

Comments on County Durham Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2019-2029	
1	<p>Will this lead to cycle routes that come into East Durham.</p> <p>All of your consultation so far seems to have been with Key partners from Durham city and south durham with no input from East Durham - Durham City cycling Forum and the like. I have been involved with Cylce UK and British cycling / Breeze for nearly 2 years and this is the 1st I heard of the plan.</p> <p>You mention you will be monitoring at sites ? - which sites - what the plan.</p> <p>Where is Park view school?</p> <p>Your intention is to instal cycle stands - but what we need is cycle cafes and areas in doors - I for one wouldnt leave a £3 grand bike outside of a council run leisure centre with a cycle stand that isnt even bolted to the ground...</p> <p>You should really check out Manchester and look at their cycle network to how how they handle it.</p>
2	<p>I applaud Durham County Council on its endeavours to make cycling and walking part of Durham's culture and to make them safe, affordable, enjoyable, everyday modes of transport for everyone. However, as Consett is one of the 12 identified towns for a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan I would like to bring your attention to an issue which needs to be taken into account as you develop the plan. A local person has been in contact with me to say that he cannot walk safely into Consett unaccompanied as there is no way he can cross the Villa Real roundabout as a visually impaired person and tells me that there are 3 other people he knows with similar views. That does not take into account other people living in the village with impaired hearing and vision. I as a dog walker use our Coast to Coast national cycle route and as an able bodied fit person I find it frightening at times trying to cross the ring road - more often at Villa Real than the others and I am concerned for any cyclists.</p> <p>Not being able to cross the ring road easily and safely does not have a fit with the overall Aims of the Strategy which are to: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan and provide high quality cycling and walking networks that are safe and usable for more people. 2. Manage and protect the cycling and walking network to ensure quality of experience for users. 3. Encourage and enable greater participation in cycling and walking across all demographic groups. <p>With the building of 290 new homes in Leadgate (County Durham Plan) there will be even more pressure put on our village roads and thus the ring road so under your Objective 3 where you will ensure cycling and walking infrastructure is better planned and embedded in planning policy to influence development management decisions – in particular your Action 4 where you will require that new developments and new roads include best practice pedestrian and cycling routes which are direct, well designed and permeable, take priority over motor traffic and are well connected to surrounding networks. How this is happening?</p> <p>In the development of the Plan can you say:- What traffic safety measures will be put in place to ensure the safety of walkers, cyclists and those with physical, visual or hearing impairment? What groups have you consulted with who are made up of or support people with various impairments?</p> <p>I believe we need pedestrian crossings with appropriate signals to enable all demographic groups of people, whether impaired or able bodied, walkers or bicycle users to cross the roads safely. If we want healthier communities through walking and cycling we need to ensure their safety and as your document quotes:- "It is unreasonable to expect people to change their behaviours when the environment discourages such changes" Schmid and colleagues 1995.</p>
3	<p>Well yet again equestrian have been ignored.. I am both. But sometimes ashamed to call myself a cyclist. There are a lot of so called 'serious cyclists who think it's ok to mow people down.. And be told on one or more occasions " this is the National c...</p>
4	<p>I would gently and politely suggest that you (planners, implementers et al), if you don't already cycle around Durham as a commute or for shopping or whatever, try doing so and you'll see very quickly what needs to be changed. If you feel you can't for any reason then your reasons will be the same as anybody else's reasons. What would it take to get YOU cycling to work/ the shops/whatever?</p>
5	<p>Although not directly linked to your Cycling and Walking Plan I would like to relate an issue that would go some way to helping with the delivery of the plan.</p> <p>On the XXXX my wife and I parked at the Howlands Park & Ride and walked into Durham. This ensured that we weren't increasing the vehicle traffic through the city and at the same time we were both able to get some much needed exercise. We returned to the carpark in the Park & Ride bus to find a parking ticket on the windscreen of the car. The reason for the ticket was because of incorrect use of the carpark. Instead of parking and riding we had parked and walked.</p>

	<p>To encourage people to walk more and use the car less I think it would a good idea to allow a more flexible approach as to how park & ride are controlled. This change could be integrated into the councils Cycling & Walking Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Happily my parking ticket was cancelled on appeal</p>
6	<p>The draft plan is a competent and well crafted plan however:</p> <p>It is not proactive enough in suggesting ways to reduce the public perception that cycling is high risk in live traffic on the highway as opposed to designated cycle tracks.</p> <p>one of these perceived risks is the alleged incidents and injury to cyclists and damage to machines occasioned by potholes on the carriageway, I note there is no pothole data in the appropriate section of the draft plan.</p> <p>I suggest therefore an addition:</p> <p>“The county plan recognising the hazard to cyclists by potholes and introduces a commitment to repair all potholes identified that occur within two meters of the kerb line within 5 working days of the carriageway failure being recorded with the highway action line service.”</p> <p>such a measure I believe will go some way to improving public confidence in cycling safety and improve the carriageway surface in a way targeted at cyclists as apposed to motorised transport.</p>
7	<p>I think that a proposal to use the rail track between West Auckland and Barnard Castle is perhaps part of what you had in mind with an extension behind GSK[Glaxosmithkline] to Harmire Road via the Leisure Centre.</p> <p>See what you think of this.</p>
8	<p>I contacted Durham CC last year regarding the state of the linking track between Sedgefield and NCN 1 at Wynyard which is in a disgraceful state and hampered by very poor signage and badly sited crossing points. The whole track needs resurfacing as a matter of urgency and the crossing points resited or preferably retrofitted with traffic lights.</p> <p>I know that there is a trigger point with development at Wynyard for the track to be extended to the A689 at Wolviston at the expense of developers, but I feel sure that Durham can work with Stockton and Hartlepool authorities to provide a continuous, high quality link to the NCN and beyond for South Durham and Teesside. I am certain the route would be popular allowing residents of Billingham to access Sedgefield and East Durham along the NCN, as well as providing safe access to Teesside for the residents of the Sedgefield area.</p> <p>In view of two recent serious accidents involving cyclists along what is a very busy road, I feel that improvement work should be a matter of high importance.</p>
9	<p>In reply to the Strategic Cycling and Walking Strategy, as a walker and cyclist, It is great to hear that this is being explored in the area.</p> <p>I also feel it is vital that these plans involve more than Durham City.</p> <p>I live in XXXXXX and it is increasingly difficult to find safe places to do either.</p> <p>Public footpaths are becoming unusable, there was a great footpath in XXXXXX that leads through fields into the neighbouring village, this is now annually ploughed by the farmer, and is virtually unusable most of the yea, either for walking or off road cycling. This is just one example of the issue in this area, and there are numerous other example that could be recited.</p> <p>Foot Paths between villages are becoming over grown, both rural paths and and those on the road side, even on the route to and around the larger village of Sedgefield, paths are broken, over grown and in desperate need of repair . They are uncomfortable to use as solo and physically able walker, this is even more difficult for anyone with a push chair or walking difficulties. There are no cycle paths in this area and back roads are becoming more overgrown and more narrow by the year- so existing routes need focus before new routes are planned.</p> <p>I appreciate that this is a huge unmaking, but could be an easy win to make it easier for these routes to be used.</p> <p>We have several county counsellors in this area who must be aware of this, as these issues are on their doorstep and easy to see, and it would be great to think that these area could be improved as part of the strategy.</p> <p>Durham City is currently receiving a huge amount of focus, but out lying villages are being left behind, and this is having a significant impact on the lives of residents in these areas, and in turn their health and ability to enjoy out door leisure time, coupled with poor public transport networks, it is not a great position to be in.</p> <p>I have walked and cycled in many parts the UK, and if you could study areas in Scotland, such as Aviemore and the Highlands, these are a fantastic examples of how these provisions can be planned and implemented. Visit Scotland is a fantastic set up, which Durham could utilise as a example. Routes are well planned and joined up, they are really well sign posted and route marked, routes for off road cycling are kept separate from the main roads where possible, this means safe walking and cycling for all, and brings attention away from the road side and onto the joy of being outdoors, and away from the pollution.</p>

	<p>Focus should be on walking and cycling, and not focusing on adding things on to existing roads etc. which will lead to a less than joined up approach. One footpath through Trimdon Village was widened with the aim of being used for cycling, however it does not go anywhere, just for 1/2 mile through 1 village, which is why things need to be well considered.</p> <p>On visiting cycling friendly areas, and seeing networks well signed, it lets people know that you are welcome to walk and cycle, which makes people want to get out and about more.</p> <p>I really hope that Durham is able to produce strategy that tick all of these boxes, and makes Durham a leader in this area, I and many of my friends, would really appreciate and healthier & happier County Durham.</p>
10	<p>I've just read through the plan and it is very impressive.</p> <p>From a strategical perspective, the creation of safe routes for cycling and walking will allow a diversity of personal transport not just the headlined cycling and walking but other forms of personal transport which are important and more highly accessible than cars such as mobility scooters and different forms of powered wheels including electric bikes. These will become increasingly common and important as forms of transport. So, even if a route is not used highly immediately as long as it connects places between which people want to travel it is likely to be used in the future.</p> <p>A major barrier to cycling is its all year sustainability. Constructing paths to minimise the effect of weather on them and having other forms of transport available (other than going by car) mean that people are more likely to stick with cycling, and return to cycling after swapping it for another form of transport in poor weather.</p> <p>I cycle around XXXXXXXX regularly both to get to work and to get to other places both alone and with kids. My major issues are parking in the centre of town and not having a good route between Nevilles Cross and the centre of town.</p>
11	<p>I would like to give my opinion on the Plan about Cycling & Walking Networks around County Durham.</p> <p>Although there are many Footbaths and Cyclepaths/byways/bridleways around County Durham, I do think everyone would be benefiting from alot more of these networks that are further away from main roads but linking up to nearby town and other networks to create a wider range of footpaths/byways/bridleways and also to reduce the possibility of accidents and harmful effects of pollution to people who choose to walk or cycle in the area. These are my opinions as a cyclist who rides a mountain bike to keep fit and as a hobby.</p>
12	<p>Found out about this consultation in the local newspaper and I am very encouraged and enthusiastic. I have commuted to various work locations for many years covering on average 60 miles per week. Whenever there was a trip which involved some cycle structure such as the cycle/walking lane between Aycliffe rail station and Shildon I had not a care in the world; it was a joy to go to work! Where I have to compete with dogmatic and entrenched car drivers between XXXXXXXX, I have to keep my wits about me.</p> <p>I think this is a long term project. It's not just about paint on the road. It's a culture change, education and investment in infrastructure.</p> <p>I'm ready for the long haul.</p>
13	<p>The reply button on the page didn't work so can you please forward this as a comment.</p> <p>Durham City Centre ought to be petrol/diesel vehicle free – maybe with the exception of buses.</p> <p>This would inconvenience me personally – I have free parking at the XXXXXX – BUT would solve the air pollution problems in the city at a stroke & stop annoying tourists & students from threatening life and limb by performing bizarre manoeuvres on busy city streets, especially North Road!</p> <p>Let's keep Durham City centre for pedestrians & bikes, as long as the cyclists respect the rights of pedestrians.</p> <p>I live beside a cycle path/bridle way/footpath & cyclists can be quite dangerous as often they seem to think THEY have more importance than horses or pedestrians. We need a code – based on good manners – so horses & cyclists go single file when it is appropriate to do so & DON'T think they have precedence over us humble walkers!</p> <p>Thanks from a humble pedestrian</p>

14	<p>The strategy focuses on cycling rather than walking. Although I recognise that the infrastructure needs of cyclists may be greater (but if there is money also for walking the poor state of some of the County's footpaths could be considered), I feel that the problems of combining walking and cycling paths should be taken into account. In particular, the safety of walkers on these dual-use paths should be given a higher priority. For example, cyclists using these paths should be encouraged to have bells and understand when to use them. They should also understand what speeds are sensible on such paths and to respect the use by walkers.</p>
15	<p>I would like to facilitate some promotion for our club and would welcome some input or ideally some kind of publicity for our club. Is there somewhere we can promote the benefits of joining the club? This would be a good opportunity to support your initiative on cycling and walking in the county and also signpost interested people in the benefits of walking with our walking club.</p>
16	<p>I am delighted to support this delivery plan However there needs to be a lot of thought into giving better access to bus services in rural areas so walkers without cars can reach these places especially at weekends, I live in an area were there is no bus service on Sundays (taxi fare over £8) to get to nearest town .as for cyclists the main roads are full of pot holes, as are the bye roads ,cars are parked on footpaths and block cycle lanes and nothing is done about this. I look forward with interest to see how Durham is going to tackle these issues.</p>
17	<p>I've read through the documents and have a couple of comments which may not be at the high strategic level for this process but perhaps worth considering (and apologies if these points are covered and I have missed them.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Winter presents particualr problems for cyclists and pedestrians as there is very little clearing of snow and ice on footways and cycleways which are not part of the carriageway. It would be good to have some plan for dealing with this. How can DCC improve its "maintenance" of these routes in this situation. While it may not be many weeks of the year that this is an issue, it nonetheless has a major effect on those who are infirm or physically disabled. - Inspection of pedestrian and cycle routes should take into account sharing, i.e. a cycle route may include carriageway sections. Those inspecting highways may tend to ignore defects and features that will affect cyclists in particular and if it is not the case already, this needs to be something inspectors are trained to take into account. The types of issues I mean are poor surface quality adjacent to kerblines, inappropriate gully location or profile etc.
18	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2028.</p> <p>Please find attached a response from the CLA.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries regarding our response or if you would like any further input into this strategy.</p> <p>The CLA which represents 30,000 farmers, landowners and rural businesses across England and Wales welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation.</p> <p><u>Objectives</u></p> <p>2: We will record the cycling and walking networks. It is useful for both network users and land owners that all routes are accurately recorded and marked. Farmers and landowners report numerous challenges when routes are recorded inaccurately or inadequately. This can cause issues such as network users becoming disorientated and straying onto private land which brings with it a safety risk, specifically land which is used to house or graze livestock, and the disturbance of nesting birds or wildlife. It is vital that, wherever possible all recording of the network is 'stress tested' for accuracy and adequacy with the landowner before publication.</p> <p>5: We will build high quality cycling and walking networks and include cycle parking. CLA would not support the creation of additional routes across private land without the agreement of the landowner. Instead investment should be focussed on the maintenance and improvement of existing routes. CLA would not support the upgrading of footpaths to bridleways unless this is as a direct request from the landowner. Network continuation must also be taken into account, for instance a bridleway must not end abruptly at a footpath as this could encourage users to misuse the footpath network.</p> <p>6: We will operate the networks to maximise safety for users. The safety of landowners and the smooth operation of their businesses must also be a consideration under this objective. For example, network users should be encouraged, through signage, to use footpaths and bridleways responsibly and recognise that the countryside is a working environment. Specific challenges faced by CLA members include livestock worrying, stock straying due to gates being left open, members of the public straying onto private land (or allowing their pets to stray) and biological challenges from dog fouling.</p> <p>11: We will engage and inspire communities, clubs, schools and businesses.</p> <p>12: We will provide training and education to staff and the public.</p> <p>13: We will promote cycling and walking and motivate participation through a variety of schemes.</p> <p>14: We will encourage participation.</p>

