

Appendix 2

	Stakeholders' Objections
North Newtown Residents Association	<p>We wish to object to the proposed introduction of two way cycling on Brookside. The road is extremely narrow and is excessively busy during term time (due to the number of schools in the area).</p> <p>The council declared Brookside unsafe in April 2006 on the grounds that the road is 2.5 metres wide, which is insufficient for a safe contra flow system.</p> <p>Other points to consider: At peak times - especially school drop off and pick up times - the local roads can be highly congested and at other times have fast moving 'rat run' cars. Union Road also has two schools and can be very busy. The junctions with Hills Road and other streets are a safety risk.</p>
St Mary's School	<p>We would like to object to the proposed introduction of two way cycling on Brookside and concur with views of (objection 9) and with previous findings from the Council itself that the road is too narrow to accommodate two way cycling safely. The timing of the consultation is disappointing, with a start and finish date within the school holidays.</p>
No	Residents' Objections
1	<p>I wish to object on the grounds that they cannot be judged to improve traffic management nor be safe for residents and road users.</p> <p>Who has right of way when the road is not wide enough for two way flow? If tricycles are allowed to travel against normal traffic flow this will create a clash with motor vehicles.</p> <p>Sections of the proposed routes have roughly 3m available for traffic flow due to parked cars, which is not enough room for cyclists to safely pass vehicles moving in the opposite direction. This will lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More conflicts with motorised vehicles • Slower passage for all • Cyclists mounting footpaths to avoid collisions or to avoid stopping, which will lead to; • More conflicts with pedestrians especially considering the width of the footpaths as is. <p>The little gain in time for cyclists travelling contra-flow is superseded by the increase in danger and increase in journey times for with –flow cyclists caught in the traffic held up by contra-flow cyclists.</p>
2	<p>I strongly object to your two-way cycling proposals for streets in Newtown. As a resident and car driver I believe that it will increase my risk of personal injury as well as damage to my vehicle and other vehicles. It will also increase the risk to the many, inexperienced cyclists that use this area.</p>

	<p>The junctions contained in this order already suffer visibility issues due to pedestrians or blind corners, particularly Union Road at its junction with Hills Road, so the addition of another variable will only increase the risk of collisions occurring.</p> <p>Brookside is narrow and though there are spaces for cars and cyclist to pull into, if a car does so it forces any cyclist travelling contra-flow to pass on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>Regarding Norwich Street, I can see the reasoning for two-way cycling, as many residents seem to use bicycles and would want to access Hills Road directly.</p>
3	<p>As a committed cyclists I am writing to object to the idea of two way cycling along several streets on grounds of safety and lack of any real unmet need.</p> <p>1) Coronation Street – The junction of St Eligius Street and Coronation Street is very sharp with poor visibility. Cyclists can pass safely along Pemberton terrace so there is no need to implement this added risk.</p> <p>2) Brookside – The street is narrow due to parking and populated by schools. The addition of cyclists travelling in the opposite direction to normal flow will only increase the risk of injury. Cyclists can travel south on St Eligius and use the new cycle lane on Trumpington Road.</p> <p>3) Norwich Street, Union Road, Coronation Street. There are other options available to cyclists so there is nothing to be gained by adding contra flow cycle lanes.</p>
4	<p>If there is not enough room to mark out a contraflow cycle lane, thereby allowing space for cycles, through vehicles and parked vehicles side-by-side, 2-way cycling should not be allowed as it is too dangerous with so many students and schoolchildren, as well as traffic, using these streets. Brookside and Norwich Street are too narrow, but Union Road and Coronation Street probably have enough width to allow a demarcated cycle lane.</p>
5	<p>I wish to objects to the inclusion of the following streets in the scheme: Brookside, Norwich Street, Coronation Street and Union Road.</p> <p>These streets are not comparable to other one way streets in the city because of the number of schools in the area (6 in total, 4 of which are primary school age and below). Newtown is bordered by three major arterial routes (Hills Road, Lensfield Road & Trumpington Road), which are subject to major congestion at peak times. This congestion results in Newton being subject to significant amounts of 'rat running' with drivers regularly ignoring the 20mph speed limit (which is not policed).</p> <p>On Brookside, parents park in residents' parking bays and on double yellow lines when dropping off or collecting children throughout the day. The road is very narrow, with metal railings on one side and residents' parking on the other, which means that those who at the moment chose to cycle the wrong way down the one-way section have nowhere to pull over safely out of the path of oncoming vehicles, unless they mount the pavement, which brings them into conflict with pedestrians. Norwich Street is another narrow street which has parked cars on most of its length and also narrow 'pinch points'. The junction of Union Road and Panton Street is a tight corner, with narrow pavements on Union Road and the junction of Coronation Street with Panton Street is another busy intersection. The junction of Bateman Street and Brookside has limited visibility (particularly at night) for cars turning in to Brookside because of the high</p>

