



working for cycling

CycleDigest

Issue no. 69 2012

Papers and politicians tackle cycle safety



On 2nd February, *The Times* launched a major campaign to improve cycle safety. *Cities Fit for Cycling* sets out an eight-point manifesto, including calls to make lorries safer; for the redesign of dangerous junctions; the building of a 'world-class' cycle infrastructure; and making cycle awareness part of the driving test. CTC strongly supports these measures and has helped supply nominations for the 500 road junctions that most need redesigning.

The newspaper kept the momentum going with a series of major articles on various aspects of cycling and road safety, and it also led to Parliamentary endorsement from the Prime Minister, David Cameron, and inspired a 3-hour debate in the House of Commons, secured by Dr Julian Huppert MP (Cambridge).

In November, Times reporter Mary Bowers was seriously injured in a collision with a lorry outside the paper's offices in London. For more and to pledge support, go to www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/public/cyclesafety/contact/

The Parliamentary debate

Opening what proved to be a hugely positive debate on 23rd February, Julian Huppert MP (co-chair of the All Party Parliamentary Group for Cycling (APPCG)), outlined the benefits of cycling, and noted that 75% of all trips in Britain are less than 5 miles, a short distance easily covered by bike. He observed that the cost to society of obesity is around £20bn annually, roughly the same as the whole of the DfT's budget. Describing cycling as "our most effective yet underrated form of transport", he

cited evidence from European best practice that growth in cycle use requires a consistent spend of around £10 per person annually. He commended "the much lamented Cycling England" for its excellent value for money and asked Transport Minister Norman Baker MP, "Can we have it back please?"

Pointing to the prosecution and sentencing of driving offences, Huppert then said that "So many cyclists feel excluded from justice." Following on, APPCG co-chair Ian Austin MP drew attention to the trivial sentences handed down to the drivers who killed Solihull Cycling Club member Cath Ward and former British Cycling employee Rob Jefferies, likewise the driver of the lorry that killed Eilidh Cairns, who was fined £200 for having uncorrected defective eyesight but not prosecuted for any other driving offence.

MPs from all three main parties queued up to echo calls for more 20mph speed limits, for better cycling provision, for junctions to be redesigned to improve cyclists' safety, for action to reduce the risks posed by lorries, and for cycle awareness to be incorporated into the driving test – all of these being measures called for in *The Times's* manifesto. There was cross-party commendation for the paper's campaign, and for the commitment shown by its editor James Harding, and journalists there such as Kaya Burgess, who played a key role in galvanising it.

Several MPs called for more joined-up working between different Government departments, e.g. those responsible for transport, health, education, planning, traffic law and enforcement. There were also calls for action to

make it easier to combine cycling and rail travel. Encouragingly, many of those who spoke noted that cycling is not particularly dangerous and shouldn't be portrayed as such. While there were inevitably a few passing references to cyclists' behaviour, there was a clear consensus that they shouldn't be stereotyped and are not always at fault. Moreover, the debate was mercifully free of calls for cyclists to be taxed, insured, treated like a criminal underclass or made to wear helmets.

At the end of the debate, Transport Minister Norman Baker announced that, in addition to the recent grants of £8m to Sustrans and £7m to the Cycle Rail Working Group, Network Rail has committed an additional £7m for cycle improvements at stations.

Altogether, 77 MPs attended – a huge turn-out for a Westminster Hall debate. Given this, and the impressive show of cross-party parliamentary support, CTC is urging Transport Secretary Justine Greening to seize the moment and initiate a properly resourced, cross-departmental action plan to create safe conditions for cycling and to encourage more people to enjoy its benefits.

For more see www.ctc.org.uk/cyclesafe



Segregation for cyclists?

In the last *CycleDigest*, we asked readers for their views on segregating cyclists from other traffic – the preliminary results are in! Turn to centre pages.

IN THIS ISSUE...

CTC gives evidence in Parliament at Road Safety Inquiry.....	Page 2
Cambridge Guided Busway – is this the UK's best new route?	Page 6
Off-road news: Paths for Communities; National Trails; Defence Estates.....	Page 7
Diary dates and new publications.....	Page 8



CTC stands up for cycling at parliamentary inquiry on road safety



Giving oral evidence to the Transport Committee's Inquiry into Road Safety in January, CTC Campaigns and Policy Director Roger Geffen stressed the need to close the gap between the safety of cyclists and other road users.

He said: *"While the Government is proud of its good overall record on road safety, Britain is a relatively poor performer on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and children. Cycle safety improved significantly over the*

past decade – cycle casualties dropped by 17% while cycle use grew by 20%, hence the risk per mile cycled has dropped by 31%. Yet this improvement is less than for other road user groups, so the gap between them and cyclists has been widening.