	<p>All of the four objectives above (11-14) must include an element of how to use the network in a responsible manner as defined in the Countryside Code of Conduct. For instance, education on the challenges of livestock worrying and how pet owners have a legal responsibility to ensure their pet is under control in a public space. Emphasis should also be put on the need to follow the designated routes and not to stray, or allow pets to stray, onto private land.</p> <p>This type of campaign should not simply be a 'do not do this' message, but one which highlights the risk to livestock, crops, the environment and network users if they stray onto private land. The Countryside Code can be found online here https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-countryside-code/the-countryside-code</p>
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a general point this has to be very much welcomed in order to help place walking and cycling as key modes of travel, especially for journeys of 5 miles or less. I feel that the plan is well laid out and shows the keys areas in terms of building blocks in a well presented format. • Actions relating to recording and obtaining data are important and very much welcomed both for yourselves and to assist other areas wishing to develop infrastructure. As you well know funders want to see increased outputs for their money! • Requiring that new roads include for other forms of transport (objective 3.4) is important I feel – so that they become new 'transport networks'. There are projects I'm trying to advance here where I do feel at time 'shouldn't this have been done originally'! • Although it may be subject to a lot of debate I don't know if there's a place for more far reaching planning tools in Objective 4. In particular 20mph zones and cycle priority streets. I think Nottingham have advanced the latter. • In the cycle parking objective 5 could 'secure' be added as this is often the issue. We're looking a couple of projects at the moment that will install cycle lockers rather than normal stands. These have the additional benefit of not being able to see the contents. • For the training side of things – objective 12 – I'd include adult cycle training including learn to ride and Bikeability. Although its primarily offered as a children's activity we do offer Bikeability for Adults – urban riding skills (Bikeability Level 3 in effect). I do feel that this is important as whilst infrastructure improvements will make a difference in order to 'normalise' cycling for everyday journeys cyclists will have to use the road network as well as new cycle tracks. Linked with policies such as 20mph zones and priority walking/cycling streets it is a case of utilising and making the most of the existing network. • On objective 14 encouraging participation as well and facilities it may be helpful to encourage employers to positively welcome cycling. This could include workplace pool-bike schemes and also challenging the way cycling as transport is viewed when it is seen to be just a form of driving. In this way there may be an expectation that for cycling in the course of work you should have insurance, a bike MoT, appropriate safety clothing and an appropriate qualification! Whilst these are clearly robust measures procedural-wise I feel its unlikely to increase numbers, change travel behaviours and 'normalise' cycling.
20	<p>Hello I cycle and have lived in the village for 30 plus years and during this time there has been no meaningful cycle paths built in the village itself unlike the rest of the county where I have watched many separate paths built The cycle path to Wynyard A689 has never been maintained since it was built There are no connections traffic free from Winterton to local schools and so the roads are choked by the school run This will be increased by traffic from Eden Gardens which will make the roads more dangerous Sedgefield will become spoiled like Yarm and Stokesley that's why I am moving away.</p>
21	<p>I wanted to drop a line to largely applaud the strategic cycling and walking delivery plan. I'm also very pleased to see that Shildon is one of the main towns receiving some focus.</p> <p>I enjoy both walking and cycling, and see also that the intention to develop walking routes can also be of benefit to runners and joggers, particularly given the trend that many have adopted to run with earphones/buds which to me raises a safety concern that the runner is not as aware of other factors in their environment such as traffic approaching. The Locomotion Way, that has already been developed, is an excellent example of a popular and safe route.</p> <p>I feel, for what my opinion is worth, that the biggest paradigm shift to be achieved (and perhaps the biggest challenge) is the idea that you can travel by bicycle 'for a purpose' rather than just for the joy and the exercise. On my own part though I enjoy cycling for fun and exercise I (and my perception is many others too) am reluctant to park the bike and leave it for any period of time for fear of it being stolen or even damaged if secured. It's not the latest and greatest, but nor is it quite a scruffy old rattler. Many of the cyclists I see out do seem to have invested a bit of money and pride in their bikes, and bikes themselves do seem to draw attention (mine though it's not that flash has attracted comments from kids when I've been out, and on one trip out with my other half a BMW full of lads in their twenties drew up and said they wanted hers, again not that expensive but a bright colour)</p> <p>This is probably an irrational concern, after all we park our cars and walk away generally confident of everything being well on our return, but this confidence does not extend to our bikes. I wonder though whether this could be changed if at the main 'go to' places in our county there were 'attended' locations to park bikes - even if that had to be for a small fee. I'm thinking the main town centres and Durham plus encourage tourist spots to do the same. Perhaps if that way we can be persuaded to leave the bike somewhere in the knowledge that at least someone is keeping an eye on it, we might become more confident in that principle and start using the bikes for more than just a Sunday ride out, and get used to the idea that just because the bike is out of site doesn't mean someone's busy dismantling it. Maybe drawing attention to availability of cycle insurance might help as well.</p>

	<p>The need highlighted in the plan for cycle parking is a key one, and for commuting I completely agree that if employers do not provide changing/showering facilities it becomes impractical.</p> <p>I also agree with the intention in the plan to map the routes comprehensively. I usually try to use the Sustrans map or app if planning a long ride out, particularly factoring in stretches that are traffic free (I'm OK with traffic but the traffic free stretches are far more enjoyable). There are many routes that I know of that are not represented on the Sustrans map (probably on account of not being part of the official National Cycle Network - though there are probably some great opportunities to add to the NCN, and be recognised on the map such as the old road parallel to the B6444 between Heighington and Heighington Station.</p>
22	<p>The above draft delivery plan was considered by Winston Parish Council at its most recent meeting on 9th August 2018. Parish Councillors request that the old railway line footpath between West Auckland and Barnard Castle be included in the County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2028.</p>
23	<p>Thank you for allowing Northumberland County Council the opportunity to comment on Durham's Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan. Firstly I would like to support your ambitions as set out in the plan and congratulate Durham CC on its efforts to further support walking and cycling as modes of active travel.</p> <p>We note that you are developing LCWIPs for your main towns and would be happy to be involved with these if any cross border issues arise, Northumberland CC also intend to develop LCWIPs for the main towns. We also note that your plan outlines how you intend to fully embrace the LCWIP process with the outcomes being integrated into your Cycling and Walking Plan and we agree that this would be very important moving forward.</p> <p>It was also positive to see that travel planning and smarter choices actions, including actions relating to the Councils own activities, school travel activities and new developments and we support your proposed infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>We were however surprised that there was not greater importance placed on electric bikes and bike share / bike hire schemes and we would be interested to understand further the reasoning behind this decision.</p> <p>Once again many thanks for giving us the opportunity to comment on your document</p>
24	<p>Reading through the plans i do like the idea of the 'Great North Cycleway'.</p> <p>Also i would like to suggest a few pointers as I've used the cycle paths quite a bit lately and i would highlight the following in order of importance from the top:</p> <p>Car parks - These are currently very well placed around the cycle routes and all i would recommend is that they remain free.</p> <p>Maintenance (broken glass/ overhanging trees) - Periodic checks should be made to ensure they safe and maintained.</p> <p>Joining up networks - It would be great if it was possible somehow to link the Bishop Auckland/Spennymoor route to any of the main network would be excellent. Same with any unjoined paths such as the new Locomotion path.</p> <p>Signposting - I have found this is much better in the Tyne & Wear area and sometimes can result in wrong turns in County Durham so could be improved.</p> <p>Improving dirt tracks - The tracks that run from Wynyard to Seaham are pretty bad. It's not a great route and is probably an example of some which could be improved.</p> <p>More cycle paths / shared paths - This would be useful to allow an even bigger network</p> <p>gpx maps of network - GPX routing would aid in people wishing to look at the routes</p>
25	<p>I am a enthusiastic cyclist and walker. I would be very willing to help develop local cycling and walking routes and activities.</p> <p>Newton Aycliffe as part of the new towns act had its public foot paths temporarily removed, in the rush to sell the Development Agency the new paths and bridleways were not then added to the OS maps. The town is very well provided with internal footpaths and some bridleways, however most are un-mapped.</p>

	<p>Actions I believe DCC could help with are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the current paths and bridleway to the OS maps for all to use. 2. Finish the proposed (30 years ago) Bridleway to the north of Newton Aycliffe around the golf club. 3. Reinstate the street lights on Burnhill Way (North) between Woodham Way and the Golf Club to improve safety and encourage walking form this place of leisure and the residents of the town. 4. Provide secure cycle storage at the Newton Aycliffe Leisure Centre, I have to drive their because there is no cycle storage. 5. Make the Great Aycliffe Way a Bridleway for its entire length both long and shorter. 6. Radially connect the Town Centre to this part at numerous points via traffic free routes. 7. Provide an arterial traffic free walking and cycle route from the town centre through the industrial park for commuters. 8. Connect Newton Aycliffe with traffic free routes to the local traffic free cycle routes at Bishop Auckland, Sedgefield and Darlington. 9. Connect the local footpaths outside of the town to the footpaths on the town. 10. Review the safety for the current road side cycleways that are either too narrow or on narrow roars.
26	<p>I think this is an excellent idea. I am an active xxxxxxxx who participates in triathlons. My key concern is about safety.</p> <p>There are several places around Aycliffe where I am no longer able to walk in the evenings because the street lights have been removed e.g. between the Woodham housing estate and Ryder Court and on the road from Newton Aycliffe (Oak leaf Leisure centre) to School Aycliffe. I am sure there are other examples.</p> <p>I find cycling around Newton Aycliffe daunting and stressful for a number of reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some instances the cycle lanes are too narrow e.g. from Ryder Court roundabout to Burnhill Way/Burn Lane roundabout. Also the traffic calming bollards encourage some (not all) drivers to squeeze along side you. • There are a significant number of pot holes and very uneven road surfaces where roads have been patched especially at the edge of the road. This leaves a choice of risking being thrown off the bike or moving into the middle of the road annoying car drivers. In some instances the top dressing has left a very uneven road surface which is unpleasant to ride on e.g. Walworth Road (I accept this is Darlington). • The cycle lanes often give priority to cars requiring the Cyclist to dismount push their bike round the corner. This is inconvenient and not practical if you are training for an event. • I would like to be able to cycle to the Leisure centre but there is nowhere to secure my bike. We really need secure boxes outside or a dedicated area inside.
27	<p>The document reads well and presents a logical approach to framing the issues, opportunities and challenges around walking and cycling provision. I think evidence from behaviour change approaches suggests however, that people are not nearly as rational as we all, perhaps, would like to think we are. The documents seem to imply a strong relationship between the improvement and promotion of the network and increased 'participation'. Again, evidence from the sport and physical activity sector would tend to suggest, I believe, that there is such a link, but that it is much stronger within those people already participating.</p> <p>I note the Conclusion in the Evidence Base document states "<i>For the individual cycling and walking bring freedom, joy, fitness, independence and a cheap and effective way of getting from A to B</i>", and as a cyclist myself, I would agree with that. I wonder though, if I were not a cyclist or frequent walker would that statement resonate with me, or would I see things in a different light? And what would be the potential impact of other related issues on my likelihood of cycling for example – cost of appropriate (wet weather/winter) clothing; my (in)ability to mend a puncture; an employer's possible response to arriving late at work because of one; availability of secure and covered cycle parking; showers and changing facilities; one's own perception of capability to cycle the distance to work; etc.?</p> <p>In terms of the social ecological model to behaviour change then, I'm not sure how far the delivery plan has adopted a 'whole system' approach to addressing the issues and challenges of the potential cyclist/walker – and my lack of engagement to date may account for this, so apologies if this is so? The strategy has a strong focus on the physical environment element of the model, but there seems less emphasis in the delivery plan on the other 'layers' in the system. I note in Building Block 3 Objective 11, the Action Plan states you will "<i>Work with cycling and walking groups....</i>" but I'm less clear how many non-cyclists/walkers have been engaged to date in developing the plan. My sense is, for those not currently cycling/walking, understanding and addressing the determinants of their current inactivity will be a key first step.</p>
28	<p>I am a keen cyclist and walker, and a car owner and driver.</p> <p>My key point is that I strongly oppose the approach of prioritising cyclists and walkers over motorists. Having cars standing around and waiting for cyclists while throwing off emissions is bad for the environment, and it is inappropriate to inconvenience the majority of travellers for the sake of a few cyclists and walkers. I strongly suggest that all travellers should have equal priority and car users should not be discriminated against.</p>

I am appalled to see only 720 prosecutions for obstruction from 2012-15 compared to 29,705 prosecutions for excess speeding. I live close to a school with serious congestion around opening and closing caused by parents driving their kids to school. Blatant illegal parking happens daily. The Council's solution was to introduce a ludicrous 20mph speed limit over most of the main roads in town, which has not addressed the problem in any way whatsoever and was a total waste of taxpayers' money. I struggle to believe that there were 29,705 dangerous drivers, but suspect they are just easier targets for cash than those blatantly parking illegally next to schools. This is the issue to address if more walking to school is to be encouraged. It's also key to strongly push parents to enrol their kids at the closest school - some live too far away to walk through their own choice.