	<p>wall. Two-way cycling will simply increase the potential for conflict on all these roads and I am concerned about the safety of school children and the elderly, as well as the cyclists themselves</p> <p>In 2006 CJAC considered two way in the Newtown area and rejected the proposals whereby the Safety Audit team determined Brookside too narrow. Since then traffic has increased, some of the schools have expanded and a new school has opened (which also has plans to expand).</p> <p>Residents have been promised a traffic management review of the area for some time now. Two way cycling should not be considered until this has been done.</p>
6	<p>Brookside, Union Road and Norwich Street can be difficult roads to drive down with just the parked cars let alone contraflow cycle traffic. If I were cycling against the flow of traffic I would not feel safe even with a lane marked out.</p> <p>Is there really a need to allow two way cycling on Norwich Street considering the normal direction of travel on Union Road is in the direction of Hills Road and there is already a contraflow cycling lane on Bateman Street. The proposal suggest that, because the authorities are incapable of enforcing the one-way system for cycling they are allowing contra-flow cycling to pander to those disobeying the road rules.</p>
7	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed two-cycling in a limited number of streets in North Newtown.</p> <p>Residents, many of whom are cyclists and support two-way cycling initiatives, are working with councillors, schools and other stakeholders on finding effective solutions for North Newtown, and the streets in question, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in the number of vehicle to the area • Reduction of the amount of Pay & Display Parking • Enforcement of the 20 mph zone • Supporting school's Traffic Management initiatives • Increasing visibility on blind corners • Addressing narrowness of pavements <p>Solving these issues makes for a safer environment for cyclists and residents alike.</p> <p>Unlike many other streets in Cambridge that have adopted two-way cycling, this area and its streets suffer truly significant traffic levels as:</p> <p>we're bounded by Trumpington Rd – Lensfield Rd – Hills Rd city traffic looking for alternative routes</p> <p>we have many independent schools of which many have 25% of parents driving in to deliver & collect children</p> <p>Encouraging cyclists to enter one of the busiest one-way residential systems in Cambridge, puts them at risk, and slows traffic further, leading to traffic queues and increased pollution for residents in an area that is recognised as one of the most polluted in the city.</p> <p>Coronation Street (section Panton St – St Eligius St) –Allowing cyclists to cross this intersection puts them at increased risk, and slows traffic further leading to increased queuing and pollution</p> <p>Brookside – this specific section has previously been rejected for safety issues given the narrowness of the road. Since that finding there have been no improvements</p>