"CTC is pleased that the Government's latest road safety framework intends to use a 'rate-based' measure of cycle safety. This means that if cycle casualties do go up, it's less likely to trigger alarmist headlines - it will be equally clear when cycle use is increasing more steeply than the number of injuries. More and safer cycling can and should go hand in hand, as CTC's Safety in Numbers report demonstrated. However, if the Government is to meet its stated aim to increase cycle use, it has to address both actual and perceived cycle safety."

Ministerial statements and the longer lorries trial...

Roger Geffen also alerted the Committee to what he believes are two questionable statements made by Road Safety Minister Mike Penning MP ahead of his decision to permit a trial of longer lorries on UK roads.

Answering oral questions in Parliament on 15/9/2011, Mr Penning said: *"Because the turning wheels of longer semi-trailers are at the back, their turning circles are much tighter than those of existing lorries. I know that because I used to drive heavy goods vehicles myself."* Shortly

afterwards he added: *"We considered carefully whether longer semi-trailers posed a risk to cyclists in particular, and the risk is not there."*

CTC subsequently wrote to him asking for evidence for these statements, or a correction to the *Hansard* record if they could not be substantiated. Regarding turning circles, the Minister wrote, *"The comment that I made, about the benefits of steering axles, reflected my own experience when I had the opportunity to see a prototype of a longer semi-trailer a little while ago."* His letter provided no evidence of any specific consideration for cyclists' safety. However, in answer to a later Parliamentary Question (PQ) about whether the Department for Transport (DfT) had assessed the trial's safety implications for cyclists, the Minister simply replied that *"The revised Impact Assessment published with the Government's Report on the Consultation into longer semi-trailers does not disaggregate the safety risk between different categories of road user."* (22/11/2011). There has been no correction to the *Hansard* record.

When Mr Penning addressed the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group (APPCG) a week after the Inquiry session at which CTC gave evidence, Martin Gibbs, British Cycling's Policy and Legal Affairs Director, asked him whether the DfT had assessed the impact of longer lorries on cyclists' safety. The Minister initially insisted that they had, and also reasserted his claim that longer lorries have "much better" turning circles. When Roger Geffen queried this, however, he conceded he could not be sure whether the impact statement had considered cyclists' safety.

... and ministerial statements on cycling & trunk roads

Before the Minister addressed the APPCG, its chair Julian Huppert MP asked a PQ (12/1/2012) about Government action to improve cycling infrastructure. In answer, Mr Penning expressed the hope that there were no cyclists on the roads for which he is responsible. CTC subsequently pointed out that his responsibilities don't just cover motorways, but trunk roads too, which cyclists can and do use. Indeed, the risk of a cycling injury on a non-built-up A-road is 28 times higher than on a minor urban road, a discrepancy that is far higher than for other road users. The Highways Agency (which looks after most major roads) is also responsible for enabling cyclists and other non-motorised road users to cross these roads both at and between junctions.

Mr Penning opened the APPCG meeting by apologising for the answer he had given to Dr Huppert's question. He claimed he had been confused because the question had come up in the context of a discussion about motorways. In fact the previous exchanges had been almost entirely about A-roads.

Nevertheless, Penning did insist that his department sought to encourage the safe use of trunk roads by cyclists.



From the Editor...

Media coverage of cycling isn't always especially gracious, to say the least. Even a positive story can descend only too rapidly and predictably into pavement-centric diatribes and calls to end cyclists' exemption from an imaginary road tax. But *The Times's* serious and enlightened 'Cities Fit for Cycling' campaign is a big, new lead. Let's hope it inspires cycle-unfriendly journalists to think much longer and harder about their treatment of cycling and, indeed, give those readers who've also fallen into an anti-cycling rut a helping hand out of it. Most of all, the campaign's immediate political impact deserves a concerted follow-up - while it's given pro-cycling MPs a platform and made others sit up, what we need now is an action plan to improve cycling conditions. That, and a better press, will go down very well indeed.

Cherry Allan - cherry.allan@ctc.org.uk

News in brief

E-bikes mustn't morph into mopeds, says CTC

The Government's long-awaited response to a consultation on electric bikes recommends yet more waiting until proposals from European motorcycle organisations have been considered at EU level. Their idea is to scrap the power restrictions on the motors used in e-bikes, which would permit much more dangerous vehicles into areas where cycling is permitted and reduce the public health benefits of a shift to e-bikes. CTC has lobbied both the UK Government and relevant Parliamentary Committee, stressing that e-bikes must retain the low-speed, low-power characteristics that make them comparable to bicycles – and not mopeds in disguise. www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/dft-2010-02/

Nothing to lose but some regulatory chains

As part of its fight against 'red tape', the Government has found itself in agreement with CTC on several points. Amongst other things, they will:

- Change the *Pedal Bicycles (Safety) Regulations*, by withdrawing the requirement to sell bicycles with bells;
- Revise the *Cycle Racing on the Highways Regulations*, in consultation with British Cycling and the police;
- Simplify the bureaucratic *Cycle Tracks Regulations* so that it's easier for local authorities to turn suitable footpaths into cycle tracks.

www.ctc.org.uk/redtapechallenge

Potholes progress

A progress report on the Government's *Potholes Review* recommends further work on, for example, improved guidance to local authorities on prioritising key roads, adopting a whole-life approach to road maintenance and using the right technology and materials. CTC is pleased that *the review* has acknowledged cyclists' needs, but fears that the measures could ignore the more subtle surface defects that put them in danger. The final report is due later this year. www.dft.gov.uk/publications/potholes-review-progress-report

Right on red?