Cycling and walking are great recreational activities to fill spare time and get a work out, but for the vast majority of people, they are not feasible ways of getting to work, especially in bad weather. If you are a factory floor worker working a mile or two from home, cycling to work may be a good option. If you are a clerical worker, you are unlikely to want to arrive at work covered in spray from the road, and oil from the chain (worse if you have had to replace the chain, or had a puncture - you can't call out the AA or RAC to do it for you), and stinking of sweat, possibly soaking wet. You will need to dress twice - cycling clothes at home, office clothes at work, after a shower at work. You may have to dry off your cycling clothes and/or bike - and you will need to change back into your cycling clothes later to return home, where you will probably change clothes again! You may be working an 8 hour day and have family to look after. You don't have time for all this! Is it any wonder that more men than women cycle to work? Of course not! Most women (and men, but especially women) want to use their own facilities to get ready for work, not a communal shower. They will want to put on their make up, do their hair etc in front of their own mirror etc.

So, there is a place for cycling to work, but to expect huge numbers to do it is pie in the sky, and focus should be on ensuring there is good, cheap public transport and good roads and workplace parking so that drivers are not wasting fuel, giving off emissions finding a place to park.

It's also pie in the sky to expect all but the keenest cyclists to travel more than a few miles to work, especially as this is an undulating county - not the Netherlands, Belgium or Denmark - and cycling is a strenuous activity for many people.

Safety is rightly a key strand of the draft plan, but cycling carries obvious dangers, notably of falling off, especially in icy conditions. The risk is greater for older people, yet more of these are being encouraged to cycle. Some will be able to cycle, but many won't - many older people are in fact moving onto disabled scooters, which are themselves a risk to pedestrians, but quite necessary for many otherwise house bound people.

There is also the problem of bikes (especially kids' bikes) being left outside shop entrances, which often represent a serious trip hazard.

The claim that walkers and cyclists spend more at shops than car users is very hard to believe, and I have to question this claim - most of the people I know do their main grocery shopping in their cars, as this is the best and healthiest way to transport large numbers of bags which need to be got home before the frozen goods defrost.

I have used the Locomotion Way once since it was surfaced, and there were a few users on it, but I also used it before it was surfaced, and there were people using it then too, so it is probably unfair to imply that an additional 1,250 people are using it each week. It is a good route, however, and a welcome development, but whether it was best use of taxpayers' money is another matter. This applies moreso to a number of routes in the County, which often look great and are good when you use them, but they don't appear to have much use at all, certainly not as much use as one would think would be justified by the likely expenditure (£2.7M on infrastructure from 2012-15 is a significant sum for a few users, and this will need to be maintained at further cost - but at least it is a long term investment).

29 I fully support the objectives of the plan and hope that it can be fully carried through.

My main comments in relation to cycling infrastructure are :

The network should be of a high quality so it can be used in all weather conditions. At the moment the picture is mixed, especially along some of the reclaimed railway tracks, they become a mud bath during winter and wet weather.

They virtually become unrideable at times and discourage use.

They need to be smooth with a sealed surface, asphalt definitely preferred.

Routes into the city centre need to be continuous and well marked.

Where there are on road routes these should be marked clearly with cycle lanes and preferably have a distinguishing colour.

If necessary reallocate road space if this is practical.

If there are shared paths they should be wide enough to have segregation between cyclists and pedestrians.

A programme of driver education would be useful to reduce cyclist/motorist conflict.

A promotional programme for the general public and schools should be considered to encourage more cycling and walking.

More people walking and cycling can only be beneficial to everyone, healthier, reducing congestion, reducing pollution and noise and making for a much pleasanter environment.

30	<p>I'm writing to you on behalf of the Teesdale Action Partnership (TAP) Board in response to the Consultation on The County Durham Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018 – 2028.</p> <p>The TAP Board acknowledges the significant work that has gone into preparing the Delivery Plan. The TAP Board also recognises that the Plan will provide a 'robust' document that will build upon current and planned economic activity within County Durham.</p> <p>The Aims and Vision of the Plan we acknowledge in seeking to ensure that County Durham will continue to be widely recognised as a cycling and walking friendly County. We also recognise that the quality of people's lives and their health and wellbeing will continue to be improved.</p> <p>The Action Plan Tables set out as objectives in this document, are we feel, clearer in their design than they were in the previous document</p> <p>The Plan outlines, throughout the document, that emphasis will be placed on the provision of supporting infrastructure. The TAP Board would like to stress, that in order to achieve this aim and ultimately have the required impact on the rural economy (tourism as an example) key infrastructure needs to be improved, or in place, within Teesdale to accommodate this aim.</p> <p>The previous County Durham Plan document Submission Draft Local Plan Tracked Changes April 2014 under the heading 'Cycling Super Routs and Secondary Routes', states in paragraph 9.43 page 216 <i>'The Cycling Strategy and Action Plan for County Durham 2012-15 specifically sets out the ambition of delivering Cycle Super Routes within and between the 12 main towns.'</i> <i>'These include the safeguarded route between Barnard Castle and Bishop Auckland, which is intended not to be simply a cycle way but a multi-user route incorporating green infrastructure and bringing ecological and biodiversity benefits.'</i></p> <p>We are requesting that the reference to the safeguarded route between Barnard Castle and Bishop Auckland is introduced in the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018 – 2028 adding after 'biodiversity benefits' 'providing a safe and attractive route serving both residents and visitors to the area'.</p>
31	<p>I refer to the Consultation in respect of this document and to Policy 25 in the Preferred Options for the County Durham Plan. I have made representations on behalf of the Club in respect of this proposed Policy and attach a copy of my letter to the Spatial Policy Team for your information.</p> <p>Clearly, the proposal to have a Strategic Delivery Plan is welcome. However, at present, as far as I can see, there is no map to define the various cycle routes. It is not clear therefore that any routes can yet be "safeguarded" within the proposed Policy 25. Indeed, I note the Delivery Plan states maps will be produced for the 12 main towns – see Objective 3. I think I must ask when they will be produced so that they can form a part of the final Durham Plan.</p> <p>As is mentioned in the letter to Spatial Policy, the south east of the county has had a considerable amount of significant development in the past few years. Integra61 at Bowburn and NETPark at Sedgefield are major employment sites and significant housing has been approved or is under construction at Bowburn, Parkhill, Coxhoe and Sedgefield. In addition, this is an important link to Teesside and the Wynyard development in particular. Yet Appendix 5.2 to the Delivery Plan does not mention Sedgefield. It therefore appears no strategic route is proposed to this part of the County.</p> <p>Given the growing importance of this part of the County, I believe this is a serious omission and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In addition, I think it is worth mentioning at this stage the Stockton and Darlington Railway. Although I have not referred to this in the letter regarding the Preferred Options, a Club member, who is involved with the Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway, has mentioned to me that this has the potential to be a future important route. The Railway is of course specifically covered in Policy 47 of the Preferred Options.</p> <p>Further, there are to be major events to celebrate the 200 anniversary of this railway in 2025. While we acknowledge that not all the route within County Durham (which starts at Witton Park, as the village sign proudly states) is restorable, we understand that part of these celebrations includes a proposal to construct a walking and cycling route to follow the original line as closely as possible. This appears to be an ideal time to start this process.</p> <p>As far as the draft of the delivery Plan itself is concerned, I have the following comments</p> <p>1) Summary While we agree with the Vision and Aims, it is represented that this should also contain a reference to</p>

- Improving the existing Network (for example the cycling provision along the A177 from Bowburn to the city) to make it a continuous system that is safe. While Objective 8 mentioned below is noted, this perhaps also needs mentioning in the Summary.
- Make it clear that Networks will be integrated and lead from important developments (mainly of course housing development) to hubs (eg retail centres or leisure facilities)

2) Vision and Aims

The comments above apply here as well

3) Building Block 1 Audit through to Build

Objective 1 audit and assess the cycling and walking network

We welcome this objective and the proposal to use standards that have been established for some time. However, it is also necessary to consider the existing network and other roads used by leisure cyclists. This is an important part of Durham's tourist economy with a number of national routes crossing the County. If roads used by cyclists are not safe, cyclists will be discouraged from coming here.

Objective 2 record the cycling and walking network

We support this Objective

Objective 3 better planned networks

Clearly, we support this objective but the issues mentioned above relating to an integrated network linking housing to hubs are important. While we note point 4 of this Objective, it should be emphasised that the network will take cyclists and walkers to the places they want to go to, eg work or leisure, safely.

The reference to showering and changing facilities in new workplaces in point 5 is welcome. People are unlikely to cycle to work if they then are uncomfortable. But it is represented that this point has to be stressed with developers – in this respect we objected to an application by Hitachi to remove the need for further cycle bays and suggested that they should do more to encourage their workforce to cycle to work.

Objective 4 Design Standards

We welcome the proposal to use the Design Standards of Transport for London and Active Travel Wales. These in our opinion are important to provide the safe routes necessary to encourage people to start cycling and keep them separate as far as possible from motorised transport. In short, they should as far as possible

- Enable cyclists to maintain their speed with as few junctions as possible (eg the roundabout at Thinford, if you are on the cycle lane, requires you to stop a number of times to navigate it).
- At traffic lights, a phase to enable cyclists to leave first should be included where appropriate.
- Avoid 90° turns
- Be segregated from other traffic, particularly motorised traffic
- Not be obstructed by parked cars (or bus stops)
- Be kept in a clean condition
- Be continuous and not cross roads, especially major roads
- Take cyclists from and to important hubs eg from home to work or shopping centres

Objective 5 Building cycling networks including Parking

Again, we welcome this. Although the Club is based in Bishop Auckland, members cycle throughout the County so we are interested in routes in all parts of the County.

Provision of routes to 2 key settlements a year under point 1 is an ambitious target which we hope can be met. We have however outlined that the south east of the county may not qualify for any routes under this head. We trust that this will be reviewed given the amount of development which has been given planning permission in recent years as mentioned above.

There does appear to be some special treatment for Durham City under point 3. We hope this will mean that safe and adequate Cycling Super Routes can be constructed to link the Integra61 development with other key hubs in the area, including Durham Gate and Spennymoor. We represent that consideration needs to be given to improving the cycling routes through the Croxdale estate.

Although we appreciate that the cycling network can only be improved incrementally, we hope point 3 does not mean that other parts of the county are ignored. There is also significant development in Newton Aycliffe particularly with Hitachi now based there. In addition, a number of new developments have been approved in Bishop Auckland which will put added strain on the road network and potentially create more issues for cyclists on them.

We look forward to seeing the maps when produced to see just what is proposed county wide. And, as we have mentioned above, the route of the Stockton and Darlington railway, should be an important route for inclusion.

All marked routes should of course be safe for cyclists, be they beginners or more experience leisure cyclists, forming part of an integrated system. Safety is critical, both with respect to the separation of vulnerable traffic such as cyclists, from motorised (and where appropriate pedestrian) traffic and in relation to the standard of the surface.

We also welcome the proposal in point 4 to provide cycle parking at all staffed council buildings. We assume therefore that all staffed Council buildings (whenever built) and all new buildings to which Objective 3.5 applies will be equipped with cycle parking to the same standard.

4) Building Block 2 operation to enforcement

Objective 6 operation of the networks

We support this objective. Safety is a key issue in encouraging people to start cycling.

Objective 7 Maintenance of Network

This again is key to securing that Durham is regarded as a safe Cycling County.

It is essential however to determine what is covered here. Durham is important not just for encouraging people to start cycling to work or to other hubs but also for leisure cycling. A number of National routes cross the County and bring in cyclists from other parts of the country. But some of these use minor roads which are not subject to the same level of inspection as busier roads.

It is critical that these routes are considered if County Durham is to be regarded as a safe cycling venue for cyclists nationally. Indeed, cyclists frequently use other minor roads which are not part of the network but provide attractive rides.

The problem is that policy suggests that these need only be inspected once a year. They also tend to be inspected with cars in mind rather than 2 wheeled traffic. We represent that this stand point needs to be changed so that road inspections consider the use of these roads by cyclists. What is safe for a car may not be safe for a cyclist and lead to serious injury. This is a growing problem for cyclists nationally.

This may be covered by Objective 8 but there are many minor roads in County Durham that are popular with cyclists, including those "travelling through" but which may not be specifically part of the Network.

Objective 8 improvement of the network

This is welcomed and point 1 relating to the existing network is, as outlined in Objective 7 above, essential. Regrettably there are many existing routes which are substandard in the County.

Objective 9 Refining the Network

This objective is fully supported

Objective 10 Enforcement

This is another critical element to ensure the network is safe and used for sustainable transport.

5) Building Block 3 Engagement etc with the public

The remaining objectives 11 to 14 relate to engagement with and education of the public. We fully support these objectives.

Conclusion

This document is one that is essential to encourage more people to cycle and provide them with a safe environment. At present, it is incomplete in that maps have not been produced and these are an essential element to provide meaningful information and policies in the County Durham Plan.

The main concern for cyclists, even among experienced ones, is safety and providing an environment that recognises their needs as vulnerable road users. We hope that this document will help to provide this and direct the mindset of policy and decision makers into taking their concerns seriously.

It needs to be recognised there are varying types of cyclists, ranging from the commuter to work to the leisure cyclist and the sports cyclist. This document perhaps does not differentiate this point and we recognise that the sports cyclist is probably beyond the remit of this document. The other two however are important.