	<p>made to reduce the number of parked cars, or the number of school children & parents delivering & collecting them, safety issues have not been addressed to allow two-way cycling. Additionally, there is a proposal to site additional 5 Pay & Display parking bays for visitors to Botanics, etc. which is an increase in visitor drivers unfamiliar with our one-way system, the narrowness of the road, and particularly cyclists 'going the wrong way'</p> <p>Norwich Street – a long street with many parked cars, and higher traffic levels from Hills Road to Panton Street. The road surface is poor and not good enough to ensure cars & cyclist can pass frequently & safely</p> <p>Union Road – the key issue is intersection of Union Road & Panton Street. This is a tight corner, with parked resident's cars close to it, and many cars coming down Panton Street at speed (above 20mph) and Pemberton Terrace (which is an unsighted dog leg, with a sharp turn left and immediately right). Please see photo attached which show the extent of queuing traffic that regularly seek to exit to Lensfield Road; traffic is backed up past Pemberton Terrace, and the intersection in question, as far as Coronation Street intersection. Allowing cyclists to go against this flow puts them at risk and further intensifies the congestion and queuing</p> <p>I include a link to photos that show the extent to which a large number of queuing cars, crossing pedestrians, etc. would be material factors when considering contra-flow cycling at intersections at Union Road, Coronation Street, and Pemberton Terrace. These are at various times of year, day, and weather:</p> <p>(Pictures Provided in email are available as background papers)</p>
8	<p>I would like to register my objections to two way cycling on the following roads with these points.</p> <p>Union Road - there is a problem with junctions in this very densely overcrowded area. As there are two schools there is excessive traffic and additional cycling as a contra flow could pose risks.</p> <p>Coronation Street - again this is a busy area which gets particularly busy especially at school drop off times.</p> <p>Norwich Street - my main concern is the junction with Hills Road and Panton Street. These areas are either a busy main road or at the other end are particularly affected by school traffic and rat run traffic.</p> <p>Brookside should not have been overruled at the last JAC against council guidance and I trust you will recognise public concerns and remove this road from the road due to safety concerns.</p> <p>I am in favour of cycling and would support appropriate schemes. However at the moment it is favourable to support traffic reduction in the area - by way of tackling parking issues, enforcing traffic speeds, rat running traffic and creating deterrents for car drivers such as working with the schools to ensure their traffic plans are effective. If parents were not able to drive in the area this would be a help but until these - and other measures take place it is very hard to ensure the safety of contra flow cycling in this particular area - especially with so many thousands of extra young people using the local streets. A traffic review should be made of this area (North Newtown) as requested in previous JAC meetings - to ensure that any scheme could be carried out</p>

	<p>in relation to the area as a whole and so that any scheme can work for the benefit of everyone.</p> <p>The streets of North Newtown - including Coronation Street, Union Road, Norwich Street and Brookside are a particular area with many schools, a variety of needs and with roads that are often very narrow and not able to cope at the moment with excessive traffic. Adding contra flow cycling at this stage is not appropriate and should only be carried out after there has been a significant reduction in vehicles and other measures to address safety issues in this area.</p>
9	<p>I would like to confirm that the views given by (see previous 3 comments) are the views held by myself and the majority of residents who live in this area. The dangers brought about by two way cycling outweigh the benefits.</p>
10	<p>A large number of young children attend schools on Brookside. Allowing two way cycling will just increase the risk of an accident occurring.</p>
11	<p>Two way cycling on Brookside would not be safe for cyclists, students, children or residents. I have lived here for 50 years and I see Cambridge roads becoming more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians, year on year.</p>
12	<p>Why has Brookside reappeared on the latest public notice when it was originally withdrawn as it was felt to be unsafe?</p> <p>Traffic levels seem to have increased over the past months in Brookside and a large number of taxis (empty) use this road as a short cut into the city centre area to avoid congestion points on the main roads, predominantly Trumpington Road and Hills Road.</p> <p>The number of schoolchildren attending the local schools has increase, which has led to an increase in traffic as parents drop off and pick up their children at these schools. Many of these parents park illegally and irresponsibly whilst on the school run putting pedestrians and cyclists at risk. The addition of contra flow cycling would only compound the dangers on Brookside which should be removed from the order.</p>
13	<p>I live in Coronation Street and I witness near misses on a daily basis due to cyclists riding the wrong way. The road is not wide enough for a cycle way and the junctions with Bentinck Street and George IV Street are blind. Parents with Dutch bikes would be a nightmare in this situation.</p> <p>(Two-way cycling is not proposed on this section of Coronation Street)</p>
14	<p>I object to the introduction of a contraflow system for cyclists along Brookside.</p> <p>Traffic levels are uncomfortably high at peak times exacerbated by rat runs to schools. Added to this, there is a lack of law enforcement to stop vehicles parking/pausing on double yellow lines, especially during school hours. Brookside is just wide enough for cars to enter the one way system, passing the Resident Parking Bays, which are used 24/7.</p> <p>One of the schools is at the intersection of Pemberton Terrace and Brookside, which is a blind turn. Given the existing junction priority for traffic at Pemberton Terrace/Brookside and the heavy usage of the canal bridge which also meets at this junction, it compounds the difficulty for the safe flow of movement for cyclists,</p>

