Road and Hills Road Sixth Form Colleges to give an opportunity to seek the views of students on current cycle provision on Hills Road. Large employers and other schools were also contacted for their views, and a number of meetings were held.

- 4.5 The proposals for Huntingdon Road and Hills Road were introduced into the public domain at the City Council's West/Central Area Committee on 6th March 2014 and the South Area Committee on 3rd March respectively. A launch breakfast event was held in Huntingdon Road on 4th March and that evening the schemes were outlined and presented at the Cambridge Cycling Campaign's monthly meeting. These generated a lot of initial media and social media interest. The public consultation for the two schemes ran from 4th March to 7th April 2014.
- 4.6 Leaflets were produced for each scheme giving details and photo montages of the proposals, and these contained tear off questionnaires which could be returned by freepost or completed on line. An extensive leaflet distribution was undertaken in the Huntingdon Road and Hills Road areas. A 'fly through' of the Huntingdon Road scheme, showing kerbed segregation, raised cycle lanes, island bus stops and the cycling zebra was created, could be viewed on You Tube.
- 4.7 **Table 1** below shows the public consultation programme that was undertaken.

Date & Times	Venue
Huntingdon Road	
12 th March 5.00 – 7.00pm	Girton Glebe Primary School
18 th March 4.00 – 7.00pm	St Augustine's Hall, Richmond Road
24 th March 5.00 – 7.30pm	Kaetsu Centre, Huntingdon Road
Hills Road	
6 th March 5 – 7.30pm	St John the Evangelist Church, Hills Road
14 th March 11am – 2pm	Main foyer, Addenbrooke's Hospital
26 th March 6.30 – 8.30am	The Perse School, Hills Road

- 4.8 In addition to the public consultation events, the following stakeholder activity was undertaken:

- Stall at Addenbrooke's Hospital Sustainability Event.
- Visit to Hills Road VI Form College.
- Visit to Long Road VI Form College.
- Meetings with Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council's Access Officers.
- Meeting with Stagecoach and Passenger Transport Team.
- Presentation and Question and Answer session at Cambridge Disability Forum.
- Proposals discussed at Cambridge City Cycling and Walking Liason Group.
- Meeting with Cambridgeshire County Council Sensory Services, Guide Dogs for the Blind Area Co ordinator and Trainers for the blind/partially sighted.
- Meeting with Cambridge City Council's Urban Design Team.

There were also internal discussions with officers from Traffic Signals, Road Safety, Highway Maintenance, Passenger Transport and other sections of the County Council.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS – HUNTINGDON ROAD

- 5.1 A total of 828 responses were received, of which 66% were responses from local residents. There was a good range of responses by age group, road user type and employment status. More details of the results can be seen in **Appendix 1**.
- 5.2 Looking first at the general need to improve cycle facilities on Huntingdon Road, 74% felt that improvements should be made. For Castle Ward residents this figure was less at 67%, and for Girton residents fairly similar at 72%.
- 5.3 In terms of the proposed options, people's views were fairly evenly spread with Option 1 being the most popular at 31% and Option 2 being the least popular at 20.3%. 39.7% of Huntingdon Road residents felt that none of the options were the best choice.
- 5.4 Cyclists preferred Option 1, but again there was a fairly even spread across all of the options for all users, with 'none of the above' being the most preferred option by motorists, bus users and pedestrians.
- 5.5 The majority of respondents supported the proposed island bus stops with 59.5% in favour and 28.3% against. Analysing the results further showed that in terms of user groups, all had a majority of respondents in favour, and in terms of geographic split all had a majority in favour except Huntingdon Road where 44% were not in favour and 41% were.
- 5.6 The most common comments made in the consultation related to the need for island bus stops to be wider, for vehicles to be able to overtake stationary buses, for pedestrians to have priority at these locations and for shelters to be sited on the islands. Other comments made related to current provision being good enough, concerns over deliveries, concerns over lost right turn lanes, a range of safety issues and a feeling that the scheme should extend all the way to Histon Road.