In towns, where we want to encourage more people to cycle say to work, it is important to tackle problems on busy roads especially at junctions and roundabouts by deploying schemes with appropriate design standards as mentioned in Objective 4. For example, people from Coxhoe are unlikely to be encouraged to start cycling to the new Integra development in Bowburn unless the motorway roundabout in between is fully considered to ensure there is safe cycling facilities at this point. Design here is critical but to date there is little evidence that the standards mentioned in Objective 4 are being followed. Similarly, the cycle route from Integra to Spennymoor (or Durham Gate) is unsatisfactory unless the routes through the Croxdale estate are improved.

In the rural parts of the County, it has to be recognised that although many of the roads are quiet, it is important that they are safe for cyclists. The inspection regime needs to address this and not just inspect the roads as if used by cars alone. Thinking about 2 wheel transport is necessary. In view of the popularity of these roads for cyclists, they should also be inspected more regularly than once a year.

32

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan.

Whilst there is much in this Plan which is of great merit, CPRE is deeply concerned at what is *not* included.

At the "Plan on a Page" level the Aims, Key Ambitions and Objectives are great.

Cycling

The systematic analysis of the current situation and the plans to progress cycling provision is commended, though we note the comment of the Bishop Auckland Cycling Club which we endorse. We have not identified a list or map of the national and significant routes within, or which pass through, the county, and consider this/these could be a useful addition.

Walking

This word is often used in this document, but we consider provision for walking is not addressed with the thoroughness of that for cycling and we believe it is important this is addressed.

-
True, provision for cyclists automatically means routes are available for walkers and horses (of which more later), but the ROWIP designation "footpath" is for walkers only, and does not permit cyclists or horses and allows for a different level of provision, eg stiles can be used which would not be permitted on bridleways.

If there is a similar commitment to footpaths as for bridleways we did not find it evident.

We have not identified a list or map of the national and significant routes within, or which pass through, the county, and consider this/these could be a useful addition. (*not least the iconic Pennine Way*)

Horses

We have identified no mention of horses in the documentation. Bearing in mind "*bridleways*" were originally designated with horses in mind and use by cyclists is a later addition, it is an important omission in our view.

If nothing else, when ensuring suitable provision for cycling and walking it will be important to do nothing which would bring issues for horses.

As with cycling and walking we have not identified a list or map of the national and significant routes within, or which pass through, the county, and consider this/these could be a useful addition. It is understood there has been a growth of horse riding routes similar to the walkers' Pennine Way. Whilst still in its infancy, there is a great potential and Durham could help lead the way

General

Some additional points we noted when going through the various documents were:

Delivery Plan

Chapter headings – there is "Building Blocks to Creating a Cycling County" – but no walking version.

p 9, Objective 5 – Names 2 cycle routes, but no walking ones

p 10 – specific mention of NCN routes, but not walking

p 10, Objective 10 – Action 2, 2nd column – add walking?

	<p>p 12, Objective 12 – Every point is cycling – could not at least Action 1 include walking? p 12, Objective 13, Action 1 – Maps include walking? Even cycling maps will only have key through routes, so why not key waking routes as well? p 13, Action Objective 14, Action 3 – Great to see something specifically just on walking CPRE comment - SCWDP2018 - Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018 3</p> <p>p 15 – Dearth of anything in SE of the county – noting it is the direction to Teesside Evidence Base p 6, Ch 4 – Why not a similar chart for Walking – or add walking into the middle roundel? We do hope these are issues which can be address and the County continues to develop its network of footpaths and bridleways for walkers, cyclists and horseriders.</p>
33	<p>Please consider the attached as my response to the cycling strategy.</p> <p>The route from Coxhoe to Durham is extremely staggered and poor and because of that cyclists are discouraged from and largely don't use the designated cycle paths and instead feel obliged to use the roads. The route goes like this, there is a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle route part through and between the villages of Coxhoe (7 miles from Durham) and Parkhill (6 miles from Durham). • GAP between Parkhill across J61 of A1(M) and through Bowburn (5 miles from Durham) • Cycle route from edge of Bowburn to edge of High Shincliffe • GAP around High Shincliffe • Cycle route down Shincliffe Bank • GAP Shincliffe Traffic Lights across River Bridge • Cycle Route from River Bridge past Maiden Castle up Shincliffe Bank • Gap from Stockton Road to University of City Centre <p>Potential improvements to important parts of this route don't form part of this plan.</p> <p>I have a significant issue with one of the objectives from a villages perspective as our 12 villages and many others across County Durham are not included at all within any of the towns referred to.</p> <p>I refer particularly to Objective 5.3 contained in the action plan 2018-2023. This limits funding for constructing new routes (up to £0.5m) to within 5 miles of Durham City. I specifically request that the end of this objective is amended from 'key settlements within 5 miles of Durham City' to add to 3 words to the end to read 'key settlements within 5 miles of Durham City being a priority'.</p> <p>We are exploring a safe walking / cycling route from Parkhill to Bowburn as improvements to increase to lanes and flow of traffic around J61 as part of the I61 developments will make it even harder on a dangerous pedestrian routes between the villages and to walk to their primary school.</p> <p>We are also hoping to work in partnership with Cassop-cum-Quarrington, Cornforth and Coxhoe Parish Councils to re-open the Clarence Railway line as a walking cycle route from Cassop Vale, through Bowburn, Coxhoe, and Cornforth linking with the existing Hartlepool line walk.</p> <p>As Objective 5.3 is drafted it would not only preclude potential funding by DCC it could deter funding by other partners and preclude these potential GAPS and improvements form forming part of LCWIPs (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans).</p> <p>This policy should not restrict improvements to towns, at the expense of improvements to villages across County Durham.</p>
34	<p>I submit the following comment on the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan on behalf of Cotherstone Parish Council:</p> <p>The railway line path between Cotherstone and Barnard Castle is not currently suitable for mainstream cyclists (or pushchairs/wheelchairs). If this stretch of the railway line path was upgraded to the same state as the path from Cotherstone to Mickleton, then this would provide an excellent and safe link for cyclists and walkers from Barnard Castle westwards until almost Middleton-in-Teesdale. It would also link well with proposals to develop the old railway line from Barnard Castle to Bishop Auckland.</p> <p>Councillors would like to understand the reason that the stretch of railway path between Cotherstone and Barnard Castle has not been developed previously, and request that the upgrade be investigated now and possibly built in to the Delivery Plan 2018-2028.</p>

35	<p>I do welcome and support the initiatives within the plan and have some personal views that I consider are significant for success of the future policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Walking needs more encouragement within communities but is probably up against other personal cultural attitudes of using the 'car' to slip down the local shop because it is quicker. 2. Bikes are often not ready for immediate use from home as they are stored away in sheds or garages. Therefore are used only for pre-planned cycling trips. 3. Success of short journey bike usage is affected by little or no provision in villages or towns for cycle visit storage providing secure and safe facilities. 4. The highway code requires cyclists to use roadways and acts against other safe use of cycles on pathways alongside fast major roads. Use of pathways in town built up busy areas by contrast is clearly not acceptable. 5. Young children cannot be expected to use roadways and their early cultural training 'to use your bike' needs careful attention and training to ensure a future lifetime of benefit. 6. Financial pressures within households prevent overall use of cycling in a similar way to car ownership. The difference is a bike usually cannot be shared – size type, needs several cycles to need purchase, storage and maintained. 7. Three wheeled bikes are rare and need their own space but nevertheless offer more people access to cycling who find two wheels unnerving. Are these catered for within the highway code by allowing footpath usage? 8. Use of off road countryside walkways for cyclists offers challenges – overgrown and poorly maintained surfaces - and yet are extremely popular amongst them. 9. The limited financial resources for the County Council offer relatively small amounts of progress for the foreseeable future and this is sad to see. 10. Finally the age old film Oklahoma song line is “the farmer and the cowboy should be friends” . How about a national approach to much the same thing “the driver and the cyclist should be friends”?
36	<p>Thank you for sight of this plan. As xxxxx who wants to cycle I find the objectives laudable.</p> <p>I remain concerned that Durham is starting from a very low base line and expenditure to date on cycling and walking infrastructure has been way below recommended levels. I do appreciate the financial issues facing the Council, but all the evidence shows that investment in cycling and walking repays many times over in terms of health and general community well being.</p> <p>I would like to see more emphasis on reducing car traffic both by banning cars from certain areas, speed reduction methods, and better enforcement of speed limits. I would like to see far more 20mph areas. I say all this as a car driver.</p> <p>My xxxxx live in xxx and at age xxxxxx can safely walk to school, crossing several busy roads on the way. This is down to road design, speed limits and heavy enforcement of traffic regulations. Durham does not compare favourably on these counts and the impact on community cohesion and health is easy to see.</p> <p>So in conclusion, the plan is very welcome but I do feel that it could go further.</p>
37	<p>I am delighted to be able to comment on the SCWDP and offer my support for its adoption to enable cycling and walking to become safe everyday modes of transport for everyone.</p> <p>The recent article in the Sunderland Echo gives a figure of £2.7 million for cycle infrastructure investment between 2012 and 2015/16 in Durham which works out at £1.35 per person per year whereas the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group's Get Britain Cycling report in 2013 recommended a £10 per person per year spend. The SCWDP does not include any figures, but I presume (hopefully incorrectly) that the per person per year spend which will be allocated will still fall far short of the £10 recommendation. Given the lack of investment to create a continuous, uninterrupted and segregated infrastructure in County Durham so far, progress can be made towards the ambitions of the SCWDP only if the per person spend exceeds £10 per year.</p> <p>The SCWDP looks and reads as an ambitious plan but it requires appropriate funding and staffing.</p> <p>My comments are as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has there been sufficient opportunity for cyclists and walkers to comment on the Plan? I am aware of it because of my membership of the DCC Cycle Forum and also Trust Pathways, Safer Cycling in Durham membership, but have cycling clubs and walking groups been made aware of it? I am also a volunteer ride leader for DCC but have not been asked to make riders aware of the existence of the SCWDP. It has been published during the summer when many people are on holiday and the timescale for comments of 5/6 weeks across the holiday period must surely have considerably reduced the opportunity for comment. Insufficient people will have had the opportunity to comment. • Road budgets need to be reallocated to cycling and walking. If the ambition of increasing the number of people cycling and walking is to be achieved it needs high levels of investment • Cycling and walking infrastructure should be prioritized over road building and maintenance. Until now roads and their users have had priority, hence the excellent road network but poor cycling and walking infrastructure. For example, the footways alongside many roads are completely overgrown with the tarmac or hardcore surface having disappeared under vegetation making them impossible or very difficult to use. • Cycling and walking are a social justice issue. Car ownership is lower in County Durham as compared with the national average and the county is large and rural, with fragmented and expensive bus services. People on a low income have restricted opportunities for travel for work, leisure and social due to a lack of access to cars and public transport. A much improved cycling and walking infrastructure would enable them to travel far more widely. • More staff are needed. The plan cannot be delivered without the reallocation (or recruitment) of staff in addition to increased resources

- **The timescale needs to be shorter.** Infrastructure is needed now rather than in 2028. It is an indication of how far behind DCC is that it is envisaged that it will be another 10 years before priority routes will be in place.
 - **All new developments need to be designed with cycling and walking infrastructure in place from the start, both within them and to enable access from elsewhere.** If it is added afterwards in response to comments on the plans it is always fragmented and badly planned. For example, although there is provision for cyclists and walkers within Integra 61 no infrastructure was put in place in the plans to enable the development to be reached by cyclists from nearby settlements who might need to cycle to work. Consequently cyclists and walkers will have to cross many lanes of fast moving traffic including the slip roads of the A1M to reach Integra 61.
 - **Road space needs to be reallocated.** This would enable streets to be made safer for cyclists and walkers. Cycle campaign groups are often told ‘there isn’t space for cycle lanes’, there is plenty of space but at present it is given over to cars.
 - **Roads were not built for cars.** Cyclists were the first campaigners for safer roads but in modern times cars and lorries have been given priority over other users.
 - **Cycle infrastructure needs to be segregated from other road users.** A painted line on the road does not guarantee cyclists safety. Cyclists need to be separated from vehicles in order to be safe as demonstrated by the infrastructure in the Netherlands and Denmark. This can take the form of raised road studs. Where there are cycle lanes painted on roads eg Tollhouse Road cars are parked in them and become useless to cyclists, or cars drive into them.
 - **Infrastructure needs to be continuous and not fragmented.** There is a shared use 3m wide path alongside the A690 from West Rainton to Belmont Park and Ride. Brilliant, but then it ends instead of continuing all the way into Durham.
 - **Durham is not a cycling City or County unless it is for leisure purposes.** The railway paths are great for leisure cycling but even they don’t form a continuous link from Bishop Auckland and Lanchester etc into Durham. To use bikes for transport to work, shopping, school etc rather than using cars decisions will need to be made as to whether the priority should be car parking or cycle lanes, rat runs or safe streets, fast moving traffic or 20mph speed limits.
 - **People won’t start cycling unless they feel safe.** The perception is that cyclists aren’t safe on the roads. Good infrastructure will keep cyclists safe.
 - **There are so many benefits to cycling.** Physical and mental health, reducing air pollution by reducing the reliance on cars, and many others as acknowledged in the SCWDP. This has been known and accepted for many years, but DCC has lagged behind other councils and is starting from a low base which will require reallocation of resources and staff.
- **Action Plan, Building Block 3 Objective 11, Action 1 states “Work with 2 groups/partnerships’.** Why only 2 and how will they be chosen?
 - **Action Plan, Building Block 3 Objective 12 and 13, Actions 1.** Cycling maps to be produced by Year 3 and 5, yet the deadline for the LCWIPS for the 12 main towns and the construction of priority routes is a much later 2028.

