

**LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES – ISSUES AND PREFERRED OPTIONS
CONSULTATION: response from Guildford Bike User Group (G-BUG) July 2020**

Contact: Doug Clare, Chair, G-BUG, doug.clare@g-bug.org, cc.n.burke@g-bug.org

References:

1. ‘Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies; Issues, Options and Preferred Options’ June 2020 – referred to as ‘DMP’
2. ‘Guildford Cycle Route Assessments’ by Transport Initiatives LLP & Urban Movement – referred to as ‘The TI/UM Report’, and the network as ‘the TI/UM Network’
3. SCC Guildford Cycling Plan – referred to as ‘the SCC Plan’

Question 37: Do you support the preferred option to address achieving a comprehensive Guildford Borough Cycle Network (Policy ID10)?

Yes, G-BUG strongly supports the preferred option ie TI/UM Network combined with the SCC plan, over the alternative option, ie just the SCC Plan.

The TI/UM proposed network is based on a thorough evidence-based professional analysis, and will provide a network which will serve the growing need and demand for safe active travel within Guildford town.

The SCC Plan makes provision for much-needed routes across the wider borough, which was not within the Terms of Reference for the TI/UM study. (NB With electric bikes, people are prepared to cycle longer distances, which will increase the importance of borough-wide and inter-borough links. G-BUG aspiration is for segregated cycle lanes along all A-roads connecting Guildford to neighbouring towns and villages.)

The SCC Plan proposes only a very limited network within the town: this is amply rectified by the TI/UM Network, but the SCC Plan does include a few additional routes within the town which could usefully be added to make the combined network.

Other Comments and Suggestions

The network maps given in the consultation document are a useful ‘shorthand’, but all the measures in the TI/UM Report should be referenced in the policies, in particular:

- Meeting best standards for cycle infrastructure;
- Introducing low traffic neighbourhoods with 20mph speed limits, modal filters etc;
- Providing sufficient and secure cycle parking (cycle parking is also addressed by Question 38, but the TI/UM Feasibility Report provides much more detailed recommendations.)
- Integration with the proposed town-wide bike share scheme (eg docking stations);
- Recognising the priorities defined in the Report, for example providing cyclists with safe routes across the town centre, especially the gyratory;
- Providing wayfinding and signposting.

The DMP makes reference to the Guildford Godalming Greenway: for the avoidance of doubt, this must be explicitly included in the network plans.

The policy should include developing, as part of the network, safe cycling routes to schools, in order to encourage children to cycle to school, which will improve children’s health and reduce traffic congestion.

Comments and suggestions about other questions

Question 37 is obviously our main concern. Other Questions which touch upon cycling, and upon which we have comments and suggestions about the preferred options, are addressed below.

Question 22: River Wey Corridor

The option requires *“developments to seek to provide publicly accessible riverside walkways and/or cycle routes to enhance the vitality of the riverside”* and *“requires improvement of access to and from the river itself by foot, bicycle”*.

Also add: provide or contribute to more or better pedestrian and cycle crossings of the River, and to improving the towpath surface, with a long-term durable surface across the Borough. (The towpath can provide a greenway through the town. The surface has been improved from the town centre to Woking Road, but this is already breaking up.)

Question 23: Sustainable and low impact development

The option should include the need for, and key role of, providing sustainable transport options, with cross-reference to Policy ID10.

Question 38: Parking standards

The Option references SCC *“non-statutory Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)”* and includes *“Define minimum cycle parking standards for both new residential and non-residential developments across the whole borough.”* Details in Table 6.

The option should also specify that cycle parking should be secure and convenient: too often cycle parking is some way from the premises, in a vulnerable location. Fear of theft can be a strong disincentive for using a bike, especially more expensive models such as e-bikes.

A more radical policy should be adopted to remove car parking bays on busy roads, in order to provide more space for cycleways and reduce the accident risk to cyclists (eg ‘car-dooring’).

A policy should be added to enable ‘Park and Cycle’ from Park and Ride sites, by providing bike hire stations and making sure P&R sites are connected to the town centre by safe cycling routes.

Other questions including cycling

Several other questions include requirements relating to cycling. We support these requirements, as summarised below.

Question 19: Public Realm: Option calls for public realm projects to *“enhance connectivity for pedestrians and cycle movement”*

Question 20: Residential Intensification: Option includes requirement *“Proposals involving ‘back-land’ development must avoid long, narrow and isolated access points, such developments should create a positive ‘street’ entrance establishing a sense of identity and encouraging pedestrian and cycle traffic into and out of the site”* and *“Encourage pedestrian/cycle links to key village facilities”*

Question 33: Open space in new developments: Option includes *“Open spaces are expected to support and enhance the existing rights of way network, providing new footpaths and cycle links where possible, with regard to the Council’s identified opportunities for high quality walking and cycling networks (see Policy ID10)....”*

Question 34: Sport recreation and leisure facilities: Option requires that developments must *“support and enhance the existing rights of way network, providing new footpaths and cycle links where possible with reference to Policy ID10: Cycle Networks”*

Question 35: Community facilities: Option states that facilities must be *“located and designed so that they can be conveniently accessed via public transport, walking and cycling”*