

TWO WAY CYCLING IN ONE-WAY STREETS

To: Cambridge Joint Area Committee

Meeting Date: 24th October 2017

From: Executive Director: Economy, Transport & Environment

Electoral divisions: Market, Petersfield, Romsey and Trumpington

Forward Plan ref: *Key decision:* No

Purpose: To determine objections to two-way cycling on restricted streets as set out below.

Recommendation: a) Implement works in order to allow two-way cycling on the streets listed below, as advertised.

- 1) Guest Road
- 2) Collier Road
- 3) Emery Street/Road
- 4) Perowne Street
- 5) Sedgwick Street
- 6) Catharine Street
- 7) Thoday Street
- 8) Ross Street (from St Philip's Road to Mill Road)
- 9) Hemingford Road
- 10) Argyle Street
- 11) Coronation Street (west of junction with Panton Street)
- 12) Norwich Street
- 13) Union Road
- 14) New Square

b) Agree not to progress any changes to Brookside

c) Inform the objectors accordingly

| <i>Officer contact:</i> | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name: | Clare Rankin |
| Post: | Senior Project Officer |
| Email: | Clare.rankin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk |
| Tel: | 01223 699601 |

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Allowing cyclists to be exempt from no-entry restrictions, and to travel both ways on one-way streets, is a cost effective and easy way of expanding the city cycle network. With better permeability for cyclists it also encourages residents to cycle, rather than use a car for short, local journeys, in accordance with the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy.
- 1.2 Many restricted streets have already been opened up to two-way cycling over the last 10 years following a Department for Transport trial which included Mawson Road. There have been no reported accidents associated with two-way cycling on these streets.
- 1.3 The Department for Transport (DfT) changed the traffic signing regulations so that 'except cycles' plates can be attached to 'no entry' signs which makes it much easier to implement these changes and more easily understood by the public.
- 1.4 This is the last phase of the project to open up restricted streets to two-way cycling, and the proposed streets are the remaining streets on the original 'long list' of streets which are the less strategic and narrower, and/or busier streets. Officers assessed the suitability of each street for two-way cycling taking into consideration road width, traffic speeds and volume of traffic.
- 1.5 Local members were consulted, and feedback fed into the process. Stakeholders and residents on each of the streets in question were then consulted in July 2016, and members of the Cambridgeshire County Council Road Safety Team visited the streets and made comments on the proposals.
- 1.6 At the meeting of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee in January 2017 <https://tinyurl.com/yanw8f2l> it was agreed to proceed with advertising the traffic regulation orders (TROs) for the above streets, including Brookside. The TROs were then advertised on street and in the local paper from 9th August - 2nd September 2017.
- 1.7 The proposed layouts are shown in **Appendix 1**.

2. RESPONSES

- 2.1 There were 22 objections and 28 responses in favour, which are summarized in **Appendix 2**.
- 2.2 There was one objection to all of the roads proposed for two-way cycling on the grounds of increased conflict between cyclists and motorists, delays for cyclists and motorists travelling with-flow, and an increase in conflict between pedestrians and cyclists as more cyclists would use the footway.
- 2.3 There were 25 responses in favour of all of the proposals, including very strong support from Camcycle. These highlighted the improved permeability and convenience for cyclists as well as consistency of approach. Some felt that it was actually safer passing oncoming vehicles rather than being tailgated or overtaken by with-flow traffic and many commented that there had been no issues using existing one-way streets which had already been opened up to two-way cycling. Six of these responses expressed

disappointment that more streets were not included in the proposals.