In conclusion, I love my county and living and cycling here but have long been frustrated by the lack of urgency by DCC to make it easier for residents to move around the county on foot or by bike. Cars and lorries have always been given priority and the lions share of the financial resources. Every time new roads are built, junctions modified, roads widened etc to reduce journey times for vehicles the number of journeys made by vehicles then increases and the roads are busier and the air quality decreases. Then journeys on foot or by bike decrease, and children are driven to school rather than being able to walk or cycle. Then the ‘cycle’ continues, those children then perceive driving as being the safe way to get about and never put their Bikeability skills to good use by using cycling as a method of transport.

I look forward to seeing priority being given to cyclists and walkers in preference to road transport to enable this ambitious Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan to be fully implemented.

38

I am writing on behalf of the County Durham Local Access Forum (LAF) to thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2028. We are a statutory body established under Section 94 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to advise local authorities and other agencies on the improvement of public access to land for the purposes of outdoor recreation and enjoyment while paying due regard to the needs of conservation and land management. Our comments on the SCWDP are offered in the spirit of independent adviser and critical friend.

The LAF welcomes the Plan and we also thank XXXXXXX for producing it; a major undertaking on limited resources. It contains a great deal of encouraging thinking and, if this response tends to focus on the criticisms, it is not because we feel the Plan is seriously flawed, it is because we wish to see the best possible Strategy producing the best outcomes.

The LAF accepts that the scope of the SCWDP has been set by Government and that walking and cycling for leisure are not included. However, since this document has replaced what was to have been the County Cycling Strategy for this period, and leisure use has featured strongly in previous cycling strategies, the LAF is concerned that this leaves the Local Authority with no formal policy or strategy on developing the Rights of Way network for leisure use. This also impacts on people who walk for pleasure and exercise; and on equestrian users. Good walking and cycling paths are also important from a tourism perspective, encouraging visitors to visit and stay in the County.

The LAF recognises that the targets for increasing the number of journeys made by bike or on foot are also set by Government and not DCC; however we consider them unambitious and the LAF urges Durham County Council to commit to exceeding them. This is particularly important because, as is set out in the SCWDP, Durham is starting from a low base.

The document is strong on the benefits of, and arguments for, a move towards an active-travel society in County Durham. The evidence continues to mount; as they do for the harm caused to our health and environment by our reliance on motor vehicles. This cannot be brushed aside. Unfortunately, Durham County Council's investment in promoting active travel is relatively small, whilst far greater energies are used to plough the old furrow of "growth through new highways". The problem that the LAF identifies in the SCWDP is that it does not address how this stuck thinking can be turned around. If it is not, the SCWDP will fail to produce results required.

Durham LAF welcomes the commitment in the SCWDP to "embed LCWIPS in the County Durham Plan" (Objective 3 Action 2); but notes that the Draft County Plan itself says little about sustainable travel or infrastructure, other than that "all development *should have regard to* the policies set out in the County Durham Cycling Delivery Plan and *where possible* should contribute to the development of the strategic cycling network and deliver new cycling infrastructure." (Our Italics). These words are chosen carefully to avoid committing either the County Council or private developers to any action. The SCWDP must be binding.

On the subject of resources, the LAF understands that Durham County Council currently invests around 70p per annum per head of population in cycling. Between them, DCC and the DfT must substantially increase this: Manchester is proposing to invest £15 per head. The Guardian reports that in the Netherlands, the average spend is £22 per person per head. Britain is fifty years behind the Dutch in shifting to active transport modes, and County Durham is performing poorly even by English standards, as the SCWDP admits. The LAF asks that these inequalities be recognised in the SCWDP and that a firm commitment is included in the Plan to substantially increase the investment in walking and cycling as everyday transport.

The LAF welcomes the amount of carrot set out in the document but laments a lack of stick. It urges Durham County Council to be more pro-active at discouraging the use of the car as well as encouraging walking and cycling. These measures might include: Making town centres less welcoming to private motor vehicles so that the bicycle or walking become the quickest and most convenient means of doing so; using one-way streets and redesigning shopping streets to reallocate carriageway space to people instead of cars; reduced speed limits and parking bans around schools; 20mph speed limits on all residential streets; consider bans on single-occupancy cars at certain times of day; introduce car-free days in certain towns; set parking charges to reflect the true value of land which is currently taken up by cars not being used; end free parking at out-of-town retail developments; create walking and cycling routes along country roads without pavements; blanket 50mph speed limits on all rural B-roads and below. These and many other measures are already being applied successfully elsewhere in the UK and in other countries.

Such measures may indeed be included in the LCWIPS, which will be the main means by which the Walking and Cycling Strategy is implemented, but the LAF believes it should be clear at Strategy level that Durham County Council means business. Part of this is inherent in the "best design standards" to which this Strategy commits, but the Local Authority's past performance in translating promising strategic commitments into real progress in changing transport policy and building quality infrastructure is not encouraging.

There are major developments taking place in the County now and others scheduled to begin before even the feasibility studies on the LCWIPS are due to be completed. Once major developments at key sites, such as Durham University are begun, any failure to incorporate high-quality infrastructure risks "locking in" that inadequacy for decades to come. The LAF urges Durham County Council to act now to incorporate the highest standards of active travel design into such developments.

There is insufficient consideration of how the Strategy may be implemented in the rural parts of the county.

1) Notes on Documents:

i. SCWDP Plan On A Page

Key Ambitions:

These paragraphs are worded as though they apply to County Durham as it is now. Should they be re-worded to make it clearer that these are ambitions? Eg: "Durham to be widely recognised ..."etc

"Durham has high quality ..." include the word "connected" in this list of ambitions.

"More people ...are cycling and walking" – is a target appropriate here?

ii. SCWDP Evidence Base

3: Introduction

"We aim to provide the right conditions to grow the next generation of cyclists and walkers ..."

This paragraph reinforces the idea that "cyclists" and "walkers" are somehow "other". This needs rethinking to emphasise that we should all walk and cycle as our default means of transport.

5: Our ambitions

Again, is this the place for some concrete targets? Eg. "Modal shift... has reduced air pollution and carbon emissions by X%"

The photograph on this page is not very encouraging. The cycle lane is icy whilst the rest of the highway has been cleared. The cycle lane is advisory and there is no segregation – the kind of provision DCC must move away from and improve upon.

6. Making the Case: Trends in England and Durham.

Should these paragraphs also include an outline of why walking and cycling have been declining nationally, and why the figures are particularly poor in County Durham?

Obesity figures in County Durham are particularly worrying, as outlined to the LAF by the Healthy Weight Alliance. The case should be made here for cycling and walking as key means to tackle this problem.

6.2: Opportunities:

"We need to change the way we travel now...."

The LAF suggests this sentence is key and should be more prominent in the Strategy as a whole. "This plan will deliver the change needed"

It is up to DCC and the Government to deliver the change. The plan sets out a way of doing so. We suggest this should be reworded, eg: "This plan sets out how these changes can be achieved. It will be the responsibility of Durham County Council and the Government to fund and implement these changes."

6.3 Benefits of cycling and walking:

The LAF agrees the potential health, economic and environmental advantages of moving to an active-travel society are enormous. This means Durham County Council and its officers must make these

cases at every opportunity. What can be done through the Strategy to ensure that these benefits trump resistance to change both within the Local Authority and in the wider public?

10: Appendices

"The priority towns for LCWIPS are Chester le Street, Durham and Newton Aycliffe".

This makes it appear that these will be the only 3 towns to be given LCWIPS. Can it be made clear that there are 12 "hub" towns in all and that all will have a LCWIP?

We note a "Masterplan" for Chester Le Street is already being considered. The LAF urges this be reviewed to ensure it complies with the new Walking and Cycling Strategy.

"The Great North Cycleway": There has been almost no public reference to this in some years. We note that a Google search turns up one Chronicle story from 2011 and one mention from Newcastle in 2016.

The LAF also argues that prioritising major links between towns is a faulty approach. It is much more important to sort out cycling structure within towns first, as a "cycle superhighway" which cannot be connected to a destination is of limited value.

10.2 QNP

The LAF welcomes the commitment to working to TfL/Welsh Assembly standards of provision for walking and cycling. Should funding for walking and cycling infrastructure continue to be as low as at present, we argue it is better to spend what is available on small works of high quality than to create more, but substandard, installations which will not be used and will weaken the argument for further investment.

iii. Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan Action Plan

Objectives:

The tables include "Cost" but say nothing about "Benefit". The LAF recommends inclusion of benefit analysis for health, environment and other gains outlined in the plan.

Objective 1:

The LAF notes this process has been underway since the previous Cycling Strategy of 2006. Unless DCC is prepared to invest in the quick and thorough completion of the task, the LAF is concerned the Strategy will become stuck here.

It may be better to work to a "rule of thumb" that none of the present cycling network conforms to the design and build standards set out in this Walking and Cycling Strategy and effectively start with a blank sheet. The Action appears only to apply to cycling. If it also applies to the walking network, this should be made clear and a separate audit with appropriate parameters set out.

Objective 3:

1 "Produce LCWIPS for 12 main towns". You have elsewhere stated this will be 3 towns. We welcome the target of 2023 but regret that no target has been set for the implementation of these plans.

4 "Require that new developments ..." The LAF would like to see this requirement extended to any and all plans to redesign existing road junctions and any developments on sites already served by the existing road network. This would ensure, for example, that developments such as Freeman's Quay could not go ahead without incorporating high quality cycling and walking infrastructure.

Objective 4:

3 Carry out feasibility and outline design for LCWIPS by year 5. This means that it is unlikely any meaningful infrastructure works could begin until the Plan has only 5 years left to run. Can Durham County Council elaborate on how it can meet the targets set out for increasing journeys by foot or bicycle on this tight schedule?

Objective 6

1 This is an important objective, given the deterrent effect of the dangers, or perceived dangers of cycling on the County's roads. The LAF notes the damaging impact of cuts on policing of the roads in recent years and urges the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner to take motoring offences far more seriously, with pro-active campaigns such as the Close Pass Initiative carried out by WM Police.

Objective 8

3 Some idea of a minimum standard of "upgrade" would be required here. The LAF notes that, in general, the NCN/Sustrans network in County Durham falls far short of highest design standards for cycling or walking to work.

Objective 9

Again, an objective measure of "improvement" for crossings is required. If this is to be the Welsh Active Travel guidance or similar standards, say so. The timeframe is too long to make a difference by 2028.

Objectives 11, 12, 13, 14

Whilst the LAF welcomes such measures to "encourage" cycling, we consider they are no substitute for hard infrastructure. That must come first. The rest will follow.

39 Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan. Generally, I like the look and feel, although I feel that the emphasis of the document is still focussed on cycling. I realise that walking was included within this document later in the process, but there is a clear cycling bias. Other minor comments below:

Plan on a Page – objectives

- No clear note of ensuring 'safe' use of routes
- No specific mention of volunteering opportunities

Evidence Base – Quality network principles; p17

- Comfortable – needs to reflect the growing need to ensure that all user groups can use the same space with respect and that additional promotion and signage requires development to ensure this key message is communicated.
- Attractive – well lit (where appropriate)

Assessments and reporting

- Consider addition of natural capital assessment which will suggest through a robust method of evaluation the actual value of each asset and this will play through into GI assessment and planning gain issues. This method will cover social, environment and infrastructure elements.

Action Plan

- Audit – 4.4 very cycling heavy and feels like it needs more reference to walking and health programmes such as Public Health initiatives.

Objective 12 – training, very cycling heavy.

- No reflection of walking education and training opportunities, such as map and compass, maybe leading to taster sessions, etc
- Health walks – developing confidence and skills
- Reflect promoted walking routes across County.

40	<p>Being a cyclist myself and having spoken to colleagues and friends who also cycle I would hope you might bear the following button-points in mind :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * higher levels of investment needed, perhaps by reallocating road budgets, as cycling investment repays many times over * local people should be involved in the information gathering and development of the LCWIPs * more staff resource should be allocated in the County Council to progressing the delivery plan as the timescales are too long: they need to counter-act decades of spending on the wrong solutions * new developments should be designed with cycling and walking considered first when laying out the access, not as an afterthought * targets could be more ambitious, as Durham is starting from a low base, with few and poor facilities * the Council should not rule out relocating or removing car parking on key roads where space is needed to give safe protected cycling routes * 20mph speed limits in towns and lower limits in rural areas * the important role of cycling in improving air quality, health, wellbeing
41	<p>I'd just like to say that cycling is great and the more it can be made safer the better. I cycle to work regularly and dread the inevitable road sections. Having cycled abroad, even though the centre of Paris, there is a lot that can be done, this includes changing drivers attitude cyclists.</p>
42	<p>I used to be a regular cyclist and before I moved to XXXXXX, I commuted to and from work regularly by bike. I was motivated to continue to do this in Durham, because of the health and environmental benefits to myself and others. Moving here from London was however a bit of a shock in terms of the lack of facilities for cyclists – I noticed in particular narrow roads, poor lighting on key routes, lack of dedicated cycle paths, and a definite lack of cycle parking both in University premises and city centre locations. Whilst I used my bike periodically as a student (when I was more able to make journeys outside of rush hour), since I have started working as a full time staff member I have almost ceased to do so. Although I walk whenever possible, unfortunately I now use my car much more frequently.</p> <p>I have two specific comments to make about the Action Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the aims presented is to ensure that in new developments, adequate provision is made for cycling and walking facilities, including the inclusion of cycle pathways that prioritise cycles over other traffic. It has been very noticeable to me, in looking over the University's ten year Estates Strategy that it has widely publicised in the university community, that these principles have not been respected in the development plans for University premises in and around Durham City. As an example, I regularly make journeys up and down South Road – sometimes by bike – and even though a number of new buildings and a new college are in development on South Road, which will lead to a great increase in student and staff traffic, there appears to be no improved cycle provision. South Road does not feel safe to cycle in rush hour, when motorists are keen to get home and are not always patient for cyclists. It surprises me that making improvements to the South Road route for cyclists has not been considered in the planning approval process for these sites – surely some university land at the side of the road could have been used for a cycle path, or a nearby cycle path developed through university premises, as a condition of planning? 2. A second aim of the plan is that the Council will work closely with cycling and walking groups to promote and further the realisation of the plan. I am a member of XXXXXXX, from whom I heard about this consultation today (the final day for responses). I am also a member of XXXXXXX, which is active across the whole of the North East and regularly walks in Durham Council), from whom I have heard nothing about this consultation. It doesn't seem very promising that on a major consultation such as this, the Council has failed to engage with the very groups it says it is going to engage with in the future. I would urge the Council to rapidly improve their public communication and consultation processes. <p>I fully support and endorse the aims of the plan, and think that it is crucial that Durham CC focuses its efforts and resources on encouraging cycling and walking throughout the County. I have commented on Durham City because this is where I have experience of daily living, but it is important that we encourage sustainable transport options throughout the County so that residents can enjoy the out of doors, be healthier, and live in a more environmentally friendly way. In Durham City at least, it seems to me that we are starting from a very low base standard – there is great scope for improvement, but also a great need for prioritisation and investment.</p>

