

Draft Cycling Strategy Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement November 2015

Prepared under regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

A 'call for ideas' consultation for the Cycling Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken during July and August 2015. This was undertaken alongside consultation on two draft Supplementary Planning Documents and a call for ideas on a further four Supplementary Planning Documents, and details were circulated to everyone on the Local Plan mailing list, published on the Council's web site, emailed to those on the Ipswich Direct email service and publicised through a press release and via social media. The Local Plan mailing list consists of specific and general consultation bodies, and private individuals who have expressed an interest in Local Plan matters.

The call for ideas invited comment on the scope and content of the document prior to preparation commencing. Comments were received from a total of eleven organisations and individuals as set out in the table below. The comments are reproduced in the table below together with the officer's response indicating how the points raised have been addressed through the SPD, if appropriate.

As part of the call for ideas consultation an online cycling to school survey was also carried out. This was publicised as part of the consultation process outlined above and also through direct emails to all schools within Ipswich Borough. A summary of the results is provided below the table of comments. The responses have been taken into account in developing the guidance.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
Associated British Ports	ABP is a major stakeholder within Ipswich owning approximately 275 acres of land, including Key Street. This is a very popular route. The route is part of the Sustrans National Cycle Route 51. ABP wishes to actively encourage cycling within areas such as these acknowledging the importance of connecting the town centre, train station and waterfront. It is believed that this route in particular would benefit	Improvements to signage have been identified in the SPD as a potential enhancement for cycling across the town. The comment regarding prohibiting non port users from using the port is noted.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>from clear signage to raise awareness for all road users and also pedestrians.</p> <p>With regard to the opening of new routes, ABP must continue to prohibit non port users from the operational port.</p>	
Historic England	No comments to make.	Noted
Natural England	Does not consider that this SPD poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to their statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted
Private Individual 1	<p>In new developments residential areas should have traditional crosslinked streets, not cul-de-sacs which make cycling access difficult.</p> <p>New main roads separate infrastructure for bikes. Wide cycle lanes preferably with physical barriers between cyclists and traffic. Shared pavements cause conflict with pedestrians and there is a lot of stop start due to side roads.</p> <p>Greatest barrier to cycling is fear caused by proximity to large/fast traffic. Narrow cycle lanes are counter-productive as they annoy drivers and discourage cyclists as they make them feel very vulnerable. Since Ipswich has narrow roads this is a major</p>	<p>The guidance has been included regarding through routes for cyclists at the end of cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>The guidance relating to routes states that ideally cyclists should be separated from other users.</p> <p>The guidance relating to routes states that ideally cyclists should be separated from other users. Guidance on the width of cycle lanes has been included. The draft refers to considering the potential for 'cycle priority streets' which would require</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>problem. Possible solution is to remove narrow cycle lanes and designate certain roads/routes as cycle priority routes where through traffic is discouraged and speed limited to 20mph.</p> <p>Cycle parking facilities could be improved and more importantly signposted.</p> <p>There are a number of specific barriers to cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of contraflow cycle lanes in the town, which are scary and dangerous. • Full width road speed humps which cannot be avoided and are very unpleasant for cyclists • Road damage along cycle routes <p>Use of roads as rat runs can result in safe side roads for cyclists becoming unsafe.</p>	<p>more detailed consideration of traffic impacts prior to being implemented.</p> <p>This has been included within the draft SPD.</p> <p>The SPD identifies a need for contraflows to be legible to all users, to consider the possibility of using speed bumps which are not the full road width and identifies specific locations where the surface of the cycle path could be improved.</p> <p>The SPD considers the potential for some roads to be designed with the effect of cyclists having priority whilst through traffic would be encouraged along alternative routes.</p>
Private Individual 2	<p>Measures to encourage cycling in and around new developments are the provision of high quality, well thought out infrastructure that allows people to go where they want to go. Infrastructure should be built in accordance with “Making Space for Cycling” guidance document published by Cambridge Cycling Campaign and the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle-Friendly Design.</p>	<p>The draft SPD states that routes should take account of key destinations. A list of references has been added to the end of the draft SPD.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>Good onsite infrastructure must be backed up by good quality infrastructure throughout the town. It is recognised that IBC has little or no control over highways, a Cycling SPD will only have a meaningful impact if the Council is also pressurising SCC to make quality infrastructure changes elsewhere. The Northern Fringe is a good example, with a new neighbourhood 2 miles from the town centre the potential for bike use as a genuine mode of transport is high. The potential will only be realised if those residents can see a safe cycling route through the town centre.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the draft SPD identifies a number of potential enhancements to key routes around the town.</p>
<p>Private Individual 3</p>	<p>The following measures should be included in all new developments to encourage cycling: high quality segregated cycle paths; integration with strategic cycle route into town centre and employment areas; all retail developments to include destination cycle parking with signage; safe routes for bikes through car parks.</p> <p>Measures that should be taken to encourage cycling: cycle training for all school children from the age of 5 and deliver Bikeability level 2 by Year 6; schools should be mandated to include cycles in School Travel Plans; provision of secure cycle storage for 20% of pupils; more highly visible destination cycle parking in town; mandatory 20 mph speed limit in</p>	<p>These have been included within the design guidance contained in the SPD.</p> <p>It is understood that Suffolk County Council offer Bikeability training to schools.</p> <p>Cycle parking for new schools would be required in accordance with the guidance provided in the SPD.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies a need for more cycle parking in the town</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>town centre; improvements to part of New Cut East; removal of contraflow bike lanes against bus traffic.</p> <p>Particular issues which currently act to discourage cycling in the Borough: the management of the transport strategy by SCC is less than ideal as decisions cannot be made at a more local level; police to enforce pavement cycling, running red lights, parking on cycle paths; there is insufficient secure parking in the town centre.</p>	<p>centre as well as other potential enhancements.</p> <p>Chapter 5 states that contraflows should be legible to all users.</p> <p>These comments are noted however the SPD cannot be used to enforce against illegal cycling. Chapter 6 identifies a need for more cycle parking in the town centre.</p>