6. CONSULTATION RESULTS – HILLS ROAD

- 6.1 A total of 845 responses were received, of which 42% were responses from local residents. There was a good range of responses by age group and employment status, with a notably high percentage of people responding who stated that they most commonly used Hills Road as a cyclist (60%). More details of the results can be seen in **Appendix 2**.
- 6.2 In terms of the need to improve cycle facilities on Hills Road, 79% felt that improvements should be made. The majority of people (69%) also agreed that on balance it would be acceptable to lose the existing two way cycle

route on one side of Hills Road.

- 6.3 In terms of the proposed options, people's views were quite mixed with more of a preference for Option 1 generally, with Hills Road residents and Addenbrooke's staff preferring Option 2. Notably when broken down by geographic area (or user type) no group felt that 'none of the above' was the preference.
- 6.4 When broken down by user group a pattern is clear that Option 1 is the most preferred, followed by Option 2 and then 'none of the above' or Option 3.
- 6.5 The majority of respondents supported the proposed island bus stops with 58.2% in favour and 29.2% against. Analysing the results further showed that in terms of user groups, all had a majority of respondents in favour, and in terms of geographic split all had a majority in favour except Queen Edith's residents where 44.8% were not in favour and 43.7% were.
- 6.6 The most common comments are similar to those made in Huntingdon Road regarding the island bus stops. Other comments made were also similar to Huntingdon Road.
- 6.7 The local member for Coleridge is very supportive of any proposals that introduce some form of segregation on Hills Road. He is also keen to address the issue of bus and cycle conflict outside Hills Road VI Form College which is not included in the scheme, but is being taken forward as a separate project in consultation with the Passenger Transport team.

7. CONSULTATION RESPONSES – STAKEHOLDERS

- 7.1 Cambridge Cycling Campaign responded by saying that they would enthusiastically support any of the options proposed, a view echoed by the Cyclists Touring Club, though they expressed some preference for Option 2.
- 7.2 Stagecoach made it clear that they could not support anything that impacted upon traffic flow and journey times for motor vehicles in the city. Specifically they echoed the comments others had made in the public consultation around the need for island bus stops to be wider, to have shelters/stop infrastructure sited on them, for pedestrians to have priority at these locations and crucially that motor vehicles could easily overtake stationary buses. In general Stagecoach expressed concern over the island stops and stated a preference for bus laybys which was surprising as these are known to give difficulties for buses trying to rejoin the traffic.
- 7.3 Disability groups, in particular those representing blind or partially sighted have expressed some concern over the island bus stops. The Project Team have engaged closely with these groups, and it is clear that they would feel much happier if at the very least, priority could be offered to pedestrians at the island bus stops. It is clear that any change in a familiar road environment causes an element of stress and concern for people with mobility impairments.
- 7.4 The East Anglian Ambulance Service expressed a preference for either

Option 2 or Option 3, as they felt that kerbed segregation in Option 1 might mean delays in emergency situations where vehicles need to pull over and allow fast passage for ambulances.

