

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

**LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LCWIP)**  
**CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

**Decision of:** **Councillor Katie Thornburrow**, Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

**Reference:** 21/URGENCY/P&T/11

**Date of decision:** 2.8.21 **Recorded on:** 5.8.21

**Decision Type:** Non Key

**Matter for Decision:**

**Purpose**

To agree the response to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Consultation currently being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council. It is proposed to be a joint response with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

The consultation material is available online:

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021>

The deadline for comments is 27 July 2021.

**Background**

The Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) forms part of the Government's aim to increase walking and cycling, particularly to school, in the UK by 2025, as outlined in the first Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (2017).

The Department for Transport advised that local authorities who have plans will be well placed to make the case for future investment.

LCWIPs are a new approach to identifying cycling and walking improvements required at the local level. They should enable a long-term approach to developing local cycling and walking networks, ideally over a 10 year period and should:

- identify cycling and walking infrastructure improvements for future investment in the short, medium and long term
- ensure that consideration is given to cycling and walking within both local planning and transport policies and strategies
- make the case for future funding for walking and cycling infrastructure

The aim is to build on the already high levels of cycling in Cambridge and to spread the cycling culture out to the rest of the County whilst encouraging more walking by improving journeys in town centres and to schools and employment areas. Walking and cycling routes to transport hubs are particularly important and feature strongly in the routes proposed for improvement.

### Cycling

All of the trips from the 2011 Census Data were mapped, establishing the cycling distance for each trip.

These were analysed using a propensity to cycle tool, which established that peak distance for cycling is 2km, majority between 1km and 5km.

The modelling factored in future growth and planned developments.

The number of additional people cycling was divided by the distance of any proposed scheme to calculate the value of each proposed scheme (for comparative purposes).

The report provides a list of most highly scoring links - translated into routes. Additional routes were added to fill gaps identified from planning and transport strategies. (This includes Active Travel trial schemes in response to Covid-19).

Appendix 1 shows the mapped routes for each district – the existing network as well as planned and funded schemes.

The design of routes will refer to current guidance and acknowledge constraints of land, landscape, heritage, drainage and local priorities – with an ambition to exceed standards where possible particularly where forecast to be high levels of usage. In urban areas, where space is more constrained, there may be a focus on reducing traffic and speeds.

Appendix 2 outlines the prioritisation matrix. In Cambridge the top three schemes include Hills Road/Regent Street: Purbeck Road – St Andrews Street, Newmarket Road/Barnwell Road – Hills Road / Fendon Road orbital corridor, and Jesus Lane – Emmanuel Street.

### Walking

Identified schemes from County Council's Transport Investment Plan (TIP). Many routes overlap with cycleways.

Appendix 4 includes maps of proposed priority walking routes and core zones – for Cambridge and Cambourne

The focus is on making routes safer, more pleasant and attractive. The rural area takes into account Rights of Way improvement Plan (2016).

Appendix 5 includes an audit of routes by Sustrans.

Appendix 6 outlines walking prioritisation matrices.

**Main Issues:**

The LCWIP builds on the Local Transport Plan 2020 – a strategy of investing in world-class walking and cycling facilities, which will create sustainable travel opportunities, reduce traffic flows and improve air quality through encouraging people to walk or cycle rather than drive for shorter journeys. The LCWIP should also help with delivering the outcome of the GCP Citizen’s’ Assembly on Transport, which included encouraging cycling and walking.

The LCWIP is a tool for securing funding from Government for cycling and walking improvements. Although, given the already high levels of cycling within Greater Cambridge and the Government’s scoring methodology it is uncertain how successful Cambridgeshire would be.

The LCWIP acknowledges Cambridge City Council’s Making Spaces for People work. The modelling factored in future population growth in committed planned developments, and the LCWIP acknowledges significant trip generators outside central area such as the Biomedical Campus, West Cambridge and Science Park. It shows routes to secondary schools and colleges outside city centre and trip generators include neighbourhood centres (e.g. Chesterton and Cherry Hinton High Streets).

The report provides a list of most highly scoring links - translated into routes. Additional routes were added to fill gaps identified from planning and transport strategies. In Cambridge the top three schemes include Hills Road/Regent Street: Purbeck Road – St Andrews Street, Newmarket Road/Barnwell Road – Hills Road / Fendon Road orbital corridor, and Jesus Lane – Emmanuel Street.

Due to the methodology used, which relies on Census 2011 data and the propensity to cycle (using 2km as a benchmark), the report outcomes are Cambridge-centric and fail to consider the greater range provided by electric cycles. This does not reflect local strategies and aspirations which seek to improve the village to village connectivity in the rural area and first and last mile trips to travel hubs including local bus stops and/or connectivity into planned routes such as GCP Greenways.

It is anticipated the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority will undertake a refresh of the Local Transport Plan later in the year, which will provide the Council an opportunity to comment on the future transport strategy.

**Proposed response points:**

That the Council support the principle and purpose of the LCWIP, intended as it is to improve cycling and walking across the County over the next 10 years.