43	<p>I have read your plan for cycling and walking in County Durham and am pleased you are tackling so many issues that create barriers to people abandoning their cars to become cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>I recently supervised some students undertaking a research project related to cycling in Durham City and attach their final report. While the main aim of the project was for students unschooled in social science research techniques to learn how to approach and carry out research, the findings are nonetheless interesting. You will see that fears concerning safety are identified as primary deterrents to students cycling in Durham City.</p> <p>As a long term resident of Durham City I am not at all surprised that concerns about road safety emerge in an enquiry into cycling in the city. xxxxxxxxxx Redhills Lane where the road narrows to 14 feet, yet is open to two way traffic. Even so the lane is part of the current schemes of cycle paths, so cyclists are encouraged to speed down its steep bank, towards traffic that is heading towards them. To make matters worse these cyclists following the route of a designated cycle path are often unaware they are likely to meet oncoming traffic at the blind corner at the foot of the steepest section and thus ride in the middle of the road. Signage does not remedy this problem because the different rules for vehicles and cycles applying to Redhills bank are just plain confusing and counter intuitive.</p> <p>The pavement is such that people have to walk in single file while remaining very close to passing vehicles. Speed humps make matters worse for pedestrians because cars try to avoid having both front wheels on the hump and thus veer towards the pavement. Further anxiety is created by the narrow pavement being bounded by terraced houses and a stone wall, so there is no possibility of escape from traffic that mounts the pavement; something that frequently occurs when vehicles travelling in opposite directions meet.</p> <p>Redhills Lane is a main entry from the A167 into Durham City Centre. The section on the bank is an extremely attractive entrance to the city with a panoramic view of the city from its highest point. There are very few houses on the bank, which would make it easy to transform its current hazardous features by restricting access to residents' vehicles only, thus enabling cyclists and pedestrians to enjoy a scenic route into the city without trepidation.</p> <p>I cite this example of an unsafe environment for cyclists and pedestrians because I know it well and have talked to plenty of its users who tell me how they feel. I am aware that there are many other such black spots in the city and elsewhere in the county and suggest that attention to people's sense of personal safety should be a key factor in your laudable intentions to get more people to walk and cycle.</p>
44	<p>I refer to the above and offer my comments as regards cycling. A bedrock for the cycling calendar for years was the annual Durham Big Bike ride, a mix of routes, distances, the ideal time of the year at the end of the summer for all ages and families, with many charities benefiting from this. It promoted the fantastic Durham countryside so why not admit it was wrong to stop this and put it back on the cycling calendar for 2019! It was short sighted for Durham County Council not to see the advantages for the health benefit of the Region, in not bTacking cycling for the younger generations to come and in not asking for financial support from the likes of Halfords, Evans Cycles etc to provide some sponsorship. An obvious spin-off is both for adults and in particular children enjoying a healthier lifestyle, potential for less cars on the road and the possibility of the Tour de Yorkshire or even the Tour de France organisers embracing the potential of extending their routes to our wonderful Land of the Price Bishops!</p> <p>Come on Durham County Council, continue to improve our cycle ways, but give the thumbs up to the Durham Big Bike ride is back for 2019!</p>
45	<p>Hi, I am responding here with a few points on the Consultation on draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan on behalf of the County Durham Green Party.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We welcome the recognition of value of cycling for public health and reducing congestion, and the need for transport planning to be directed towards making cycling an easier option. - The action plan could be clearer about which projects have already been partially completed and which are new proposals. - The proposal to link settlements within 5 miles of Durham is welcome, but this plan covering the whole county we're not sure why this refers to the area around Durham in particular - all major settlements within several miles of each other should be well-linked by cycleways. - We do need to emphasise the quality of cycleways not just their presence. The plan could use more specific commitments about the quality of the new cycleways being built (e.g. segregation from other traffic and pedestrians, clear links to town centres). We welcome the commitment to audit and upgrade the NCN routes given that concerns have been raised about how they route round roundabouts and other issues, but in future it would be sensible for new routes if this is done during the initial construction stage. - We would also like to point out that this doesn't link clearly to the County Durham Plan to 2035 for which there was recently a Preferred Options consultation, and which committed to putting far more resource into building two new relief roads around the city than this plan ever envisions putting into increasing take-up of cycling. Another question is whether the new developments proposed around the city of Durham will also be linked by cycleways.
46	<p>Living Streets Consultation Response County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan: Evidence Base What we like:</p>

- Commitment to achieving CWIS targets
- Quality network principles

Ambitions (page 8): ‘modal shift from cars to cycling and walking’ - this should include public transport as this enables longer journeys where walking is a key component.

Making the Case (page 10): comparison of killed and seriously injured pedestrians and cyclists per billion miles walked or cycled should be made with the equivalent journeys by other modes:

“Per mile travelled, over the last three years, figures suggest that pedestrians were more likely than cyclists to be killed on the roads. Cycling and walking, however, are both more risky than car driving, although motorcycling is the most risky kind of transport of all - around 3 - 3.5 times more so than walking or cycling” <https://www.cyclinguk.org/resources/cycling-uk-cycling-statistics>

Opportunities in County Durham (page 11) 3rd paragraph: this should include uptake of cycling, walking **and** public transport as part of enabling longer journeys on foot as per the CWIS objective to make walking a natural choice for shorter journeys, or as part of a longer journey by 2040.

Opportunities in County Durham (page 11) 7th paragraph: cyclists **and** walkers spend more than people in cars – see Living Streets report, The Pedestrian Pound*

https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1391/pedestrianpound_fullreport_web.pdf

**An updated version of this report is due to be published shortly, so a more up to date reference may be available by the time you publish this document*

Benefits of walking and cycling, health (page 12): the NHS quote refers to cycling **and** walking:

“In *Claiming the Health Dividend*, a report for the DfT (2014), the direct cost to the National Health Service (NHS) of illnesses resulting from physical inactivity has been conservatively estimated at up to £1billion per annum (2007 prices)ⁱ. However, the health benefits of increased active transport (walking and cycling) could save the NHS about £17billion over a twenty year period (2012-31).” https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/371096/claiming_the_health_dividend.pdf

Appendices (page 16) 3rd paragraph: alignment with LCWIP guidance – Durham should set ambitions which go beyond the guidance in considering walking networks. Specific reference on your LCWIP work relating to walking should be added here.

County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan: Action Plan

What we like:

- e.g. objective 3 action 4 prioritising active travel over motorised transport in new developments.

Building block 1 (page 7): is it worth adding ‘public’ health? Also when listing Local Transport Notes the emphasis here is on new/existing off-road cycling and/or shared cycling and walking infrastructure. It’s important to acknowledge that footways form part of existing pedestrian networks and to include the relevant guidance for walking infrastructure (e.g. LTNs linked to traffic calming (1/07), traffic management and streetscapes (1/08) and forthcoming Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions guidance on pedestrian crossings).

Objective 2 (page 7): does recording the *use* of cycling and walking networks include counting the number of pedestrians using routes?

Objective 3 (page 8): Action 1, Performance indicator – include walking policies!

Objective 5 (page 9): what is the walking element here? It’s all about bikes. Objective could also be extended to include pedestrian infrastructure as well as cycle parking (e.g. benches...)

Objective 6 (page 9): suggest giving examples of enforcement e.g. speed restrictions (especially 20mph areas)

Objective 7 (page 9): Action 1 – key thing is that inspections are carried out on foot as well as by bike. Maintenance should be factored into the Highways Asset Management Plan at least for footways? Assume that system for reporting problems would be the same/dovetail with existing procedures.

Objective 8 (page 10): Suggest an additional action along the lines of seeking to maximise opportunities to implement the LCWIP when other development is taking place (to retrofit improvements to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure/public realm).

Objective 9 (page 10): In line with LTN 1/95, 2/95, 2/08 or revised TSRGD Guidance (chapter 8, forthcoming, which will succeed LTN guidance on crossings).

Objective 10 (page 10): Action 3 links to comment above on Objective 6.

Objective 11 (page 11): there should be an additional action around building links to public transport because this enables longer journeys on foot – and this is a key difference between walking for transport and walking for leisure, when thinking about walking for transport, bus travel (to lesser extent rail) should be taken into account too.

Objective 12 (page 12): Action 1, add training on walking infrastructure and public realm design.

Objective 12 (page 12): Action 3, include wayfinding for walkers.

Objective 13 (page 12): Action 1, include walking route maps!

Objective 14 (page 13): Action 2: include workplace walking schemes (as illustrated in accompanying case studies).

General comment: create a new e-mail address which encompasses walking!

47 Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2028. A key project that we are looking at within the Darlington borough is creating a walking and cycling route along the length of the Stockton and Darlington railway in advance of the 200th anniversary of the line in 2025. Although there is a large portion of this route in Darlington there is an even larger section with Durham County from Witton Park to the county boundary with Darlington Borough. Whilst a purpose built route was put in from Shildon to Newton

Aycliffe alongside the line there are sections of the original route that do not have such an accessible cycling and walking route. I would like to see reference to the Stockton and Darlington Railway walking and cycling route and how Durham will link into the route in Darlington.

The completion of this route could have great impacts on tourism in the area and draw visitors from all over the world. With Locomotion already situated in County Durham and the creation of a walking and cycling path from Shildon to Newton Aycliffe in recent years it would seem that extending the route and creating a wider offer would be of benefit to County Durham, Darlington Borough Council and Stockton Borough Council and enable the creation of a coherent 26 mile long route which would be used by both visitors to the area and local residents.

48 Overall the plan has a very well designed progress monitoring methodology and it is apparent from the remainder. of the documents that this is where the most time and effort has been expended.

In terms of strategy there is very little concrete description of what will be undertaken in detail with broad-brush objectives and no real detail given.

In parts this draft strategy conflicts directly with the draft County Strategy Plan especially in relation to the stated protection of the existing networks of cycling routes with no discussion of how the cycle route from Lanchester across the Browney valley will be crossed TWICE by the proposed Western Relief Road. I have been informed by Council Officers at 'Consultation Events' that users of this route will be expected to cross what will be an extremely busy and 'fast' route without the provision of Pelican crossings, refuge points or other ways of securing a safe transit to the continuation of the cycle route.

The provision of cycling related maps and materials by Durham County Council requires substantial improvement. Five months ago I visited this webpage <https://www.durham.gov.uk/article/11672/Where-to-cycle-> and given it informs the reader that for "

Cycle routes in County Durham

- County Durham West: Hills and Hollows - Trees and Trails
- County Durham North: Skirting the Cities - Routes to Roam
- County Durham South: Villages and Towns - tracks without Trains

These are available at our various libraries and venues across the county. contact us if you want a copy."

I attended Clayport Central Reference Library and requested a copy of each of the above. I was informed these had ceased publication many years ago and there were not even reference copies available. I feel this is unacceptable the website has obviously not been maintained for a number of years and it shows the importance with which the current Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan is held ie very little.

[Where to cycle? - Durham County Council](#)

www.durham.gov.uk

Information on where to cycle in County Durham, whether you're a commuter, cycle for leisure or you're visiting the area."

My comments are mainly restricted to the area around Durham City as that is the area in which I do most of my cycling.

It should be within the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan that unless agreement with the landholders concerned is reached then land will be subject to Compulsory Purchase in order to build a safe cycleroute avoiding Durham City across Belmont Viaduct. Durham County Council has used CP previously in relation to the purchase of land for roads so the same should apply to cyclepaths// shared use paths.

Traveling by bicycle across Durham City Centre is in serious need of improvement. At the moment the situation is highly dangerous with a severly disjointed network. Additionally the hoarding around the old National Savings Site is obscuring at least one NCN direction post.

I would suggest the footpath along Langley Park Front Street from the roadabout on the Witton Gilbert to Lanchester Road to the junction with the Lanchester Valley Railway Path and Cycleway is made shared use. This would be far safer for cyclists than at the moment where traffic 'moves smartly' along this long fast road. If necessary there is a verge in excess of 5 meters wide along the entire route of this footpath before the road edge.

I find the self-congratulatory tone of the documentation inappropriate as Durham County Council is failing to adequately safely maintain shared footway provision in the Durham City area:

I have seen a number of cyclists with garden equipment cutting back tree branches that were obviously two to three years old and were posing a severe risk to cyclists helmets and overgrowing the footway as the shared routes are adjacent to busy main roads with very little verge space in these locations this is a serious issue. They have also removed overgrowth of brambles and dog roses which were causing an obstruction and leaving, in places, less than 12 inches of tarmac footway before a narrow strip road verge.

As you will be aware Durham City is a prime site for bicycle theft. In part this is due to the volume of cyclists in the city but it is also due, in part, to the poor security siting of some of the cycle racks (mainly no CCTV routinely directed at the bicycle racks). Bicycles which were locked to these racks have been stolen in the past. On a short walk in Durham City last weekend I noted the following in relation to some of the racks:

Bottom of North Road - No CCTV coverage.