The new *National Bicycle Plan* for France proposes to allow cyclists to turn right at red lights, an arrangement common in Germany and at certain junctions in the Netherlands. In Great Britain, the Government's recent *Signing the Way* policy framework promised to provide sufficient regulatory flexibility to allow local authorities to trial and assess pre-signals for cyclists and cycle bypasses to signalised junctions within the carriageway.

www.ecf.com/news/frances-national-bicycle-plan-lacklustre-or-ambitious/

www.dft.gov.uk/publications/signing-the-way/

Rail welcome for cycle commuters

First Great Western has teamed up at Oxford station with two local companies, Walton Street Cycles and Bainton Bikes, to offer a full suite of cycle facilities to commuters and visitors, including repairs and hire.

New CEO for CTC

After 14 years as CTC's Chief Executive, Kevin Mayne is leaving to become ECF's Director of Development. He said: "I have a really exciting opportunity to take my experience at CTC and use it to help cycling



Gordon Seabright



Kevin Mayne

organisations all over Europe grow their influence." CTC's incoming CEO is Gordon Seabright, who has worked for a number of high profile charities and membership organisations, including The Royal Horticultural Society (Acting Director General) and English Heritage (Commercial Director), where he was also in charge of Stonehenge. He said: "CTC has an enormously important role to play as the champion for cycling and cyclists, and I feel very honoured to be joining the team."

Road safety news from London

- **Love London, Go Dutch, says LCC:** With the Mayoral elections coming up this May, London Cycling Campaign's (LCC) Love London, Go Dutch petition calls on candidates to commit to more people-friendly streets and continental-standard cycle facilities. To sign up, see www.lcc.org.uk/go-dutch.
- **A City of 20:** Sustrans and Living Streets have also launched a Mayoral election campaign calling on candidates to implement 20 mph on sections of the main road network in London. www.sustrans.org.uk/resources/in-the-news/a-city-of-20
- **Bow roundabout:** Following the deaths of two cyclists in quick succession at Bow roundabout in East London, Transport for London is undertaking a review of major junctions and brought forward proposals to improve the spot where one of the cyclists was killed. Proposals include a 'super advanced stop line' that may be deep enough to give cyclists time to get past the most dangerous point by the time motor vehicles catch up with them. 2011 was one of the worst years for cyclist fatalities in the capital in recent times – the provisional total is 16, around half killed in crashes involving lorries. However, London's cycling levels are continuing to rise, with a 27% year on year increase in the last quarter of 2010/2011 (partly attributable to good weather).

Better deal for cycling in Scotland

Scottish Transport Minister Keith Brown has announced an additional £13m cash injection for active travel in Scotland over the next three years. Originally, severe cuts threatened to undermine progress on active travel, but the final version of the budget has been welcomed by campaigners, especially Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign, who have battled throughout for a better deal for cycling. Most of the £13m, plus funding from other budget headings, will go to Sustrans for their work with councils and other partners across Scotland. Notwithstanding, road construction projects will be given an additional £72m.

www.transportscotland.gov.uk/news/Sustainable-transport-funding/
www.spokes.org.uk

CyclingExpertise-News: comprehensive online information, in English, about cycling policy in Germany, plus good practice and research from elsewhere. www.nationaler-radverkehrsplan.de/en/transferstelle/

European split: what proportion of trips is made by cycle in Vilnius, or Toulouse, or Florence – or almost any city in Europe? Find out at: www.epomm.eu/tems/index.phtml?Main_ID=2928

The segregation debate: what you said

In the last *CycleDigest*, we said we would be reviewing CTC's stance on the debate around segregated cycle facilities, and invited comments on some early thoughts. Thank you for the fantastic response. Roger Geffen, CTC's Campaigns and Policy Director, now reports on the feedback...

A wide spectrum of opinion

Well, your responses certainly covered the full range of opinions! Some of you were very much in favour of high-quality segregated facilities, even including some hardened urban cyclists who are perfectly happy 'mixing it' on busy roads. Others were much more sceptical. Comments included concerns that UK laws didn't support segregated facilities because they don't give cyclists priority at junctions; that they would encourage illegal cycling on pavements more generally; that they would continue to be designed to the very poor standard typical of the UK; and worse still, that promoting segregation could simply lead to cyclists being banned from the roads and forced to use these substandard 'facilities' that don't facilitate cycling at all, being designed purely to get cyclists 'out of the way'.