	pedestrians and traffic and increases the potential for an accident to happen. I consider the contraflow system to be an unsound and unsafe proposal.
15	<p>My main objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The street is too narrow for a cycle to pass an oncoming car given the residents' parking bays. Who then has priority? 2. Two way cycling is not needed as there is a new cycle way in Trumpington Road running south parallel to Brookside - which would be the safer choice.
16	<p>My Family and I would like to object to the proposal of permitting two way cycling on Brookside.</p> <p>Brookside is heavily congested due to the local schools. Especially at drop off and pick up, which can be until after 6pm because of after school clubs.</p> <p>The road is often used as a rat run during peak traffic times with little regard for the speed limit, pedestrians or cyclists. I see near misses daily because of it.</p> <p>Cyclists are already a risk to children as you cannot hear them until they are right upon you and two way cycling would only make this problem worse.</p>
17	<p>I am against the proposal to allow contraflow cycling in Brookside.</p> <p>The road, as previously acknowledged by the Council in 2006, is simply too narrow, and also tends to attract a lot of car traffic at particular times of the day (e.g. the school run). So cyclists going against the traffic flow in this constrained space would be exposed to regular danger.</p>
18	<p>I wish to object most strongly on safety grounds to the proposed allowance of two way cycling along Brookside. Additionally, I have concerns about the safety/necessity of allowing two way cycling along other streets in north Newtown.</p> <p>I cannot understand how the dangerous proposal to allow two way cycling along Brookside was approved at the last meeting. Indeed, my understanding was that this proposal had been withdrawn prior to the meeting and then was reinstated at it. Since the report of the 24th April 2006 by the Director of Highways and Access to the Cambridge Traffic Management AJC that this proposal was too dangerous to proceed with, the traffic levels in Brookside have increased massively with two new schools. There are three school drop off and collection times at school start time, mid-day and afternoon with numerous cars stopping in every available space, residents' parking and double yellow lines. At the moment some cyclists, who cannot get through on the road, cycle on the pavement amongst the pedestrian children and parents, and if the cyclists were coming both ways, this would become even more dangerous. I would like to see the evidence that counters that presented in the 2006 report which otherwise must stand and would be used in any court proceedings?</p> <p>Norwich street and Union road are not suited for two-way traffic: Norwich street because it has many parked cars on both sides of the road, suffers from rat-run traffic from Hills Road to Panton Street, and the road surface, is poor and the road too narrow to allow cycles and cars to pass safely. Union road is unsuitable because at the intersection of Union Road & Panton Street there is a very tight corner, with parked resident's cars close to it, and many cars coming down Panton Street at speeds above 20mph, plus Pemberton Terrace, which does a blind dog-leg sharp left</p>