Private Individual 4	<p>More coherent safe routes through Ipswich to encourage more cycling and walking.</p> <p>Dangerous hotspots are on routes from the waterfront to the hospital or train station. There is no safe through route off-road through town, only busy roads can be used.</p> <p>No traffic along the waterfront, traffic to use the road parallel to the waterfront</p>	<p>Chapter 6 aims to enhance routes between key destinations in the Borough.</p> <p>Chapter 6 aims to enhance routes between these places.</p> <p>Chapter 6 states that legible routes for cyclists should be created along the waterfront.</p>
Private Individual 5	<p>There are two handbooks released around April 2014, which contain very good direction that should be referenced and used as inspiration: 'Making Space for Cycling' and 'Sustrans Handbook for Cycle-friendly design'</p> <p>Various new items in Traffic</p>	<p>The draft SPD contains a list of documents for further reference, including those mentioned.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>Signs Regulations and General Directions 2015 improve things for cyclists and should start making an appearance in Ipswich including low level traffic lights for cyclists, red cycle symbol on cycle signs, "Except Cycles" plates added to existing restrictions, Zig Zags offset up to 2m from the kerb so cyclists do not have to ride over and cycle lanes continue through junctions; cycle streets where cars are guests, flexible traffic wands or armadillos to separate cyclists from traffic.</p> <p>Cambridge Cycling Campaign has an excellent cycle parking guide as do Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>Cycle parking should be signposted and cycle parking should be included within car parks.</p> <p>Conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles should be avoided at all times. At present there are some areas with on and off road infrastructure for cyclists, this should be changed to a single type that all are happy to use.</p> <p>Many of the key main routes into Ipswich do not provide space for protected cycle infrastructure, as an alternative some corridors should become key cycle routes with no through traffic and access</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The design guidance in chapter 5 includes reference to these points.</p> <p>The guidance in chapters 5 and 6 recommend that routes should be continuous and legible.</p> <p>Chapter 6 promotes the consideration of 'cycle priority routes'.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>only to properties. There would then be quiet links between the corridors that would encourage people to cycle round to those corridor routes.</p> <p>‘Cyclist Dismount’ signs should only be used in extreme circumstances. It is really rare that there is a valid use for them or the cycle infrastructure is not good enough.</p>	<p>The design guidance in chapter 5 states that such signs should be avoided, and that cyclists should be directed to where they can cycle.</p>
<p>Private individual 6</p>	<p>Ipswich has a massive traffic problem.</p> <p>The current cycle infrastructure is a major factor in people not feeling confident to cycle after having spent years in cars. Ipswich needs to link surrounding villages and towns together with a proper cycle investment – direct well-built infrastructure, providing a safe route for cyclists to make cycling into work and town an actual alternative to driving.</p> <p>Closing of some roads which are simply rat runs for cars, making an area pleasant for cycling and living in, especially important where a link to a cycle route is possible.</p> <p>Reduce much of the conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, and cyclists and road users, and to certainly not introduce any further conflicts in new developments.</p> <p>To encourage cycling in and</p>	<p>Chapter 6 identifies a number of potential enhancements to existing routes.</p> <p>Chapter 6 promotes the consideration of ‘cycle priority routes’.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter 5 states that cyclists should be separated from vehicles and pedestrians where possible.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>around new development there should be links to existing cycle routes, and should be developed into attractive cycle paths to ensure cycling is a viable method of getting to the town centre, work and train station. Also linking these routes to develop a network of cycle routes which are their own form of transport for getting to schools and colleges.</p> <p>Decent availability of cycle parking, see page 5 of the Cycle Parking Guide produced by Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>Review the Making Space for Cycling document.</p> <p>With a decent enough solid infrastructure, it is not just cyclists who will use it to commute but people with other needs, such as disabled and younger cyclists.</p> <p>There should be investment in a linked network starting from and out to the satellite villages, such as Westerfield, Sroughton, Bramford, Claydon and Needham Market – this should not just be signs but a space for cycling.</p> <p>Cycling parking needs to be sign posted and available where people need it around the town.</p> <p>A lack of coherent well-built and</p>	<p>5 states that new routes should link with the wider network.</p> <p>Guidance on cycle parking is included in the design guidance in Chapter 5.</p> <p>A list of further references is included in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Chapter 5 acknowledges that there are a range of different types of cycle.</p> <p>Chapter 6 recognises that routes within the Borough also extend to locations beyond the Borough, however this is beyond the Council's direct influence.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter 5 identifies a need to signpost cycle parking and chapter 6 identifies that enhance cycle parking in the town centre is needed.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies potential</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>linked infrastructure discourages cycling. Also a constant conflict between other road users and pedestrians. Clear/unnecessary signage – such as the overuse of ‘dismount’ or ‘End’ on cycle routes. It is a form of transport reliant on person power. The feeling of suddenly being put out from a cycle lane and into the road is potentially very dangerous.</p> <p>All for sharing roadspace with other traffic but through certain areas this is just not possible – the Sustrans route along Bramford Lane is a good example.</p> <p>Areas like Rope Walk are good examples of cycling infrastructure in Ipswich.</p>	<p>enhancements to the wider network whilst Chapter 5 states that ‘end of route’ signs should be avoided where possible and instead the cyclist should be directed to where they can cycle.</p> <p>Due to the historic nature of some roads in the town it is difficult to provide significant enhancements for cyclists.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Private Individual 7	<p>Measures at new developments to encourage cycling:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dutch style home streets, cars only at rear of houses 2. Longer route to exit development for drivers than cyclists 3. Cycle priority traffic lights where cycle routes cross roads 4. Cut motor vehicle speed in and around development 5. Good connecting routes to town centre and other popular destinations 6. Routes to be cycleable by unaccompanied older children without risk from car/vans etc. 7. Full segregation where possible <p>Measures to encourage cycling in the Borough:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The guidance differentiates between main routes and quieter routes. 2. The guidance states that where cul-de-sacs are planned there should be a through-route for cyclists. 3. The section on junctions and crossing identifies that priority phases for cyclists may be appropriate in some instances. 4. Speed can be influenced by design, and the draft SPD contains guidance on the design of quieter routes. 5. The draft guidance in chapter 5 states that new routes should link with existing