Yet even among the segregation-sceptics, few dismissed segregation altogether. There was plenty of support for segregated facilities, at least alongside high-speed inter-urban roads, and in various other situations too. However, several felt that segregation is rarely if ever the right answer in town centres. There were suggestions that 20 mph limits are a preferable solution for encouraging more and safer cycling on urban streets – or possibly just a more cost-effective one. Some also cited cost-effectiveness as an argument for CTC's campaigning to prioritise cycle training and other 'smarter choices' measures above segregation, along with changes to traffic law, planning policies and other means – particularly given that funding for cycling will inevitably be pretty constrained for the foreseeable future.

The common strand

Despite this diversity, one common strand ran through your responses. Whether you supported segregation or were deeply sceptical, you generally recognised that any segregation must be done to a high standard. Segregation-sceptics were generally prepared to agree that could be a good thing IF it is done well – it's just that you were rather more doubtful that this could ever happen in the UK!

The segregation debate tore the cycle lobby apart in 1997, just one year after the Government had adopted its ambitious but ill-fated *National Cycling Strategy*. The result was that the NCS never got funded, with politicians deciding that if cycle campaigners couldn't agree what they wanted, there was no point in giving them anything. With political

support coming behind us again, but with funding still tight, this is a pitfall we definitely want to avoid falling into a second time! *We need to agree on some standards that define what we mean by high-quality segregation, so that we can decide when to support it, when to reject it and when to argue that an on-road solution is bound to be a better answer. Agreement on these standards could prove crucial for maintaining the necessary unity among cycle advocates to secure strong political backing for pro-cycling schemes and programmes to be funded and delivered to a high standard.*



Recent evidence

Three recently published pieces of research potentially influence the debate (for publication details see 'Further reading', p6):

- The first, *Cycling for transport and public health*, reviewed the evidence on how the built environment affects cycle use. The findings suggested a positive association between levels of cycling and the provision of cycle routes and lanes. Conversely, 20 mph schemes did not figure amongst the interventions the authors highlighted.
- The second is a DfT-commissioned review of the evidence on the relationship between *Infrastructure and cyclist safety*. This points in the opposite direction, finding that 20 mph schemes have strong cycle safety benefits. And incidentally, so too are various other measures to reduce traffic speeds, whether through raised tables at minor or side-road junctions, traffic signals at major junctions, or redesigning junctions so that drivers have to make tighter corners. It did also note that countries with high quality cycle networks have very good overall cycle safety – this might be explained by the positive impact of cycle provision on cycle use, and a consequent overall 'safety in numbers' effect. However, it found no evidence of direct safety benefits from cycle facilities, segregated or otherwise – i.e. cycle safety was not improved on roads where facilities were



introduced. Indeed it cited evidence, from Denmark of all places, that cycle facilities may reduce the risks cyclists face between junctions, but increase them AT junctions, which is where c75% of cyclists' collisions occur. And Denmark is a country where drivers are obliged by law to give priority to cyclists (and pedestrians) before turning across their path, even when the driver has a green light. What's more, this rule is well respected in countries like Denmark, not least because it is supported by the legal principle of 'driver liability' (where drivers are assumed to be liable to pay compensation for any injuries suffered by pedestrians or cyclists they hit). By contrast, if you tried introducing Dutch/Danish segregated infrastructure into Britain (i.e. a country without these rules and the driver behaviour that goes with them), the worsening of cyclists' safety at junctions could be even more serious.

- The third, *Transport, Physical Activity and Health*, provides a more general overview of the evidence on the relationship between transport, physical activity and health, including effective ways to increase active travel. It noted the benefits of dedicated

cycle infrastructure as well as many 'smarter choices' measures, such as cycle training and individualised marketing. However, it concluded that the strongest relationship was with traffic restraint. To quote the summary: *"The key relationship is between car use and physical activity. In order to increase levels of physical activity, it is necessary to reduce use of the car."*

Implications for the 'Hierarchy of Provision'

The above evidence strongly supports the *Hierarchy of Provision*, the idea embedded in the Government's cycling policies (at least in theory!) that traffic reduction, speed reduction, redesigning junctions and reallocation of road-space are the most desirable solutions for achieving more and safer cycling. There is also a case for treating segregated facilities that reallocate road-space very differently from simple pavement conversions. In other words, road-side cycle tracks which do NOT involve road-space reallocation (and which therefore also do not contribute to traffic reduction) should remain at the bottom of the Hierarchy – even though shared use cycle tracks may still be the best option for higher speed main roads. Meanwhile, cycle tracks that are wholly separate from roads (e.g. through parks and open spaces, or along canals, rivers and sea-fronts) should be treated as a separate category altogether. Provided they are well designed and maintained, and well linked to the wider road and/or cycle route network, these can sometimes be among the most valuable cycle facilities of all. However, they should still be seen as complementary to the aim of creating a fully cycle-friendly road network, and not a substitute for it.