Bottom of North Road before turnup to Crossgate - No CCTV coverage.

Bottom of Claypath - No CCTV coverage view of racks; racks obscured by street furniture allowing a greater opportunity for theft to occur.

Bottom of Claypath beside ramp from Millburngate Bridge - No CCTV coverage.

Gala Theatre complex, outside Durham County Council Offices - No CCTV coverage; two sets of racks almost completely obscured by large planters allowing a greater opportunity for theft to occur.

In the case of the North Road sites there is no need for this to happen as there are CCTV cameras directly adjacent to the racks but the cameras are never rotated from viewing up North Road.

[Where to cycle? - Durham County Council](#)

www.durham.gov.uk

[Information on where to cycle in County Durham, whether you're a commuter, cycle for leisure or you're visiting the area.](#)

It should be within the Draft Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan to ensure across all relevant Durham County Council Departments and external utility providers that when roadworks are undertaken the surface of the entire carriageway is restored fully. Cycling around villages near to Durham City is NOT pleasurable and is downright dangerous due to the poor quality repair work undertaken and patches on top of patches.

I hope the issues I have raised will be addressed in the finalised Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan.

49 Durham University has a major presence in County Durham; it is a key stakeholder in many local partnerships such as the County Durham Economic Partnership, The County Durham Environment Partnership Climate Change Group, Durham City Board and Durham City Area Action Partnership. The University seeks to support and encourage the use of sustainable transport modes, including walking and cycling and shares the Council's goal of creating a more attractive City in which to live, work and study.

Response to the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2023: Evidence Base Document

Durham University support the document and agree with the ambitions set out on page 8 of the Evidence Base document.

Response to the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2023: Action Plan Document

General comments on the Action Plan are set out below followed by a detailed response to the objectives set out in the document.

Durham University believe that this is an ambitious Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2023 and one which they would very much support.

The University supports wholeheartedly the stated Vision and Aims of the Delivery Plan, as given on page 3 in the Action Plan. The University's Sustainable Travel Plan (STP) envisages greater take-up of sustainable transport modes including walking and cycling, and the Vision and Aims, would not only help make the STP a success but would contribute to Durham becoming a more attractive City in which to live, work and study.

However, there are some key areas which it is felt are missing from the Delivery Plan which may need to be addressed:

1. It would be good to see measurable targets set against the performance indicators for the actions. The PIs for each action tend to be about the implementation of detailed steps towards the various objectives. There is no indication of what the County Council's targets are for key indicators such as the number of cycle and walking trips, travel to work, travel to school, gender balance in participation rates and so forth.
2. There appear to be no set targets for increasing cycling and walking activity.
3. No reference/commitment to engage with major employers or bicycle user groups on the design of the network.
4. No proposals map to safeguard cycle routes in conjunction with the County Plan.
5. It is noted that capital schemes in Years 1 & 2 will be eligible for LTP3 funding and that further funding will be secured through NECA and match funding possibilities. However, there is no indication as to what sort of level of funding is aspired to and concern how these may continue to be resourced, as it is recognised it may be difficult to meet aspirations as central government cuts continue to bite. LTP3 funding is time limited and the level of NECA funding may be uncertain. It would be useful to understand whether there are options to utilise funding streams related to those used for other transport modes.

Comments addressing the following may be useful in answering the above questions:

- An explanation as to which of the actions in the plan would fall under capital funding and which would be revenue.
- Informing us how much capital/revenue spend there has been over, for example, the last five years.
- The level of uplift hoped to be achieved. [The All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group "Get Britain Cycling" report in 2013 recommended £10 per person per head spending on cycling alone to get investment to an adequate level, rising to £20 per head as cycling increases. It is believed from the figures in the 2012-2015 strategy report, that Durham County Council spending was under £2 per head per year?]

Turning to the detail of the Delivery Plan's text, there are a few anomalies where walking seems to have been omitted from consideration. For example, page 5 is entitled "Building Blocks to create a Cycling County". Under Objective 5 (for building high quality networks) all but one of the actions relate to cycling, but perhaps it is assumed that the walking network already exists, and it is covered under Objective 8 (improving the networks).

Given the evidence included on page 9 of the Evidence Base document, which shows a dramatic decline in walking to school, there needs to be more emphasis in the Delivery Plan on addressing this. A perceived need to drive children to school is often linked with driving to work. Without safe walking and cycling routes to allow more independent travel to school by children, it will be hard to achieve a reduction in motor vehicle use.

The Delivery Plan does not appear to address the fact that, in order to provide better cycling and walking routes in the City, it is inevitable that road space will need to be reallocated. This may require a reduction in car parking spaces and better management of the remaining provision to ensure a better turnover. In the vicinity of the University there are several roads (for example, Quarryheads Lane, Church Street, Hallgarth Street) with relatively cheap on-street parking which is not primarily residential. Widening pavements and providing dedicated cycle lanes are essential to improving the active travel environment in the final approaches to the University, but this will require careful political handling and a willingness to explore a wide range of options by looking holistically at the local network of streets.

One of the critical factors for success of the Delivery Plan will be the ability to secure funding for network enhancements.

Policy 23 of the County Durham Plan Preferred Options, which was recently out for consultation, states that "all development should have regard to the policies set out in the County Durham Cycling Delivery Plan and where possible should contribute to the development of the strategic cycling network and deliver new cycling infrastructure". Elsewhere the same policy requires provision of well-designed cycling and walking routes. This would be a means to obtain funding via planning obligations. The concern, however, is that this policy, when combined with the Delivery Plan, will not for some time provide sufficient clarity for assessing planning applications and determining whether the cycling and walking routes are up to standard.

There are two key aspects to this: where the routes should go, and how they should be designed. The Delivery Plan does not state where specific cycle routes will be developed, and nor does it give much idea of a vision as to how the network will be determined or what the final target is. For example, how close should a user expect to be to a high-quality route if they live somewhere in Durham City? Which locations will routes serve? When will pedestrians be expected to share space with cyclists? What sort of motor traffic levels should determine whether a cycle path needs to be provided? The Delivery Plan is very vague on such fundamentals, so it is not clear what, in fact, will be delivered. There is some hint of the aspirations in the Evidence Base document, but not enough to form a clear picture.

The supporting text of Preferred Options Policy 23 includes paragraph 5.206 which refers to the forthcoming "County Durham Cycling Delivery Plan" (no mention of walking) and says that this will "identify a network of cycle routes that connect our key centres as priorities for investment". This seems to be a throwback to the 2012-2015 Cycling Strategy which concentrated on routes connecting the main towns, rather than routes within urban areas. The greatest scope for increasing cycling and reducing congestion tends to be on shorter urban journeys. There is great scope to improve routes to the University, most of which are devoid of cycling infrastructure. For example, routes from Carrville and Belmont to the University could easily be developed via Old Durham and Maiden Castle. There is a good route from Newton Hall into the City, but it is not connected in any realistic way with the University's main sites because of the lack of cycle routes in the City Centre, which must be addressed. These major suburbs would benefit from better connections to the University.

Preferred Options Policy 25 also refers to a network, as it safeguards "the Cycling Super Routes and the Primary and Secondary Cycle Routes identified in the County Durham Cycling Delivery Plan". The Delivery Plan out for consultation does not identify any routes, and so it is far from clear how these can be safeguarded or how developer contributions to funding can be obtained. The withdrawn County Plan did include cycle routes in its proposals map and the University questions why are these not included in the Delivery Plan as a basis for further refinement? The County

Plan Preferred Options consultation has now closed, but it is worth saying that these routes need to be detailed and safeguarded via either the County Plan or the Delivery Plan, and not fall into a gap between the two.

It is true that the cycle routes included in the proposals map of the withdrawn County Plan had many omissions when viewed from the perspective of travel to the University. In fact, no primary routes served the Mountjoy Campus. A few additional routes were proposed in a report by Transport Initiatives in October 2014 which the Council did not take any further. Some missing routes are picked up in the Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan which was consulted upon alongside the County Plan Preferred Options and which is mentioned in the latter's Policy 24. But Policy 24 does not invite developer contributions towards the realisation of the proposals in the Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan, and the cycling and walking aspects of that plan are not referred to in the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan. In turn the Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan avoided tackling some key issues, like cycling connectivity across the City Centre. Thus, the routes which are most relevant to travel to the University are left in an ambiguous position. This should either be remedied in the pre-submission draft of the County Plan, or a proposals map should swiftly be provided to accompany the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan.

Paragraph 5.247 of the supporting text of Preferred Options explains that the strategic cycling network will be developed as part of the ongoing work on the Delivery Plan. It is disappointing that the County Council has not yet reached a point of identifying and safeguarding routes within Durham City to provide for a functioning safe cycle network, along with walking infrastructure improvements. Repeatedly the University's Travel Plan surveys of staff and students show that the top factors which would encourage more people to cycle are provision of safe routes, separated cycle paths and traffic reduction, while the footways along a number of key routes are poor and inadequate. In the last decade there has been a problematic cycle safety scheme on Shincliffe Peth, some work on Pelaw Leazes Lane, and surface improvements to the approach to Prebend's Bridge, but few other cycling improvements have been made near to the University's estate. There have been no proposals brought forward which would tackle danger at junctions, or segregation on main roads leading to the University. The County Council's policies, in the form of the Local Transport Plan and the previous cycling strategies have been supportive but have not resulted in sufficient progress. This suggests there has been too low a priority in budget and staff resource. The issue of financial and staff resource needs to be made explicit, to make the business case for investment.

It would also be beneficial if there was a commitment in the strategy to ensuring that improvements to cycling and walking environments are considered and implemented whenever there is major roadworks such as resurfacing and junction remodelling. For example, Church Street was completely resurfaced recently. More effective use of budgets might have been made if cycling and walking improvements had been carried out at the same time as this regular revenue-funded activity.

The University would also like to see Park and Ride schemes extended to include park and cycle schemes, so longer distance commuters into Durham could park on or near one of the super routes and complete their journey on bicycle (or foot) for the last 1-5 miles into Durham City Centre. A park and cycle/walk would work particularly well if there was a chance of an extra park/ride facility in the Bowburn/High Shincliffe/Shincliffe area, allowing people to cycle/walk along the river into the City Centre.

Please see the following comments in relation to some of the objectives:

Objective 3

Action 1

To produce the LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans), should surely not just involve DCC and developers as the key partners. The local community, major employers such as the University, and groups representing local cyclists, walkers and disabled users must also be involved in this process.

Objective 5

Action 1 –

Construct priority routes identified in LCWIPs

Noted in the Evidence Based document on page 16 that the Priority towns for LCWIPs are Chester-le-Street, Durham and Newton Aycliffe which sit on the line of the Great North Cycleway and a main transport corridor. Given the growth of the University we should urge for the priority routes for Durham City to be identified, designed, funded and built in a short timeframe.

Could the map set out in the evidence-based document on page 16 be linked to this objective or even included to be referenced as an appendix, to show readers this is this area this refers to? Many readers may not read both documents.

Action 3

Proposes the construction of cycling super routes strongly supported

This will benefit many University staff and help achieve the University's Travel Plan targets. In particular, routes which cross the A167 need attention, with safe approaches on roads such as Lowes Barn Bank, Potters Bank and Tollhouse Road. In all cases it is key that complete routes are provided which lead all the way to key destinations, such as the City Centre and the University. Only with the construction of good routes will it be worth moving on to the promotional "soft measures" of Building Block 3.

The review of the County Durham Cycling Strategy 2012 – 2015 stated: 'Established a hierarchy of routes: Cycling Super Routes, Primary and Secondary Routes to better protect, manage, plan and develop the network.'

Would it therefore be beneficial to include a map or link to the super route map set out in the first strategy into the proposed strategy for 2018-2028? If including a map or link is not possible, could a list be mentioned of the super route areas?