	<p>turn and immediately right, all of which makes for a dangerous exit of cyclists from union road. Moreover, the narrow and sloping pavements at both ends of Coronation street and Union road mean that people with wheelchairs and pushing prams have to use the road, which will make clashes with cyclists more likely.</p> <p>The residents of north Newtown have been requesting a full traffic review for some years now.</p>
19	<p>As a resident of Norwich Street, I do not consider it suitable for two-way cycling. The street is narrow and there are many parked cars, with parking on both sides for much of the street. There is not much space to pass a cyclist travelling in the same direction as the other traffic and if delivery vehicles use the street, there is hardly any gap between them and the parked cars. It strikes me that it would be highly dangerous to also have cyclists riding in the opposite direction - a hazard for all road users but particularly for the cyclists themselves. Surely, it is more appropriate for them to use the streets that are one way in the direction of their travel.</p>
20	<p>I am writing to you about two-way cycling in Emery Street. At the junction with Mill Road visibility is poor and it would be difficult to mark a contra-flow cycle lane all the way to the junction with Mill Road. My particular concern is that as two-way cycling increases the flow of bikes, the likelihood of collisions between cyclists and motorists as the latter turn left into Emery Street will also increase. Many residents walk with their cycles to Mill Road, this will encourage everyone to cycle against the traffic. The matter is made more urgent by the rising number of children living in the street, who will now be approaching Mill Road on their bikes or child-carriers.</p> <p>To reduce the flow of motorised traffic into Emery Street the faded 'No Entry Except for Access' signs should be replaced and there should be better enforcement.</p>
21	<p>Over the years, I have seen frequent near misses and collisions between cyclists who enter Perowne Street against the one-way system, with no regard for cars and vans driving the correct way.</p> <p>I cannot see how this proposed scheme would help with this problem, which is further exacerbated by the constant flouting of parking regulations by cars, vans and taxis who park on the double yellow lines and up on the pavement in Perowne Street. The parking problem should be addressed as the first priority.</p>
22	<p>I wish to object to the proposed plan to introduce two way cycling in Sedgwick Street. I consider Sedgwick Street totally inappropriate for two way cycling and I also consider that this would be extremely dangerous too. My reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sedgwick Street is a narrow street • There is no room to for a vehicle and cycle to pass each other and at certain areas the volume of traffic volume is considerable • Parking on both sides of street restricts visibility and access • A large number of delivery lorries come down this street • Two way cycling will be dangerous to pedestrians and also to the cyclists themselves • Many houses have front doors straight onto pavements • There are car pull-offs/parking spaces on front "gardens" of some houses • It is not just local residents who use these streets • Chisholm trail is set to take cycles away from the side streets – why pre-empt this?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two way cycling encourages cars to drive wrong way down street • There is a need to consider other street users – not just cyclists – pedestrians, wheel chair users and baby buggies should have a greater priority over cycles on the pavements. <p>The proposed change to two way cycling is only going to exacerbate existing problems – not solve them. Legalising the two-way cycling will only make the area more unsafe, with a risk to other street users.</p> <p>(Pictures provided in email are available as background papers)</p>
23	<p>I wish to register an objection to the proposal to permit two-way cycling on Thoday Street and the streets around it (Ross St, Hemingford Road etc.).</p> <p>Firstly, this proposal will create dangerous traffic situations. As a daily commuter I regularly cycle on these streets, and thus am aware that, with the addition of parked cars, they are not wide enough to permit safe passage of both a car and a bicycle at the same time.</p> <p>Secondly, allowing for a contraflow is unnecessary as there are parallel streets that cyclists can use.</p> <p>It might be suggested that as some people already cycle the wrong way up one-way streets, making this arrangement formal would at least encourage car drivers to watch out for cyclists. However, this is clearly a flawed argument; the fact that people disobey traffic regulations is not a justification for scrapping the rules themselves.</p>

	Comments in Support - Stakeholders
CamCycle	<p>We strongly Support the proposals and urge that all the proposed streets are implemented quickly. Previous schemes have seen few problems in practice and avoids unnecessarily criminalising both local and more strategic journeys. The original purpose of making these streets one-way was to reduce rat-running by motor vehicles, not to make cycle journeys more difficult. The streets of Romsey in particularly are well overdue for making two-way for cycling.</p> <p>If there are any remaining objections to any streets these should be trialled with a temporary TRO and reviewed within 18mths.</p> <p>We are disappointed that Willis Road and other streets in Newtown are not being done. We are keen to work with residents to see wider traffic reduction measures that would allay their concerns but are strongly of the view that two-way cycling would be acceptably safe to change more immediately. We are particularly disappointed at the failure to include Panton Street which avoids the major collision black spot of the twin roundabouts on Trumpington Street and enable a more pleasant and safe way for those cycling to the many schools in the area.</p>
	Comments in support - Residents
1	<p>I am in favour of the proposed two-way cycling in all the proposed one way streets mentioned on your website. The Council's default position on all one-way streets should be to allow two-way cycling unless it is not physically possible as in the Netherlands.</p>