We also know that there is strong opposition to segregated cycle 'facilities' that merely keep cyclists of the way. This was all too evident from the popularity of the Warrington Cycling Campaign's hilarious *Cycle facility of the month* website, and (more seriously) from the 11,000 cyclists who objected vehemently when the Government suggested adding a rule to the *Highway Code* 5 years ago that cyclists 'should' use cycle facilities where provided – there are clearly some real problems with many of these 'facilities' ostensibly provided for our benefit. Yet even the UK's best (admittedly flawed) segregated cycle networks – i.e. those in Milton Keynes and Stevenage – have come nowhere near achieving continental levels of cycle use. The obvious explanation is that these facilities are forlornly competing with road networks designed for high traffic volumes and speeds – totally contrary to the aims of the Hierarchy. Contrast this with nearby Cambridge: a city with traffic restraint naturally built into it, and some excellent routes away from roads, but virtually no segregation alongside its road network. People there still make 25% of their trips by cycle.

This is not the end of the debate! See how you can get involved in the next steps - turn to page 6.

Your comments...

"It is time the CTC took a lead and supported segregation. Even if it didn't work we wouldn't be any worse off than we are now." (Derek Clark, West Midlands)

"What converted me from an occasional cycle commuter to a regular was the introduction of two stretches of shared use path. In both cases, they are little used by pedestrians." (Shirley Littlefair, E Yorks)

"A significant factor for cyclists in our area is the A and B road links between settlements, many of which are busy and off-putting for cyclists. Well constructed segregated cyclepaths along these routes would, therefore, be a great encouragement for more people to cycle." (Virginia Mason, E Hants)

"As an experienced cycle-tourist I used to be very anti-segregation [...]. As a father with cycling-keen 6-year-old twins, I'm very pro-segregation." (Anthony Cartmell, Worthing)

"The trouble with the 'we won't unless' approach is that it cuts CTC off from meaningful engagement where segregation would be beneficial." (Martyn Sandford, Surrey)

"I have cycled extensively in the Netherlands, and it's like being on another planet in cycling terms [...]. Once you see what a properly planned system delivers, you realise that it is not beyond the wit of man to achieve this..." (David Butler, Stockport)

"It is only from talking to hundreds of non-cyclists, who nevertheless are attracted to the idea of cycling, at the events which we run that I have been convinced of the segregation argument." (Sandy Clark, Wakefield)

"...segregated cycle facilities do not necessarily make you safer [...]. However, good quality segregated cycle facilities do encourage more people to cycle, and this in itself does make cycle safer..." (Simon Geller, Sheffield)

"Tracks are preferred where the built environment allows them to be made properly." (Martin Ayling, Leicestershire)

"I am totally opposed to segregation as a default system [...]. My local campaign group has for many years campaigned for better cycling facilities, which includes some offroad options where suitable, but we wish for better road usage and greater visibility for cyclists. Since our campaign started 6 years ago we estimate cycling around Leighton Buzzard has increased by close to 300%, with no increase in accidents." (Barry Metcalfe, Leighton Buzzard)

"The great danger with segregation is that it will gradually create a mindset amongst motor vehicle drivers that cyclists should not use the ordinary roads because they have special facilities." (John Stewart, Derby)

"Experience of two crashes on a poor quality segregated facility, convince me to state that unless segregated facilities are of a really high standard, they are a distinct disadvantage for cyclists." (Reg Oakley, Sevenoaks)

"The [segregated] routes need to be designed at the beginning of the design stage and not stuck on at the end to suit a whim." (Philip Thomas, Southampton)

"The short answer must be that segregation as a general solution is unlikely to be practical." (Jim Weeks, Fareham)

"'Dutch-style segregation without Dutch-style traffic laws and driver behaviour could make cycle safety worse, not better'" [*Digest 68*] was a point that I had not thought of and made strong sense." (Sarah Wood, Rushmoor)

"We need to press to have the law changed so that motorists have to give way to pedestrians and cyclists when they turn into a minor road which intersects a cycle path etc" (Bryan Attewell, Sunderland)

"Sub-standard shared use pavements [create] the problem of cyclists using non-designated pavements, much to the annoyance of pedestrians [...] the two look the same!" (Peter Quest, Cambridgeshire)

"Over-reliance on segregation as a first resort promotes the idea that cycling is a 'problem' requiring a primarily engineering solution rather than mainly a problem of driver behaviour..." Bob Damper, Eastleigh)

"20's Plenty has a very sound strategy for improving conditions for cyclists [...] Reducing vehicle speeds where people live, work and shop benefits everyone at some time, in exchange for limiting their freedom a little at other times." (Peter Robinson, Aylesbury)

Could the Cambridge Guided Busway be the UK's best new route?

Peter Quest, local CTC campaigner, explains why he's so impressed...