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>1. Enforced speed restriction 2. Cycle priority on roundabouts 3. Cut out all rat runs (filtered permeability) 4. Locked and covered cycle parking provided 5. Universal Bikeability with bombproof routes to schools 6. Cyclists pass behind pedestrian refuges to avoid pinch points 7. Cut emissions in town by introducing zones and congestion charging</p> <p>Factors which discourage cycling in the Borough:</p> <p>1. High vehicle speeds and volumes 2. Rat runs 3. Non continuous cycle provision. 4. Too much poorly designed shared use 5. Pinch points at pedestrian 6. Fumes at high traffic volume times</p>	<p>networks and should take account of key destinations.</p> <p>6. The design guidance states that routes should be designed with less confident cyclists in mind.</p> <p>7. The draft guidance in Chapter 5 encourages separation of cyclists from other vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Measures to encourage cycling in the Borough:</p> <p>1. Chapter 6 of the SPD identifies consideration of 'cycle priority routes' as a possible enhancement.</p> <p>2. Chapter 5 and 6 consider potential improvements to roundabouts.</p> <p>3. Chapter 6 of the SPD identifies consideration of 'cycle priority routes' as a possible enhancement. It is not realistic to cut out all rat runs.</p> <p>4. Chapter 6 identifies a need for improved cycle parking in the town centre.</p> <p>5. It is understood that Suffolk County Council offer Bikeability training to schools.</p> <p>6. The draft guidance in Chapter 5 promotes the use of bus stop by-passes.</p> <p>7. Emissions will specifically considered through the Low Emissions Supplementary Planning Document which is to be produced during 2016.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
		Factors which discourage cycling are noted and have been taken into account.
Northern Fringe Protection Group	<p>In accordance with the Local Plan Policy CS5, Ipswich Cycling Strategy SPD should aim to work towards the development of an integrated cycle network across the wider Ipswich Area. This should be in accordance with recognised standards.</p> <p>Planning should be made on the basis of clear Business Plans that should be monitored to ensure the outcomes match the predictions. Investment decisions should be phased according to an ongoing cost benefit analysis to ensure value for money for the tax/community charge payer. Success should be measured against specific objectives in achieving modal shift from cars and a corresponding increase in cycling.</p> <p>There should be a clear time-bounded target to increase the number of cycling journeys and reduce the amount of vehicular traffic. Through joint working with all relevant authorities, proposals should be developed and implemented to deliver these targets.</p> <p>The wider Ipswich Area cycling network must be effectively maintained and measures agreed and implemented with the responsible authority to ensure this happens.</p> <p>Existing routes need to be upgraded with resurfacing where needed such as the Christchurch</p>	<p>The SPD will set design guidance which will apply to cycling provision in new development.</p> <p>The Borough Council does not invest directly in highways infrastructure, Suffolk County Council is the highways authority. The Core Strategy and Policies development plan document contains indicators which are monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy and Policies development plan document relates to the Ipswich: Transport fit for the 21st Century target of reducing dependency on the private car by 15% within the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Maintenance is the responsibility of Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies where existing routes could benefit from enhancements, however</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>Park bridleway. Uneven and dangerous road surfaces on cycle networks need to be eradicated.</p> <p>Using road space for protected cycling space, rather than mixing cyclists and pedestrians on shared pavements, is to be preferred. Main travel routes should, where possible, allow segregated cycling.</p> <p>All new developments should include high quality cycle infrastructure that connects with existing networks, paid for by the developers.</p> <p>In particular, safe and convenient cycle routes to and across Ipswich town centre should be improved.</p> <p>IBC should work with SCC, schools and academies to increase the number of children walking and cycling to school, including delivering infrastructure that is safe for users.</p> <p>Better integration of cycling networks with public transport is required. In particular IBC should work with train operators to remove the existing constraints on taking bicycles on trains.</p>	<p>this is not an exhaustive list.</p> <p>The draft design guidance in Chapter 5 states that separating cyclists from other vehicles is preferable.</p> <p>The draft design guidance in Chapter 5 identifies the provision that should be made.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the draft SPD provides guidance on enhancing town centre routes.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD will relate to provision for cycling around new schools.</p> <p>Noted. The draft SPD identifies that links between the station and the town centre could be enhanced.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	No comments	Noted
Office of Rail and Road	No comments	Noted
Westerfield Parish Council	No comments	Noted