8. POST CONSULTATION ACTIVITY

- 8.1 The scheme proposals have been reviewed by Robin Reed, who was formerly Project Manager for cycling schemes in Brighton and Hove. His input and comments, along with those from the public and stakeholders, have prompted a review and redesign of the island bus stops.
- 8.2 The Stakeholder Group has met to review the consultation results and to agree on the recommended options and aspects that need further development.
- 8.3 At the time of writing this report, arrangements are being made to further discuss the results and recommendations with local Members.
- 8.4 The Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) for both schemes have been identified. For Huntingdon Road in the length that will have segregation by level difference and for Hills Road, a no waiting at any time restriction will be needed, with a peak time loading restriction. Existing mandatory cycle lanes will need to be revoked for both roads. There may be some statutory processes to be undertaken if bus stops need to be moved, and in establishing the cycling zebra. Objections to TROs will be considered by the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 In both scheme consultations, Option 1 (kerbed segregation) emerged as the most popular option, but not by a large margin. However, this option does give rise to a number of concerns, not least the potential high maintenance requirements as debris such as leaves, are likely to build up within the segregated lanes, visual aspects, winter maintenance, loading and unloading, and cost are also considerations.
- 9.2 In the city section of Huntingdon Road and in Hills Road the large number of private accesses means that the segregation would be very discontinuous, and it is likely that for safety reasons a bollard would be needed on each short section of segregation. This would look unsightly, and would be a maintenance liability as bollards are hit and require cleaning.
- 9.3 The Girton length of Huntingdon Road is wider and a relatively long, unbroken length of kerbed segregation could be provided, with no loss of verge or footway width, and a minimal number of bollards. Residents of Girton showed a clear preference for kerbed segregation therefore on balance, it is recommended that kerbed segregation be introduced at the Girton end of Huntingdon Road, and that a raised lane be introduced at the city end - in other words the introduction of Option 3. This proposal is supported by the Stakeholder Group.

- 9.4 Hills Road is a key route for the emergency services. The Ambulance Service have stated preferences to introduce either Option 2 or 3. Option 1 could have a negative impact on emergency services as vehicles would have much less width to move out of the way in emergency situations.
- 9.5 Option 2's raised cycleways would allow motor vehicles to mount the raised cycle ways quickly in emergencies. This option also allows wider cycleways to be provided, as no allowance is required for kerbed islands.
- 9.6 It is therefore recommended that Option 2 is introduced in Hills Road. This proposal is supported by the Stakeholder Group.
- 9.7 The detailed design of the island bus stops will be developed to provide the maximum width so that shelters and stop infrastructure can be sited on them if possible, and to give pedestrians greater priority crossing cycle lanes.

10. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

10.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

More people cycling contributes to a healthier population, improved productivity, reduced traffic congestion, reliability of journey times and adds capacity into an already constrained road network, all of which contributes to economic improvements.

10.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

Currently many people feel unsafe cycling, although cycling is potentially a form of economic, reliable transport that allows them to access employment or training and hence independence, and the opportunity to incorporate active travel into their lives.

10.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

Good cycling infrastructure including segregated lanes and island bus stops potentially means less cycling on footways and less conflict with elderly and disabled people.

11. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Resource Implications

The schemes are capital funded by the DfT from an overall programme budget of £4.1million. There is flexibility but the scheme budgets are £1.2m for Hills Road and £625,000 for Huntingdon Road. The schemes are being designed to ensure minimal maintenance/revenue costs.

11.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

11.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

11.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

A thorough and extensive period of consultation and engagement has been undertaken for both schemes as described in Sections 4 – 7 above.

11.5 Public Health Implications

More people cycling and walking undoubtedly contributes to improved public health. The Public Health team strongly support the proposals.


11.6 Localism and local member engagement

There has been extensive public and stakeholder consultation.


The Project Team have engaged with, and updated local members throughout the scheme development and consultation process.

Source Documents	Location
Consultation responses	A Wing, Floor 2 Castle Court, Cambridge


PLAN 1 – Showing Option 1, kerbed segregation




PLAN 2 – Showing Option 2, segregation by level difference




PLAN 3 – Showing 'island' bus stops






APPENDIX 1: Huntingdon Road Responses


Respondent Location



Education / Employment



Age Range



Do you often use Huntingdon Road as a... Please tick as many as apply




Which are you most often?




Do you see a need for improvements on Huntingdon Road?



Of the three options shown which is your preferred option?




Do you support the new bus stop layout?




APPENDIX 2: Hills Road Responses


Respondent Location




Education / Employment




Age Range




Do you often use Hills Road as a... Please tick as many as apply (multiple choice question)




Which are you most often?




Do you see a need for improvements on Hills Road?



Do you agree or disagree with the removal of the two-way cycle lane on the pavement near Hills Road 6th Form College?



Of the three options shown which is your preferred option?



Do you support the new bus stop layout?