How do you like riding on a wide path with no motorised vehicles through quiet countryside and on a smooth surface? All too many cycle facilities are badly designed and constructed, but in Cambridgeshire we now have an excellent cycle path between St. Ives and the South of Cambridge, thanks to the development of a Guided Busway. This is 25km or 16 miles of actual busway, with additional sections on the road.

Originally, the proposal was for a maintenance track alongside the Busway which walkers, cyclists and horse riders could use. The plan was to leave it un-surfaced, and although money was found for surfacing roughly half of it quite quickly, this left the rest to be surfaced with compacted limestone. CTC was active with others in arguing that

this would be slow and dirty, and unsuited to commuting with cycles. We also had evidence that a similar local path elsewhere had broken up and had to be (expensively) repaired and resurfaced.

It took time, but first the politicians were convinced and, despite a more difficult financial climate, the money was then found first for one section of the cycleway, then the final section with help from Sustrans. It was finally completed in November 2011.

The Busway was an unpopular project, very late in being delivered and way over budget. It eventually opened on 7th August 2011. From day one, it was more heavily used than expected and more buses were purchased because of demand.

The cycleway itself has been consistently well received by the public and was used by cyclists before buses ran on it, many using the narrow tracks of the Busway itself. After the buses started to run, some foolhardy cyclists continued to use the track, one being seriously injured by being run over and one having his bike destroyed (it also disabled the bus).

And what does the facility offer? It is a relatively wide – 3 to 4 meters mostly – vehicle-free route for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. It has a very smooth surface and consequently it's less effort to push the pedals round. Being an old railway line, it goes through quiet, attractive countryside, over the Great Ouse and between extensive lakes. At Fen Drayton, we cycle through a huge RSPB reserve famous for its winter water birds (www.rspb.org.uk/reserves/guide/f/fendraytonlakes/about.aspx). Did you know that this area has more water area than the Norfolk Broads?

(Continued on Page 7)

The segregation debate - next steps

It is clear from your feedback that, despite the diversity of opinions, there is a broad consensus that segregated facilities, designed to a high standard and in the right circumstances, can be highly beneficial for cycling.

The questions are: how do we define "high standards" and "the right circumstances"? If councils propose facilities of a lower standard than whatever we define, how far do we go in accepting compromises? In what situations is an on-road solution (e.g. traffic reduction, a 20mph limit, or a decent on-road cycle lane) always going to be the better option? And for urban streets with regular side roads and junctions, can the evident need for priority at junctions be met simply by good design, or are changes in the law also needed to ensure real benefits to cyclists, and to avoid the risk of worse-than-useless segregation which merely increases conflict with motor vehicles at the places where it matters most?

Let us know your views! Our online questionnaire will soon be available at www.ctc.org.uk/campaigns.

"I agree with you that we should not and cannot risk sundering the cycle campaigning community over this issue (again) and lose the momentum we have gained." (Linda Cottrell, Braintree)

• Further reading

Cycling for transport and public health: a systematic review of the effect of the environment on cycling (S D S Fraser & K Lock, European Journal of Public Health)

Literature review looking at the effect of the built environment on cycling as a healthy physical activity. The findings suggest that promoting cycle lanes could be a promising intervention, but recommends the need for further research.

<http://eurpub.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/6/738.abstract?etoc>

Infrastructure and cyclist safety (S Reid & S Adams, published TRL)

DfT commissioned literature review concluding that the most significant infrastructure-related risk factors for cyclists in multi-vehicle collisions appear to be: posted speed limits; and encounters with other road users at junctions. Suggests that reducing the speed of motorised vehicles is the intervention most likely to increase cycle safety.

<http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/infrastructure-and-cyclist-safety/infrastructure-and-cyclist-safety.pdf> (Summary)

www.trl.co.uk (full report, download free)

Transport, Physical Activity and Health: Present knowledge and the way ahead (R L Mackett & B Brown, Centre for Transport Studies, University College London)

DfT commissioned review of the evidence on the links between transport, physical activity and health. Says that: "In order to increase levels of physical activity, it is necessary to reduce use of the car."

www.ucl.ac.uk/news/pdf/transportactivityhealth.pdf



Good news for community-friendly off-road cycling

The byway and bridleway network in England is a great asset, but routes are often not close to communities, and can be infuriatingly fragmented, making circular off-road cycle rides difficult to plan. Colin Palmer, CTC's off-road adviser, looks at a promising solution – the Paths for Communities Scheme...

Until recently, the best potential for providing useful cycling routes came with the access element of the Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) grants available from Natural England (NE) to landowners. However, the schemes that allowed for cycling were often very limited in their usefulness - and EU rules have now stopped revenue funding for any new examples, although current schemes will continue to the end of their 10 year agreements.

