

## **Surrey County Council 's Local Transport Plan - LTP3**

*Summary and discussion of key points relating to cycling covered by discussion papers recently published by Surrey County Council and available on their website. Item 2 on the agenda for the Waverley Cycle Forum Meeting to be held on 30 September refers.*

### **Congestion Strategy**

Cyclists are mentioned among the victims of congestion but do not feature much in this paper. However, encouraging mode shift, for example through Safe Routes to Schools does get a mention and so cycling is clearly seen as part of the solution. Cycling featured more prominently in the Climate Change Strategy document where its potential role in reducing congestion is recognised.

Reliability in terms of journey times is seen as more consistent than speed as such. This seems sensible inasmuch as it is better if all journeys take 30 minutes than half taking 15 minutes and half 45 meeting. But if consistency were to mean that journeys are consistently slow that wouldn't help!

The report mentions "identifying and implementing developer funded schemes that will mitigate the impacts of additional demand". Cycle infrastructure provision fits with this.

### **Parking Strategy**

Some of the discussion is about making parking more difficult in certain places where it causes problems in residential areas. *Comment:* This can lead to problems if there simply isn't enough space to meet demand. For example, if the result of people being unable to park near a station means they will get dropped off in the morning and picked up in the evening it will add to congestion. Clearly, getting people to walk or cycle wherever possible gets found this, and puts the focus on developing safe routes to railway stations (in particular). This shows how problems of congestion and parking link up – and how cycling can alleviate both. School parking is often a problem at peak times. Safe Routes to School are part of the answer and School Travel Plans are required to incorporate a site specific cycle strategy

Public Policy Statement 3 states that residential parking should be provided as appropriate to local circumstances including adequate cycle parking for all new development.

The paper has detailed recommendations on cycle parking: "Cycle parking should be designed and provided in accordance with the appropriate government guidance. Current guidance suggests that such parking should be undercover, lit, secure, adequately signed and as close to the destination as possible (within 20m). The following standards are suggested as a minimum:

Use Class	Standard
<b>A1 Retail</b>	
Food retail	1 space per 350m <sup>2</sup> (out of town) 1 space per 125m <sup>2</sup> (town/local centre)
Non-food retail	1 space per 1500m <sup>2</sup> (out of town /minimum 4 spaces) 1 space per 300m <sup>2</sup> (town/local centre)
Garden Centre	1 space per 300m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
All other retail uses	Individual assessment
<b>A3 Food and drink</b>	
Restaurants, snack bars and café's. For sale & consumption on the premises (if located beyond Town Centre locations).	1 space per 20 seats (min 2 spaces)
<b>A4 Drinking establishments</b>	
Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments but not nightclubs (if located beyond Town Centre locations).	1 space per 100m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
<b>A5 Hot Food Takeaways</b>	
For sale & consumption of hot food off the premises (if located beyond Town Centre locations).	1 space per 50 m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
<b>B1 Business</b>	
Offices	1 space per 125m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
Research & development / light industry	1 space per 250m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
B2 General Industrial	1 space per 500m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
B8 Storage or distribution (including open air storage)	1 space per 500m <sup>2</sup> (min 2 spaces)
C1 Hotels/Guest houses	Individual assessment
<b>C2 Residential Institutions</b>	
Care homes/Nursing homes	Individual assessment
Hospitals	Individual assessment
Residential colleges	1 space per 2 students 1 space per 2staff
Training centres	Individual assessment
C3 Dwelling houses (family houses, up to 6 residents living as a single household, including households where care is provided)	
Flats / houses without garages or gardens:	
1 and 2 bedroom unit	1 space
3 or more bedroom unit	2 spaces
<b>D1 Non-residential institutions</b>	
Day Nurseries/Crèche	1 space per 5 staff plus

### Passenger Transport Strategy Part 1 Local Bus

The is only one reference to cycling: “Having been very successful in increasing the amount of cycle access to railway stations, we would also like to take forward ideas for installing

good quality cycle facilities at key bus stops to increase the catchment area for bus services.” This clearly deserves support.

The reference to section 106 money for bus services is of possible relevance. “In some cases, buses can be funded through a section 106 agreement, where a developer provides funding to mitigate against the traffic impact of a new development. Several bus services in Surrey have been provided through such agreements. Only the largest developments are likely to result in section 106 funding for bespoke site-specific public bus services, and it is unlikely that any similar developments will be completed in the next few years. Our experience has also shown us that unless bespoke bus routes are actively marketed during their operation, they may not attract sufficient passenger numbers to make them commercially sustainable when the Section 106 funding runs out (usually after five years). This leaves the new development accessible only by private transport, and can strand those passengers who had come to rely on the bus. With reductions in Surrey County Council’s revenue support for bus routes, there is very little chance that we will step in to support such routes once Section 106 funding runs out. However, some developments may be able to support modifications/diversion to an existing bus route which can achieve significant levels of bus access for the development site at a much more acceptable cost.”

*Comment* It would seem that bus services often end when section 106 funding stops because they do not attract enough customers. Is this a waste of money? It prompts the question of whether improved cycle provision should be given a higher priority as a means of mitigating the impact of increased volumes of traffic. It is very possible that good cycle infrastructure would be more cost-effective and would not end after five years.

## **Passenger Transport Strategy Part 2 - Information**

Cycling is not mentioned in this paper but there is one issue that may be worth raising. One problem for those of us travelling with bikes by train is that there may be space on the train but it is difficult to know where it may be. When there was one guard’s van and it always stopped in the same place, one knew where to stand with a bike. This has got more complicated with cycle accommodation spread through the train so that if the first compartment one tries is full it is necessary to sprint to another. Could there be better advanced information? And more generally, better information as to whereabouts on the train the cycle accommodation will be for those who only occasionally take a bike on a train.

## **Air Quality Strategy**

The only direct reference to cycling appears as an item in the Air Quality Strategy Toolkit which includes “Cycle lanes and priorities, and cycle parking provision” which are seen as a way of reducing traffic volumes.

Mentions is made of identifying and agreeing options for supporting travel choices that are better for air quality, and implement as and when funding becomes available. Councils are

also exhorted to “Consider air quality issues in borough and district-led planning processes and areas of responsibility.” *Comment* Again, focusing on safe cycling routes to transport hubs, places of work, schools, colleges etc would help, as well as ensuring good cycle provision in new developments.

David Moxon  
*Chair, Waverley Cycle Forum*  
September 2010