Urge the County to give careful attention to the many detailed

comments being made on the draft LCWIP by the public, cycling and walking organisations, parish councils, residents' associations and developers.

That the LCWIP should state as a matter of principle that it will have careful regard to, and seek to enable the implementation of, development proposals included in adopted plans (including Local Plans, Area Action Plans and Neighbourhood Plans).

The Councils urge the County Council to engage the public, cycling and walking organisations, parish councils, residents' associations and developers through the route options and detailed design process.

The Councils support that the design of new cycle routes will have regard to current guidance, especially the Department for Transport's LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design (DfT) and 'Gear Change' document (2020) as well as considering the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design and LTN 1/12 Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists.

The Council has some points of clarification and comments on the detail contained within the LCWIP for example to ensure consistency with the Councils adopted and emerging plans and strategies.

**Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):**

The Consultation raises important issues that the Council wishes to respond to.

**The Executive Councillor's decision(s):**

To approve the proposed Consultation response to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Delegate authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to make further technical comments in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

**Reasons for the decision:**

**Scrutiny consideration:**

**Report:**

**Conflicts of interest:**

None known.

**Comments:**

A parallel decision is being considered by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Further information

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Proposed joint response by South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council Councils to Cambridgeshire County Council on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

## **Background Papers**

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan:

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/7736/widgets/27624/documents/12521>

Appendix 1 – Cycle links

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6352>

Appendix 2 – Cycling Prioritisation Matrices

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6353>

Appendix 3 – Prioritised Cycle Route Maps

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6354>

Appendix 4 – Walking Maps

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6356>

Appendix 5 – Walking Route Audit Tool

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6357>

Appendix 6 – Walking Prioritisation Matrices

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021#folder-27624-6358>

## **Appendix A: Proposed joint response by South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council Councils to Cambridgeshire County Council on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)**

The Councils support the principle and purpose of the LCWIP, intended as it is to improve cycling and walking across the County over the next 10 years.

The Councils urge the County Council to give careful attention to the many detailed comments being made on the draft LCWIP by the public, cycling and walking organisations, parish councils, residents' associations and developers.

The LCWIP should state as a matter of principle that it will have careful regard to, and seek to enable the implementation of, development proposals included in adopted plans (including Local Plans, Area Action Plans and Neighbourhood Plans).

The Councils urge the County Council to engage the public, cycling and walking organisations, parish councils, residents' associations and developers through the route options and detailed design process.

The Councils support that the design of new cycle routes will have regard to current guidance, especially the Department for Transport's LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design (DfT) and 'Gear Change' document (2020) as well as considering the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design and LTN 1/12 Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists.

The Councils have the following comments on the detail contained in the LCWIP, ordered by section of the document:

### **Main Report**

The Councils are concerned that the methodology used in the LCWIP, which relies on outdated Census 2011 data and propensity to cycle using 2km as a benchmark, has resulted in a Cambridge centric focus. This fails to consider the greater take up of cycling and use of electric cycles which increase the distances people cycle. The outcomes do not reflect local strategies and aspirations which seek to improve the village to village connectivity in the rural area and first and last mile trips, including to travel hubs and local bus stops and/or connectivity into planned routes such as GCP Greenways.

Minor point of clarification (pg7) - "Traffic congestion is already a problem and a significant increase in the level of walking and cycling is needed to mitigate this growth and meet the target of a reduction in traffic levels of 10-15% (based on 2011 figures) in the Greater Cambridge area." The report should clarify where the 10-15% target has come from.

Typo on page 14 - "In order to future proof our analysis we also factored in future growth (as set out in fig. 1)..." – should refer to Fig 3.

Figure 15 Making Spaces for People Area – remove references to SPD from the labels in the key as follows:

- 'SPD Area Boundary' should refer to 'Making Space for People Project Area Boundary'
- 'SPD Site Area Boundary' should refer to 'Making Space for People Site Area Boundary'

### **Appendix 1 - Cambridge Cycle routes map**

- Greenway - shows routes into North East Cambridge (NEC) via Jane Coston Bridge and Milton junction but not into the north east corner of NEC as being considered through the NEC AAP – this route has been under discussion with GCP for delivery in the longer term.

### **Appendix 1 - South Cambridgeshire cycle routes north map**

- Appears to be a missing a short link from Longstanton to the funded route to Bar Hill
- Does the LCWIP route from Bar Hill link to A14 route? – does not appear to on this map, but a link is shown on west map.
- Amend label for Land Beach to read 'Landbeach'

### **Appendix 1 - South Cambridgeshire cycle routes west map**

- One of the LCWIP route options is shown to cross the site of Bourn Airfield New Village. The Council should be consulted on any detailed alignment.

### **Appendix 4 - Cambridge walking map**

- The routes shown do not extend out to NW Cambs, or beyond CBC towards Shelford, there is limited provision to serve area near Newmarket Rd/North of Cherry Hinton etc. These include areas with new and/or permitted development. There appears to be an anomaly considering the report outlined that planned development has been taken into consideration.