To help meet the need for improved access opportunities to the English countryside, a new, two year funding scheme, Paths for Communities (P4C), was announced by the Chancellor in his Autumn Statement. Applications open on April 23rd, offering grants of between £5,000 and £150,000 out of a £1m per year pot for the creation of new rural paths, which, unlike those in the former HLS schemes, will be dedicated in perpetuity. Grants will normally provide up to 75% of the costs, with the remainder from match funding.

Multi-user paths catering for cyclists, equestrians and walkers are intended to be the priority, as are those that will support local businesses through increased tourism. Schemes will need to be developed through co-operation between local communities or user groups and the relevant landowner.

Although the overall pot of money is relatively small, if there is a need to address that missing bridleway link in your own locality, then this scheme could provide the opportunity to resolve it.

The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) has produced a useful note about P4C (best found by Googling 'Paths for Communities').

Details of HLS schemes are available, in a rather convoluted fashion, from www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/enjoying/places (click on 'Access to farms & country estates', then 'Countryside walks register'. Next click 'Search for a walk or ride' and finally enter your county and click the 'bridlepath' box).

Other off-road news...

National Trails review

There are 12 National Trails in England, 3 in Wales and 20 'Scottish Great Trails'. Many of the trails in England and Wales do offer cycling opportunities, and the better ones are:

- Pennine Bridleway - 100%
- South Downs Way - 100%
- Ridgeway - 50%
- Peddars Way - 50%
- Yorkshire Wolds Way - 47%
- Offa's Dyke - 35%
- Cleveland Way - 20%
- Cotswolds Way - 19%

The remainder have less than 10% or no quoted figure available for cycling. Natural England is responsible for England's Trails and, in a climate of reduced funding, is currently reviewing their management. Maintenance, signage and promotion are the main focus.

Corridor management is of particular interest to cyclists, because of the strong support for looking beyond the boundaries of the actual route on the ground. This could be interpreted to include the braiding of trails (where users start veering from the given route for a while for some reason), which could open up more routes for cycling and equestrian use - currently less than 30% are available for cyclists.

Any comments or views on how management can be improved should be sent to: Rachel.Cook@NaturalEngland.org.uk.

- English and Welsh trails: www.nationaltrail.co.uk;
- Scottish trails: www.snh.gov.uk/enjoying-the-outdoors/where-to-go/routes-to-explore/scotlands-great-trails

Cycling and Defence Estates

A recent problem at the Ministry of Defence (MoD) training site at Hankley Common in Surrey, has raised the issue of cycling on MoD land. MoD policy on access is quite clear and declares a "presumption in favour of safe public enjoyment of its estate wherever this is compatible with operational and military training uses, public safety, security, conservation and the interests of its tenants". It recognises that the estate is used by the public for horse riding, cycling and other recreational activities, and generally welcomes responsible access providing users bear in mind that the prime purpose of the land is for military training.

"Responsible" does not, however, include the building of new trails and jumps without permission, or riding when red flags are flying - both of these will be met with considerable ire! However, problems do arise because currently there are no national bylaws - each site has differing requirements which can lead to confusion and misinterpretation. This problem is being addressed - but there is no end date yet for finalising the project.

There have been some excellent initiatives in the last few years, including the 40 miles bridleway around the Sennybridge site near Brecon, and the new bridleway skirting the tank testing ground at Castlemartin in Pembrokeshire.

www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/DefenceEstateandEnvironment/AccessRecreation/Policy.htm gives details of policy and individual sites.

Colin Palmer

Guided busway (continued from page 6)

The route passes through Cambridge with all its attractions - colleges, greens, punting and museums, while St. Ives at the other end is well worth a visit - don't miss the medieval bridge over the Great Ouse and the museum. Market day is Monday with very large markets on Bank Holiday Mondays.

For those coming from a distance, it is now the new route for NCR51 (Oxford to Colchester). I am told that it is also the longest (and, we believe, the best) new route in this country. Even on a recent, foggy cold day, the cycleway was very well used by a variety of cyclists on everything from fully equipped city bikes through MTBs to road bikes. One fit 73-year-old from St. Ives described the route as "magic" and a lady told me "This shows that if you provide a safe route people will use it." This is the only facility I know that gives the Dutch a run for their money.

Lessons for campaigners: don't accept an initial "no"; politely argue technical matters with the engineers - but putting pressure on the right local politicians may work better. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambridgeshire_Guided_Busway

DIARY DATES

Cycling, health and safety: Winning the arguments

21st April 2012, Carrs Lane Centre, Birmingham
10.30am - 3.30pm (Cyclenation)



The ogre of cycling 'danger' is constantly with us in the media, road safety publicity and in poorly informed campaigns run by other organisations, impeding our efforts to get more people cycling more often. From where to cycle and how, to helmets, hi-viz and counter claims of contributory negligence, the truth often gets trampled, but rebutting misinformation and criticisms of cycling is not easy.

This seminar will help cyclists more fully understand the issues, get the facts at their fingertips and be ready to engage locally with the media, councils and others. It will bring together a range of experts not just from the world of cycling, but also from the medical, legal and road safety professions.

