

# Hertfordshire Transport Vision 2050

## Response from CycleHerts

CycleHerts is a grouping of cycle campaign groups in Hertfordshire. We have over 1,000 members in our groups. Our response to the questions is set out below.

### **Are there any other challenges and opportunities we should take into account in our future transport strategy?**

Under the heading *Challenges and Opportunities – Existing transport deficiencies and a future network struggling to cope* the lack of a network of safe cycling routes in all of the main urban settlements, other than Stevenage, needs to be mentioned.

The consultation document says that current and likely improvements to the transport system will predominantly enhance the rail network or the roads. There is very little to enhance cycling, walking and bus transport in the current and likely improvements. The vision for the future needs to redress this lack of past investment and have a clear focus on investment in cycling, walking and public transport. The cycling element in particular needs sufficient funding: guidance on this is available from Cycling UK.

Following the example set by London the county should plan for and fund a step change in provision for cycling in the county.

### **Do you agree with the LTP Objectives and Principles identified?**

The first four objectives under the heading Prosperity could all be read as a programme for road building. If this is not meant, the meaning of and method of achieving the following needs to be spelt out:

1. *Improve access to international gateways and regional centres ...*
2. *Enhanced connectivity between primary urban centres.*
3. *Improve accessibility between employers and their labour markets*
4. *Enhance journey reliability.*

Without further explanation it is hard to see how these first four objectives can be reconciled with other objectives such as:

7. *Reduce carbon emissions*
8. *Making journeys and their impact safer and healthier*
9. *Improving access and enabling participation in everyday life through transport.*

We would suggest that the first four objectives need to be redrafted to align them with the rest of the Vision.

We agree with the four Principles and in particular *Modal shift and encouraging active travel*. If, as stated, active travel “*should be a high priority, and a key feature of the future transport system*” this needs to be reflected in future spending priorities.

### **Do you support the adoption of a Transport User Hierarchy Policy?**

We strongly support such a hierarchy (which has been recommended by the Government since 2004).

### **Do you support the adoption of a policy to deliver a step change in cycling in larger urban areas?**

We support the policy of delivering a step change in cycling. It seems sensible, as proposed, to start with the larger urban areas.

Looking at the wording of this section of the document we would stress:

1. There is clear evidence that more people cycling will have economic and health benefits not only to the participants but also to the rest of society.
2. Just improving routes for cyclists is not sufficient. They must be improved to a nationally recognised standard. Sub-standard routes are not likely to be seen as safe by people who might start cycling and as such are likely to be poor value for money.
3. Other measures such as 20 mph speed limits properly enforced can be a very cost effective way of encouraging people to cycle whilst at the same time improving the environment for everyone.

**Do you support the adoption of a policy to do more to facilitate and support shared mobility?**

Yes. Widespread use of car clubs could free up road space from parked cars. The road space so liberated could be used for cycle tracks, bus priority and improvements to the street scene.

**8. Do you support the adoption of a policy to enhance public transport connectivity between towns with bus priority measures?**

We support all policies to enhance sustainable modes of transport including public transport. However, in this context "*connectivity between towns*" must be understood to be between town centres. Significant delays to buses are often within towns rather than on the open roads between them. For example; speeding up the buses between Garston and Chiswell Green will be of limited benefit if the buses are still held up in St Albans city centre and in north and central Watford.

A bus priority network could be a useful starting point for bus priority measures. We also need bus priority measures within towns. Buses need to be more reliable and more frequent. Cashless ticketing, speedier boarding and alighting and real-time information all have a part to play.

**Do you support the adoption if a policy to implement a Priority Traffic Management Network?**

It makes sense to manage the road network outside towns and villages more effectively so that journey times are more reliable. However, this technology must not be used to encourage more motor vehicle journeys in urban areas which will then created more congestion and defeat the achievement of the Transport Vision.

**Do you support the policy to develop a series of local Growth and Transport Plans?**

We support the need to work with district councils to draw up local transport plans. We would stress that local organisations representing users should also be involved in developing such plans.

**For each of the major schemes please state whether you agree or disagree with their inclusion in the new strategy in principle**

**Sustainable Travel Towns (Watford, Stevenage, St Albans, Hemel H)**

We strongly support this. We welcome the funding proposed (£5-10 million for each town as a minimum) to be provided by 2021.

#### **Access Improvements to East Hemel Hempstead**

Our concern is that this might encourage car commuting. Measures to discourage this such as workplace car parking charges, improved bus services and cycle tracks would be essential.

#### **Hertford Bypass & Sustainable Travel Town**

We support only the sustainable transport measures. These should be implemented whether or not a new bypass is built.

#### **A414 Corridor Junction Capacity Upgrades**

Taken with the other road schemes (East Hemel, Hertford) the spending on these road schemes totally dwarfs that proposed for active travel. As we suggested earlier, future spending needs to redress the lack of past investment on active travel.

#### **Hertfordshire Bus Rapid Transit Network**

We would like to see a rapid transit network in Hertfordshire. Whatever system is chosen we would like it to be able to carry cycles. If this is not feasible we would at least want folding bicycles to be regarded as luggage and be carried at all times.

**Limiting future levels of traffic growth and improving walking, cycling and public transport provision will be very hard to achieve without policies which encourage less car use and help to enhance provision of and investment in more sustainable modes. What policies should Hertfordshire consider adopting to achieve this?**

1. Widespread introduction of 20 mph speed limits
2. Safe cycle networks for all towns
3. Restrict commuter parking in town centres
4. Car parking charges at out of town shopping centres
5. Make town centres traffic free
6. In new developments with easy access to town centres and public transport do not provide parking spaces for cars.
7. Make more streets in urban areas access only except for walking and cycling
8. Road user charging (or congestion charging)
9. Ban diesel vehicles in the inner areas of towns.
10. Trial car exclusion zones around schools at school start and finish times as is being trialled in Edinburgh

*John Metcalf*  
Chair, CycleHerts

December 2016