2	I am in full support of all of the proposals. They will assist people accessing their homes and local shops by the most natural and safest routes. I encourage you to implement these changes as soon as possible.
3	Following the various work you have done, I fully support the proposal to make one way streets (and otherwise restricted streets) be available for lawful two way cycling.
4	I strongly support the proposals to allow two-way cycling in one way streets on all 15 proposed streets. I hope that these changes are implemented quickly.
5	I support the proposal to allow two-way cycling on more restricted streets. I use several of the proposed streets regularly, especially the ones in Romsey near where I live, and I have been using the existing two way cycling in Ross Street for some time with no problems. Where the opening up is not for the whole street the change should be clearly indicated in both directions please, unlike the present Ross Street.
6	I fully support the proposals for the streets you list to allow cycles both ways. This can only improve permeability for cyclist and allow them to take quieter routes so that there are less conflicts with pedestrian and motor vehicles.
7	I write to add my support for conversion of one way streets to allow two way cycling. Cycling facing the oncoming traffic is far more friendly than being tailgated by motor traffic in any of the streets in the consultation. Evidence shows that there is no safety concern in practice.
8	I fully support this as a cyclist myself as feel much safer when cycling towards on coming traffic. I find cycling in one way streets with cars behind me very intimidating at times.
9	<p>As a commuter by bike to Newtown, and a regular cyclist around Mill Road, I strongly support these measures - the other roads where two way cycling has been permitted does not appear to have caused significant issues, and opening up these new roads for two way cycling makes many more journeys sensible by bike. New Town in particular has a network of roads that are one-way making it difficult for many cyclists to lawfully cross the area using quieter back streets.</p> <p>Opening up more opportunities to cycle through the area will encourage cycling and sustainable transport, for example to schools in the area, and therefore should reduce the need for people to drive.</p> <p>I would you urge you to approve two-way cycling on all the proposed streets, and consider introducing it in streets not currently included, such as Willis Road and Panton Street,</p>
10	I am a regular visitor, by foot and cycle, of properties in the Romsey area. I support two-way cycling in all the streets under consultation. Over the years we have had plenty of evidence that two-way cycling in one-way streets is not a significant source of danger, and potentially enables people to cycle routes away from more dangerous roads. Given so many streets in Cambridge are already two-way for cycling, it would remove ambiguity to have a consistent approach allowing it, and provide convenience for residents and visitors to the streets.

11	This is a really good idea and I hope it goes through.
12	As someone who cycles in Cambridge on a daily basis I fully support the initiative to introduce two-way cycling on 15 new one-way streets, providing the change is clearly sign posted. It would be even better if cycle lanes were clearly marked on those streets.
13	I would like to wholeheartedly endorse the Transport project "Two-way cycling in one way streets". A consistent implementation of this system across Cambridge removes ambiguity/confusion for cyclists and drivers alike.
14	<p>I generally support these proposals, particularly New Square which I might use more often as it's close to my home. I do cycle in North Romsey from time to time and cannot see the logic of Cavendish Road being wholly two-way while others like Sedgwick Street and Catharine Street which are no narrower and just as clogged with parked cars don't even allow two-way cycling.</p> <p>My only question about the south side of New Square is why it is still one-way at all. . It has hardly any traffic since first the east side of New Square was closed as a through route and Emmanuel Road was closed to most through traffic decades ago. The restriction was introduced when there were parking bays all the way along one side too. The road serves minimal network purpose. A goodly number of intrusive signs could be removed if the entire restriction went, too. I think some are lit.</p>
15	Please be sure to make it clear via road markings & signage that two way cycling is allowed. Many times I have experienced drivers performing what is known as a "punishment pass" - i.e driving at me and squeezing past because they believe I'm in the wrong for cycling in the opposite direction.
16	<p>I'm writing to support the current initiative to make most of Cambridge's one way streets two way for cycling.</p> <p>In view of previous experience, it seems very unlikely that this would cause problems and it is a major improvement for cyclists. It is long overdue.</p> <p>I would like to ask that the entry points have a line on the road, and red surfacing for a short distance, just to discourage right turning drivers from blocking cyclists' way in, as you have done in some other places (Kingston Street for example)</p>
17	<p>I'm writing to support the current initiative to make most of Cambridge's one way streets two way for cycling.</p> <p>In view of previous experience, it seems very unlikely that this would cause problems and it is a major improvement for cyclists. It is long overdue.</p> <p>I would like to ask that the entry points have a line on the road, and red surfacing for a short distance, just to discourage right turning drivers from blocking cyclists' way in, as you have done in some other places (Kingston Street for example)</p>
18	I am writing to express my support for the proposal to allow two way cycling along Hemingford Road and the other roads off Mill Road. As a resident of Hemingford Road I believe the proposals are an effective way of enabling transport around the city by bike. The low volume of traffic on these roads makes them suitable for two way traffic.