- 2.4 There were seven objections to all of the proposals within Newtown, including an objection to the proposals for Brookside and Union Street from the North Newtown Residents' Association. There was one objection to all of the Newtown schemes except Norwich Street, which was supported.
- 2.5 As well as the above, there were eight objections to two-way cycling in Brookside including an objection from St Mary's School.
- 2.6 The main objections to Brookside were on grounds of safety for cyclists and pedestrians, particularly school children, based on: the narrowness of the road, number of parked cars, number of schools and nurseries located on Brookside and number of parents dropping off and picking up their children.
- 2.7 There was one objection to Norwich Street, in addition to those for all of the Newtown proposals as set out in paragraph 2.3. The objections were due to: parked cars leaving the space available too narrow for cyclists and cars to pass each other safely, the number of schools and traffic in the area, and the availability of a nearby alternative route (Union Road), the poor surfacing of the road, the junctions with Panton Street and Hills Road, and the volume of traffic.
- 2.8 The proposals in Coronation Street attracted one additional objection but this was for the section east of the Panton Street junction which is not being pursued.
- 2.9 Of the 28 responses in support of the proposals, six, including the response from Camcycle, expressed disappointment that Panton Street was not being progressed as it would provide a route to school and an alternative route south, avoiding the double mini-roundabouts on Trumpington Road, which has the highest accident rate for cyclists in Cambridge.
- 2.10 There was one objection to Emery Road on the grounds that it would lead to collisions between exiting cyclists and motorists turning in from Mill Road. The respondent felt the situation would be improved if the faded no entry except for access signs were replaced.
- 2.11 There was one objection to Perowne Street. The respondent had already witnessed a number of near misses and collisions between motorists and cyclists travelling the wrong way, and felt that improving the parking situation should be the priority.
- 2.12 For Romsey generally there was one additional response in support and one objection. The objection was for reasons of safety due to the narrow widths available and likelihood of collisions as a result. The respondent felt that there were adequate alternative routes available and so the proposals were unnecessary. The comments in support included the point that the space available for roads such as Sedgwick Street and Catharine Street was no narrower than Cavendish Street which was wholly two-way.
- 2.13 There was an additional response in favour and one objection to Sedgwick Street.
- 2.14 There was one additional response in support of Hemingford Road.

3. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 Allowing two way cycling in one way streets has proved to be a safe, low cost intervention to encourage cycling and add to the network of routes that can be used in the city, giving cyclists an advantage over motorists in terms of journey times, and thus making cycling an attractive option.
- 3.2 Objectors concerns about the narrowness of the proposed streets are mirrored by the Safety Audit report, and officers concede, as stated in 1.4 above, that the streets in question are narrow and relatively unstrategic in terms of the wider cycling network.
- 3.3 However, with the exception of Brookside, it is felt that the levels of risk are low and that the proposed signs and lines will alert drivers to expect contra-flow cycling, and so make it safer for the local residents who are often cycling to access their homes and who, in most of the proposed streets, do not have other options due to narrow footways and parked cars.
- 3.4 Whilst there are reported problems of congestion and unsafe conditions in the Newtown area during peak hours, particularly at school drop off times, there have been only three slight accidents involving cyclists in the last five years. These were between cyclists and motorists and none of the accidents were located on the streets under consideration.
- 3.5 A large number of objections related to the proposals for Brookside and it is recommended not to proceed with works to allow two-way cycling on this street. As stated by objectors Brookside has a number of independent schools, nurseries and colleges and in the morning peak hours it is extremely busy with parked cars and queuing traffic. Available carriageway space is very narrow and there is no footway on the west side so it would be very difficult for cyclists to travel in a contra-flow direction during this time.

4. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

4.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

Encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport helps people to get around Cambridge more effectively and efficiently, and so supports the development of the local economy.

4.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

Making streets more permeable for cycling makes cycling a more attractive mode of transport. Regular cycling has been shown to have significant health benefits and also gives more independence to those who do not have access to a car.

4.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications within this category.

5. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Resource Implications

The works will be funded from the Department for Transport Cycle City Ambition Grant and S106 developer contributions.

5.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

Traffic regulation orders have been advertised for each scheme following consultation.

5.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

The Traffic Regulation Orders were advertised following the statutory process and there was consultation with local residents, stakeholders and local members.

5.5 Public Health Implications

More people cycling and walking undoubtedly contributes to improved public health. Cycling is a physical activity that can prevent ill health and improve health. It is important that people are supported and encouraged to be physically active and any efforts should focus upon interventions that mitigate any barriers like perceived safety risks.

The Transport and Health Joint Strategic Needs Assessment makes reference to encouraging short trips of less than 2km within the city to be undertaken on foot or by cycle. The proposals support and encourage this.

| Source Documents | Location |
|---|---|
| Scheme plans Objections and responses in support of the advertised TRO Road Safety Audit comments Papers for CJAC January 2017 Photographs sent by a resident | Room 310 Shire Hall 3 rd Floor. |

| Implications | Officer Clearance |
|---|---|
| | |
| Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? | Yes Name of Financial Officer: D Parcell |
| | |
| Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law? | Yes Name of Legal Officer: F McMillan |
| | |
| Are there any Equality and Diversity implications? | No Name of Officer: T Oviatt-Ham |
| | |
| Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications? | Yes Name of Officer: S Silk |
| | |
| Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues? | No Name of Officer: T Oviatt-Ham |
| | |
| Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health | Yes Name of Officer: T Campbell |