Cycling to Schools survey – summary of responses

Total respondents: 190 (168 parents and 22 pupils)

Age groups represented:

- Primary, infant or junior – 40 (28%)
- Years 7-9 – 75 (43%)
- Years 10-11 – 40 (23%)
- Sixth Form – 21 (12%)

A large proportion of respondents represent Northgate High School, Sidegate Primary School or St Helens Primary School.

Distance from home to school:

- Less than a mile – 56 (37%)
- 1-2 miles – 65 (43%)
- 2 – 5 miles – 23 (15%)
- Over 5 miles – 6 (4%)

Method of transport currently used (in order of most common):

- Walk – 76 (51%)
- Cycle – 41 (27%)
- Car, as passenger – 21 (14%)
- Car, as driver – 5 (3%)
- Bus – 2 (1%)
- Other (includes scooters) – 5 (3%)

Please note that not all respondents answered every question

Commentary

27% of respondents to this question cycle already, 51% walk already and 1% travel by scooter. Of the 26 (17%) who go by car as passenger or driver, 16 (11%) live within 2 miles of their school. If this is a representative sample, it would suggest that there is a relatively small percentage (11%) who do not cycle but live close enough to do so regularly.

Around half of those who don't cycle to school do cycle at least once a month for other purposes, with a quarter cycling at least once or twice a week. However, in most cases those who go to school by car who do cycle at other times do this around once a month or less often. Those who cycle more regularly at other times are generally those who walk to school rather than those who go by car.

Only 18% of parents who responded stated that they never cycle, with 40% cycling either every day or a few days per week. There is some correlation between those parents who cycle regularly and pupils who walk or cycle to school (i.e. where the parents cycle regularly, the child(ren) walk or cycle), although there are some pupils who cycle to school whilst the parents do not cycle regularly. In the cases where

parents regularly cycle but pupils do not walk or cycle to school, the distance from school is over 2 miles and the pupils are primary / infant / junior school age (i.e. it may not be possible for the children to cycle due to distance).

In answering the question about how more pupils could be encouraged to cycle, traffic free cycle paths / safer cycle routes were the most requested improvement. Secure cycle parking, cheaper equipment, better crossings / junctions, cycle training and parking restrictions around schools were also mentioned a number of times.

In responding to the question asking for general comments about cycling in Ipswich, in addition to the points mentioned above other issues identified include problems negotiating around parked cars and maintenance of cycle lanes.