Objective 6

	<p>This is quite brief. It would be helpful to give more context on the sort of enforcement operations envisaged. Does this include enforcement action against pavement parking, speeding, dangerous and careless driving? The speed of traffic alongside narrow footways often gives cause for concern, and it would be good to see the Highways Authority and the Police showing a willingness to introduce a 20mph urban speed limit with effective enforcement, particularly on roads with narrow footways and no cycling provision.</p> <p>Objective 7 There is nothing in Building Block 2 about winter maintenance such as gritting and leaf clearance. These are both issues, particularly for the walking routes to the University. This is a shame considering the reliance many people have on walking around the City and the potentially dangerous conditions that can arise on the steeper streets and paths.</p> <p>On the other hand, some of these aspects are more appropriate for a service level statement than for a strategic delivery plan. Most of the objectives in Building Block 2 should surely be considered "business as usual".</p> <p>Objective 8 Action 1 Do they need to consult with the University / other organisations if the routes go through their land? If so, does this should be reflected in the delivery section?</p> <p>Objective 9 It would be important for the County Council to work closely with the University on signage within Durham City, respecting the World Heritage Site and Conservation Area while incorporating signage that helps students, staff and visitors to navigate the City and key University sites on foot and by bike.</p> <p>Objective 10 Good to action for the provision of biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 11 Action 1 Should Living Streets be added as a key partner too?</p> <p>Action 2 Should the word 'cycle' be added to 'parking in prime location'?</p> <p>Action 3 Suggestion to add in 'National cycle to work day' and 'In town without my car day'</p> <p>Objective 12 & 13 It is unclear why town cycling maps are mentioned under Objective 12 while countywide cycling maps appear under Objective 13.</p> <p>Objective 13 Covers promotion of cycling and walking but the only methods suggested relate to maps and new routes. It might be better to merge this objective with the following one (Objective 14) which mentions promotional events which are more relevant to the University population as well as other educational establishments.</p> <p>Objective 14 Action 3 As the University brings several thousand new students to Durham every year, promotion is an ongoing task and the University would want to see the continuation of promotional events that can encourage and inspire new students and staff. However, for some reason, the timeframe of the action has the activity ceasing in March 2020. Should this continue until the end of the plan?</p>
50	<p>I want to strongly support the proposed strategic cycling plan. I see welcome signs of ambition in the plans; I am particularly interested in the plans for routes reaching out to the nearby villages as I live in Sacriston and commute to Durham by bike. I have not so far seen any investment in cycle facilities along my route, and overall the level of investment in cycling and the attention given to cyclists in new road developments in Durham in recent years has been disappointing. I hope this strategic plan will represent a change in direction in this respect. I encourage the council to prioritise investment in delivering the proposed improvements and consult widely with local people in formulating the local action plans.</p> <p>I know this is a strategic plan, but just to mention a couple of particular areas for improvement where I cycle, the main challenges on my route are crossing roundabouts and the hill up to Sacriston on the road from new college. I think improving facilities for cyclists at junctions, particularly roundabouts, is one of the most important ways to encourage more people to come into cycling. On the hill, I used to use the unpaved footpath along the road going uphill, but this is now largely washed out. If this could be paved for the hill section it would be a marked improvement for cyclists travelling in this direction.</p>
51	<p>It is good to see the draft Cycling & Walking strategy finally coming together and thank you for all your hard work on this important document. Whilst many actions/policies appear to be repeating existing ones that have not met their ambitions over the last 5 years (eg school travel plans!), there are other key actions that are great to hear about (eg Super routes to link up local commuting). I am sure (as a cyclist) you have also been a tad ashamed of DCC lagging so far behind other councils on many transport issues, so it is good that there are targets to get DCC staff themselves to lead more by example in future. Some of the targets though seem a little lacking in ambition given that Durham is starting from such a low base, with few and poor facilities. I am also disappointed</p>

at the slight lack of teeth in some sections "incentivise" "encourage" rather than more forceful language. Sigh! It is long past time for Councillors/politicians to stop thinking of short-term popularity and take true responsibility to make 'inconvenient' decisions to protect future populations and the environment, instead of deferring actions until they have personally retired so it doesn't affect their comfortable commute! Aaaanyway

Air pollution:

There is little mentioned in the deliverables on air quality (although it is part of the evidence base). This severely affects all users/population and has (*in my opinion*) as much of an effect on the perception of walking/cycling health/safety as road sharing fears do. Existing laws on engine idling are NOT enforced in fact DCC pollution officers seem unaware who's responsible for enforcing the laws and Civil Enforcement Officers don't want to know. I would strongly recommend an educational campaign to remind drivers (and driving schools!) that it is ILLEGAL to run their engines whilst stationary (either parked up or in a traffic queue). A single car engine idling produces up to 150 balloons' worth of harmful chemicals PER MINUTE. Why are other councils enforcing this with FPNs but not DCC? We need a 'Don't be idle' campaign to show all drivers that they do not have the right to pollute Durham and waste resources unnecessarily.

Part of your aim to encourage people to return to walking into the cities/towns should be to establish safe, ie unpolluted, and pleasant walking routes not just sticking a pavement alongside a busy road. One easy example is Redhills Lane - a direct route from the Crossgate Moor residential area into Durham City centre, currently served by a one way traffic route (up), single cycle lane (down) and narrow pavement. The section on the bank is an attractive approach to the city with a panoramic view from its highest point (*and already part of a tourist walking route*), however it is a dangerous route for both cyclists and pedestrians due to the speed that motor vehicles approach the corners (often in the cycle lane). There are very few houses on the bank, which would make it easy to transform its current hazardous features by restricting access to residents' and emergency vehicles only, thus enabling cyclists and pedestrians to enjoy a scenic route into the city without trepidation (and manage the hard walk back up without gasping for air as the polluting vehicles zoom past inches away). If Durham Johnson school were to be serious about a travel plan (and I have heard that they currently couldn't give a jot about one!) then they should be encouraging the closure of Redhills bank to traffic to provide a safe and direct walking route to the city centre transport links for pupils, staff and residents alike! It is scary when you make the healthy choice to walk but you feel like you are actually putting your overall health more at risk because of the pollution on the route. :(This walking route currently fails on the key network principle of SAFE (speeds and distance from motor vehicles).

DCC should put more pressure on the truly local taxi firms to convert to LEVs, then bring in local bylaws (*is this possible?*) that only LEVs can operate in the city centre (so protecting local firms as well as reducing pollution). Similarly with bus companies.

Safety: Existing laws on pavement parking seem rarely enforced. Both cyclists and pedestrians are forced to swerve out into the road in many areas where parking on pavements and in cycle lanes are prevalent. Many new drivers do not seem aware now that it is technically illegal since it is so commonplace. I would strongly encourage an educational campaign to remind drivers (and driving schools!) that it is ILLEGAL to park over junctions and cycle lanes and to block reasonable egress on pavements. The plan needs to be firmer about relocating or removing car parking on key roads where space is needed to give safe protected cycling routes.

Reduction of speeds (eg making the residential areas all 20 mph and A167 thru residential areas 30 mph) would make a big difference to the perception of safety when walking (and cycling) and reduce rat-runs. People dodge traffic on the A167 because of the low priority on timing of the pedestrian crossings!

Resources and budgets:

Higher levels of investment are needed if DCC is to take this seriously - **reallocate** road budgets, as cycling investment repays many times over in comparison. USE local expertise (cycling groups etc) in information gathering and development of the LCWIPs. I am sure you will agree that more staff resources should be allocated in the County Council to progress this delivery plan, as the timescales are way too long999 there is a need to counteract decades of spending on the wrong solutions!

DCC is seeking behavioural change of the county residents and seems in the past to have said 'we can't spend money on pedestrian/cycle routes as there is no demand'. OF COURSE there is low demand when the walking/cycling routes are unattractive/unsafe/polluted. CREATE the demand by making the routes the most attractive, safest and quickest commuting options please! I will be delighted to see this plan adopted (*with some strengthening tweaks*) and I strongly support your vision to make cycling and walking safe everyday modes of transport for everyone.

52 I'm really pleased to see this initiative and strategy. The objectives seem really good; I look forward to their realisation. Points I'd like to make, as they affect me:

1) Cycle paths/lanes are needed on commuter routes, not just leisure routes.

2) It is REALLY IMPORTANT that the surfaces are suitable and flat. It is great that there are cycle paths around the NETPark in Sedgfield and through the Winterton Estate next door, for example, but the surfaces often undulate so much that they are very uncomfortable to ride (especially the path near old St. Luke's Church).

	<p>3) I now commute between XXXXXX and XXXXX, although I have not yet tried cycling it. This is partly because, unless I take a very long route, I'd have to use the A177 (the path alongside it being rather overgrown). This is a fast road - fairly wide most of the time, which is helpful - with no cycle lane. I can then pick up a cycle path from Coxhoe along the A688, join the A181 but crossing the road into Sherburn House is a bit hairy. The rest is probably manageable, with care and making myself very visible.</p> <p>4) Better awareness and consideration from motor vehicle drivers is essential.</p> <p>5) Better awareness by cyclists about their own visibility. The number I see with dark clothing and no lights is crackers.</p> <p>All the best with this initiative!</p>
53	<p>First of all I would like to express my support for the plan. It is a nicely structured piece of work created for the benefit of all residents at County Durham and I hope that it will receive all the support it needs to become a reality.</p> <p>With regards to the contents of the plan, perhaps it may be of benefit to future versions of it emphasised a bit more its alignment with policies of accessibility for people with limited mobility or disabilities. Within the context of an ageing population, it is important that the road infrastructure provides a safe environment for the growing number of voters that may have limited mobility due to age. In the case of County Durham, I am particularly concerned about road crossing at roundabouts. I noticed that along the A167 there is existing provision for walking and cycling but when it comes to crossing the roads at the roundabouts, there are hardly any crossings that are safe for pedestrians that may either walk slowly or with the need of an aid or a disability scooter (in my opinion there aren't particularly safe for pedestrians with normal walking ability, children and cyclists). The absence of safe crossings can turn a road into an impassable obstacle or boundary. The roundabouts seem to be designed with the intention to maximise traffic speed but that has a negative effect on non-motorised citizens.</p> <p>The County Durham Summary of Population Projections from the Office of National Statistics (2014) states that "the proportion of the overall population aged 65 and over in County Durham will increase from one in five people (19.6%) in 2014 to one in four people (26.4%) by 2039." So it is clear to me that the number of voters with restricted mobility (and their relatives) that need to be taken into account when designing road layouts are very likely to grow.</p> <p>Because of the above I would like that the team in charge of implementing the plan ensures that crossing points at roundabouts on main roads do not become an impassable obstacle for pedestrians of all abilities and cyclists.</p>
54	<p>Trust Pathways welcomes the production of this Delivery Plan, which will set the foundation for producing Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) to implement the government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy. We fully support the vision to make cycling and walking everyday modes of transport for everyone. That is clearly not the case at present, with the British Social attitudes Survey showing that around two thirds of people think it is too dangerous to cycle on the roads. In the 2013 survey, even 48% of people who had cycled in the previous 12 months agreed that the roads were too dangerous for them to cycle on. There is also a social equality issue here, as the percentage of women responding in this way is much higher. The Action Plan sets out a good framework for achieving the aims and vision of the Delivery Plan.</p> <p>We do feel that there are a few weaknesses, however, which we would like the Council to consider seriously.</p> <p>Firstly, given the conditions on our roads, and the disjointed nature of the existing cycle network, the provision of safe, continuous and direct cycle routes is of paramount importance. Taking the cue from the DfT's Propensity to Cycle tool, we agree that initial investment must be focussed on the urban areas where the scope to enable people to switch from short car journeys to cycling is greatest. However, the objective relating to infrastructure provision is not given sufficient prominence in the Delivery Plan. It would be quite possible to achieve many of the targets on the other objectives, such as promotional activities, assessment and audit, without conditions for cycling improving at all.</p> <p>Secondly, it is very hard to tell from the documents what level of priority is assigned to this Delivery Plan in relation to other transport investment. There do not seem to be regular sources of funding guaranteed beyond the next couple of years. Can we be assured that the existing roads budgets will be used to the full to further cycling and walking investment?</p> <p>Thirdly, we fear that the Delivery Plan may prove ineffective if attitudes and skills within other sections of the Council are not transformed. The previous Cycling Strategy mandated the use of best practice design guidance including the CROW manual, but this does not seem to have resulted in practice. There are examples of greenfield sites such as Integra 61 and Mount Oswald, where the cycling provision could have been high-quality, but simple mistakes around junction design mean that we are storing up yet more problems to fix for the future. There is too much emphasis on putting cyclists on pavements with shared toucan crossings, and not enough provision which is truly attractive for everyday cycling. Even with the latest link from County Hall to the railway station, the junction treatments could be a lot better. We would like to see the design guidance being fully implemented by planning control and the Council's own design teams. We welcome the action point around improving officer training.</p>

	<p>Although the action points have a cost indication, the likely benefits are not tabulated. This may make it harder to argue for the right level of investment on the costlier items such as infrastructure improvements, which is also highly beneficial. The other thing that is lacking is a real vision of what might need to change about our streets to realise the ambitions. Those who are familiar with Dutch infrastructure and the Active Travel (Wales) Act Design Guidance will be visualising an environment where on street car parking is better managed, and road space is reallocated to provide dedicated cycleways, with safe sequencing at junctions. But any uninformed reader may think that the plan means more of the same, with a bit of footway widening, and little attention to junctions beyond a few toucan crossings. Perhaps some more photographs of good quality infrastructure from around the UK would help set the expectations higher.</p> <p>In conclusion, we hope the Delivery Plan can be adopted quickly, so that the LCWIP process can commence. We would be very keen to be involved in the process of determining the network requirements for the LCWIPs.</p>
55	<p>The Environment and Sustainable Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ESCOSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment and provide a collective response to the Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018 -2028 (SCWDP) consultation.</p> <p>Members of the ESC OSC together with members of Adults Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee received a presentation on the SCWDP and provided the comments below which form the ESC OSC formal response to the consultation.</p> <p>Members suggested that a mechanism is in place to allow members to monitor the performance of the delivery plan specifically the participation levels prior and following the implementation of the delivery plan and for this to be provided before the scheduled update on the delivery plan to the committee.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about the maintenance of pathways and cycle routes in and around villages. They highlighted health and safety issues and that residents in local villages need to use these routes to get to the designated 12 towns in the County.</p> <p>Concerns about maintenance of pathways and cycle routes and highlighted currently in many local villages volunteers undertake litter picks. This would suggest that there is a need to educate those using the paths and cycle ways to take their litter home.</p> <p>Members highlighted that whilst encouraging residents to cycle, there is a need to ensure enough provision to park bikes at schools and employment sites.</p> <p>Councillor Dunn Commented that the cycle route from Coxhoe to Durham City was staggered and intermittent and suggested that the wording in objective 5.3 '<i>Construct Cycling Super Routes linking key settlements within 5 miles of Durham City.</i>' be revised to add '<i>be a priority</i>' at the end of the sentence.</p> <p>Councillor Gardner commented that Spennymoor needs to be included in the key transport corridor of the A167.</p> <p>Members suggested that safe walking routes from major housing estates to schools should also be included within the delivery plan, as these are routes used by local communities. We are encouraging children to walk/cycle to school so we need to ensure that these routes are maintained.</p> <p>Members sought clarification as to whether equestrians had been included in the consultation.</p> <p>Members highlighted the need for the emerging County Durham Plan (CDP) to include in its future development strategy (including highways infrastructure proposals in the CDP) provision of quality cycling and walking routes.</p> <p>Members commented that whilst recognising the delivery plan concentrated on getting people to work in 12 major towns the plan must maintain and develop tourist cycling and walking routes within the County. This would increase the tourism offer within the County.</p>