	<p>I would also urge that consideration be given to reducing the extent of parking on one side of the road to increase the space for all road users and consideration be given to placing additional bike parking in some of the parking spaces.</p>
19	<p>Can I please add my voice to supporting this sensible move, which hopefully will encourage more people to choose to use bicycles rather than cars by shortening and making easier many journeys.</p> <p>These streets historically were all two-way, and were made one-way, either to allow car parking (a result of car parking?) or to prevent rat running. Ironically, on a narrow street, it is far safer for a cyclist to pass an oncoming car than to be overtaken by a car travelling in the same direction, as you can see where their wing mirrors are before they hit your handlebars!</p> <p>It is ridiculous that residents are either criminalised or have to travel three times as far to reach their houses owing to this silly historic regulation, made in the car-orientated 1970s or 80s. It also makes areas such as Romsey and New Town very hard to navigate for those who are not very local to the area, even if they regularly commute by bicycle around other areas of the City. I find it madness that if I take a route from Coldhams Common to Hills Road, I need to go an entirely different route in each direction. I should not find it preferable to cycle on main roads rather than these quiet traffic calmed back roads.</p> <p>It is sad that there are still some roads that appear to be left off the list.</p>
20	<p>I support the introduction of two-way cycling on one way streets in Cambridge, as proposed. This is already done for example on Kingston Street without problems.</p>
21	<p>Simply to say fantastic! Please keep it up.</p>
22	<p>I am currently a resident of Hemingford Road, one of the roads included in the proposal. Cycling is my primary method of transport, and I fully support the extension of two-way cycling to our street. There is significant cycle traffic on the road, and a dedicated space for cyclists would make the road much safer, particularly at the junction with Mill Road.</p> <p>Both my partner and I cycle regularly, and would request that consideration also be given to providing on-street cycle parking on the road.</p>
23	<p>I'm writing to support your initiative to make more of Cambridge's one-way streets two-way for cycling.</p> <p>I am a resident of Romsey Town and my experience of the opening up of one-way streets to two-way cycling that has already occurred is very positive. I've seen no increase in cyclist-motorist conflict as a result, indeed it seems that now that cyclists are "allowed" to cycle against the flow of motor traffic, motorists are MORE tolerant and careful about cyclists. Making the remaining streets two-way for cycling will improve things further as there will be no question of "is it permitted here or not" and cycling traffic will be more evenly distributed around the streets.</p> <p>I do wish to express my disappointment that neither the eastern part of Coronation Street nor the northern part of Panton Street (as far as Union Road) have been included. Opening these streets to contra-flow cycling would greatly assist cyclists to avoid the notorious "Catholic Church" junction which is a hostile and dangerous place as it currently exists.</p>

24	<p>I strongly support the proposed opening up of the listed streets to two way cycling. This will improve the city's cycling network and encourage more cycling use.</p> <p>I am very disappointed that Panton Street is still not being opened up to two-way cycling as it is important link of a safe cycling route from tennis court road to bateman street and the new cycle lanes on trumpington road. Currently there is no suitable cycling route for young children from the tennis court road area to the trumpington road area as the only route is through the double mini roundabout at the junction of the Fen Causeway & Trumpington Road and this is clearly not a safe place for cycling.</p>
25	<p>I'm writing to support the proposals for more streets to be made two-way for cycling. I would urge you to consider further changes where this can be done safely, in particular on Panton St.</p>
26	<p>I strongly welcome the proposal to open the given list of streets to two-way cycling. It is long overdue. Thank you for getting this done.</p> <p>I would also _strongly_ urge that we make progress on Panton St too. I use it regularly and it is _very_ frustrating that it remains one-way even when all the others are done. There is no good justification for this anomaly. Currently I have to zig-about down Brookside, Pemberton terrace and then go in the opposite direction to my desired travel and use Union lane, when I really want to down to Norwich or Bateman St.</p> <p>Similarly Willis St should be on the list.</p>