No fee to attend, but you must register at www.cyclenation.org.uk/seminar (bring your own packed lunch).

Promoting Health through Transport

24th April 2012, London (PTRC/GILT)

Aims to bring together transport and health policy makers, practitioners and stakeholder groups to explore key challenges and ways to work together to promote health through transport. Standard fee £245 + VAT (concessions apply). www.ptrc-training.co.uk

20mph places

1st May 2012, London (20's Plenty for Us/PTRC)

National conference, looking at how slower speeds make for good places to live, work or play, characterised by vibrant communities who respect each other's rights to get around safely. Keynote speaker: Norman Baker MP, Under Secretary of State for Transport. £215 + VAT (concessions apply). www.ptrc-training.co.uk

5th National Active Travel Conference

29 May 2012, Glasgow (Walking, cycling, Connecting Communities)

Includes The Carnegie Challenge debate: Are our towns and cities for people? Put your questions to the panel of politicians, practitioners and campaigners. Plus keynote presentations. <http://walkcycleconnect.org/>

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Think Cycling!

A Guide for Local Authorities (Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport UK)

'How to' guide to encourage local planning and transport authorities to provide more practical and cost-effective cycling measures. Highlights good practice. www.cituk.org.uk/

Unsafe! A review of road safety audit procedures and the cyclist

(Hugh Morgan, Merton Cycling Campaign)

Review of London's road safety audit procedure, concluding that it's fundamentally flawed. Calls for standardised basic road safety auditing procedures that fully consider the safety of all road users, including cyclists. www.mertoncyclists.talktalk.net/Unsafe.pdf

Road Safety Report (British Cycling)

Summary giving the views of British Cycling members on road safety measures. BC says that in the past 10 years, almost 90% of incidents reported by its members to them occurred on the road outside of competition. www.britishcycling.org.uk

Cycle more often 2 cool down the planet (European Cyclists' Federation)

Compares the emissions savings of cycling to other modes of transport. Says that if EU citizens were to cycle as much as the Danes did in 2000, (an average of 2.6km a day), it would help the EU meet more than a quarter of the targeted emission reductions for the transport sector. www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/ECF_CO2_WEB.pdf

Benefits of shift from car to active transport (Ari Rabl & Audrey de Nazelle, published in Transport Policy, 19 (2012) 121-131)

Largely considering the effect of a shift on mortality, this paper concludes that health benefit due to physical activity is by far the biggest positive and that the general population does benefit from reduced emissions (although not nearly so much). Also says that "the benefits of bicycling completely overwhelm any concern over pollution exposure of bicyclists." www.elsevier.com/locate/tranpol

Event Review:

CTC's Roadshows over the last few months gave community-based professionals the opportunity to meet and discover more about CTC's cycling expertise. CTC local campaigner David Naylor went along to the event in Cardiff, not sure what to expect from a 'Roadshow'...

The Cardiff Roadshow was in effect a conference. There were talks in the morning, then after lunch a panel discussion followed by workshops and finally a summing up.

CTC's CEO Kevin Mayne, who chaired the meeting, set the scene in his introduction. This was to be a celebration of cycling, he said; cycling was becoming mainstream; we could no longer be ignored. This was a rather special meeting for Kevin, who is shortly to move to Brussels to become Director of Development for the European Cyclists' Federation.



Six short talks in the morning focused on cycle training for youth and the importance of partnerships. Interaction with the audience was good, with all the speakers inviting questions, both during and after their talks. A Workplace Cycle Challenge is planned for Swansea this June, so I was particularly interested to hear Sam Robinson and Ian Richardson talk about these. Apparently getting people to cycle for a mere ten minutes is key to getting them started. This surprised me, but it appears to work.

After lunch, a panel answered questions ranging from the costs of cycle training to the balance between cycling for leisure and transportation.

There were four workshops: Economic, Health, Social and Campaigning. I attended the last. As there was a handful of people round one table, all could participate. The message that it is important to break down barriers, e.g. with people who have disabilities or partial sight, was of particular interest to me.

Overall, it was inspirational. My only regret was that there was nothing on infrastructure. As a retired civil engineer this interests me, but I became more aware that training and promotion go hand in hand with the provision of quality infrastructure.

Please give us your feedback on CycleDigest! www.ctc.org.uk/cycledigest

CycleDigest is also available at www.ctc.org.uk/cycledigest. Save Paper! If you would prefer to receive notice that the latest issue has been uploaded onto our website, email the address below. Please also let us know if you no longer wish to receive this publication. Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the editor or the policies of CTC. Material from the CycleDigest may be reproduced in any form for the purposes of campaigning and in the promotion of cycle use, provided the source is acknowledged.

Published by CTC, Parklands, Railton Road, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 9JX
Editor: Cherry Allan Tel: 0844 736 8450 Fax: 0844 736 8454 e-mail: cherry.allan@ctc.org.uk