



Lancaster and District Cycle  
Campaign

Website: [www.lancaster-dynamo.org.uk](http://www.lancaster-dynamo.org.uk)  
Blog: [lancasterdynamo.wordpress.com](http://lancasterdynamo.wordpress.com)

11 January 2011

Lancashire County Council  
LTP Consultation  
**Freepost PR89**  
PO Box 100  
County Hall  
PRESTON PR1 0BR

Dear Sir/Madam

### **Local Transport Plan draft 2011-2021**

Dynamo (Lancaster & District Cycle Campaign) would make the following comments on the November 2010 draft of the LTP.

#### **Our vision**

Our vision of the future is one where cycling (along with other sustainable forms of transport) is an easy and safe choice for shortish journeys, particularly within towns. **High cycling levels address the County's concerns about congestion, air quality, public health, safety, attractiveness of neighbourhoods, and reducing carbon emissions.** To this end, bicycles should be prioritised over private motor vehicles far more widely than hitherto. Measures should include introducing and enforcing a county-wide 20 mph speed limit in residential areas and re-allocating road space (e.g. blocking "rat runs" to all but cyclists, pedestrians and emergency/utility vehicles). Roads would thus be freer for essential motor traffic.

Cycling should also be acknowledged as an important leisure activity, both sport and touring, that can bring health and economic benefits.

#### **Comments on the LTP draft**

1. Dependency on car Section 3 talks of "High dependency on car for personal travel" as one of the biggest challenges, but there is little indication of what measures will be taken to actively reduce that dependency beyond trying to make the alternatives look attractive. There is nothing about actively discouraging car use for local journeys - e.g. by blocking rat runs, reallocation of road space or a 20 mph limit in residential areas. Research by Sustrans has shown that just under half of local urban car trips could be changed to walking, cycling and public transport - why is the County not using this as an inspiration?

Recommendation Lancashire County Council should adopt clear targets for modal share to be achieved by 2021 and work towards them, utilising the measures outlined above.

2. Congestion and air quality Traffic congestion and poor air quality in Lancaster, Morecambe and Heysham are mentioned on page 6, yet on page 13 the aim is to "increase road capacity, improve highway links and junctions" and "deliver adequate parking". This will inevitably encourage more cars – precisely what the previous section wants to avoid. The Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA) found in their report "Transport and the Generation of Traffic" (1994) that providing extra road space generates more traffic. This will not improve congestion or the air quality and will produce more greenhouse gas emissions.

Recommendation Make clear the County's approach in circumstances where there is a tension between congestion/air quality and the desire for increased road space.

3. 20 mph schemes We welcome the commitment on pp.18-19 for 20 mph schemes but we need widespread rather than piecemeal schemes. We welcome the overall commitment to improving safety of streets, but this does need to be non-negotiable for the sake of the most vulnerable users.

Recommendation The County must make the arguments in favour of 20 mph speed limits to the public, and then implement them across the county.

4. Economic generation Page 10 proposes the Heysham-M6 link road, but SACTRA also demonstrated in their report "Transport and the Economy" (1998) that in the type of economy which we have in the UK there is no automatic link between providing more roads and economic benefits/attracting more employers. Indeed, new roads can lead to an outflow of commuters to work elsewhere. The public enquiry into the M74 in Glasgow and the Thames Gateway Bridge in London made similar conclusions.

Recommendation Rethink the reliance on more roads for economic generation. This is not just pie in the sky. A glance at continental Europe or even British towns like Cambridge and York shows that promoting high levels of cycling is completely compatible with high levels of economic activity.

5. Public health There are obvious health benefits to regular cycling and walking, and as a society we need to encourage more activity in daily life. Dynamo welcomes the commitment to active travel on the grounds of public health, but what are the targets? Given that there are economic benefits to having a healthier population, these are crucial.

Recommendation

- a. Incorporate a public health element in all planning. This should ensure that it is easier to choose to cycle or walk reasonable distances rather than use the car if it is not strictly necessary.
- b. Start young. Promote cycling and walking journeys to school, reduce car use for the school run and encourage a generation of active citizens. Roll out the Sustrans Bike It scheme (or similar) across the county to get schoolchildren cycling from the start. We must realise that cycling proficiency has skipped a generation or two - getting children cycling as a normal form of transport cannot be left to parents who have never done this themselves. According to Sustrans's research, the Bike It schools programme tripled daily cycling. (There is a focus on getting schoolchildren travelling by something other than private car in the LTP draft, but it is very general.)

6. Economic benefits of cycling Improving cycling facilities makes good economic sense, particularly in time of falling investment. Sustrans have shown that they can demonstrate a benefit to cost ratio of up to 20:1 (Economic Appraisal of Walking and Cycling Routes, 2006<sup>1</sup>), although 8:1 is more usually quoted. Moreover there are tourism benefits. One only has to look at well-known cycling routes on the continent - e.g. the Loire Valley or German river routes, with hotels full to bursting with cyclists in July and August - to appreciate that<sup>2</sup>.

Recommendation Market Lancashire as a county for cycle touring, drawing on the existing National Cycle Route network. Target continental cyclists as well as domestic ones.

7. Siting of new developments Page 4 states that "New developments will be located to reduce the need for unnecessary travel and developers will provide all reasonable opportunities for people to arrive or depart safely and conveniently by a choice of travel modes." Excellent! But this doesn't seem to be followed up in the report, apart from a mention of reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This is key. We are used to an enormous degree of transport mobility and hence most new developments expect people - and people themselves expect - to travel long distances simply to go about their normal activities of daily living. This is simply not sustainable.

Recommendation Strengthen the terms under which new developments can be approved. These should have a full travel plan at an early stage and a stringent approach to the number of car parking spaces.

We hope that you will look seriously at these comments and recommendations.

Yours faithfully

Patricia Clarke  
for Dynamo

---

1

<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/assets/files/general/Economic%20appraisal%20of%20local%20walking%20and%20cycling%20routes%20-%20summary.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> See also Sustrans research on the economic benefits of cycle tourism in North East England - <http://www.sustrans.org.uk/resources/research-and-monitoring/the-economic-impact-of-cycle-tourism>.