



facilities encourage high cycle use (left) However, priority at to ensure their safety

## **Separate but equal?**

Are segregated cycle facilities the way to boost utility cycling? CTC wants your feedback, for or against. Campaigns & Policy Director Roger Geffen explains

WANT MORE CAMPAIGNS NEWS?

to Cycle Digest. Email cherry.allan@ ctc.org.uk to receive

THE PAST three years have seen a revival of the debate over the pros and cons of segregated cycle facilities, prompted not least by the huge growth in cycling in New York and Seville. Cycle use doubled in New York between 2007 and 2011, while Seville achieved a ten-fold increase in cycle trips between 2007 and 2010.

New York's achievements involved political battles, including a lawsuit led by a former New York transport commissioner. And a recent change of administration in Seville threatens to reverse the progress made there too. It is clearly not easy to win the political support, road-space and funding necessary for segregation to be done well.

With or without segregation, creating good cycling conditions here will require the political will to reduce traffic volumes and speeds, and to reduce car parking. London Cycling Campaign's 'Love

London, Go Dutch' campaign is an attempt to mobilise political support in the run-up to May's London mayoral contest.

LCC know that the cycling lobby undermined the political support it enjoyed in 1997 with a huge argument over segregation. We had won cross-party support for the National Cycling Strategy in 1996, but that argument meant it was never funded. We can't make that mistake again.

A recent focus group research project, entitled 'Understanding Walking and Cycling', found that few people would contemplate cycling on Britain's roads today. It suggested that the only way to recreate a cycling culture was through segregated facilities.

Yet segregation gets a bad press in Britain, where it often means cheap and nasty pavement conversions, with poor surfaces and maintenance. conflict with pedestrians, and no priority at junctions.

We also know that people can be persuaded to take up cycling by being given targeted opportunities - for example, through cycle training or CTC's Workplace Cycle Challenges. Such programmes are not expensive, costing around £100 for each person who takes up cycling - as compared to £200,000 to £1m per kilometre for segregated cycle routes.

The best solution may be a mix of both approaches. Focusing on encouraging on-road cycling (through 20mph schemes, on-carriageway cycle lanes on main roads, redesigned junctions, and targeted promotional activities) may be the most cost-effective way to boost cycle use from a low base. It may ultimately prove insufficient to reach Dutch or Danish levels of cycle use, but the increased 'cyclists' vote' may then help unlock the funding, road-space and political will needed to do segregation well.

## Give us your views

The latest issue of CTC's campaigns newsletter, Cycle Digest, provided summaries of three additional research reports and a roundup of readers' responses to a discussion-piece in the previous issue. You can read them online at ctc.org.uk/ cycledigest - or email cherry. allan@ctc.org.uk for a copy.

Despite the diversity of responses, there was a consensus that segregated facilities, if well designed and in the right circumstances, could be highly beneficial for cycling. The questions are: how do we define 'well designed' (in order to have a basis for objecting to poor or downright dangerous segregation); and what are 'the right circumstances'? And specifically, do the answers to both questions require the introduction of Danish-style rules giving both pedestrians and cyclists clear priority over traffic turning across their path at junctions?

CTC has now launched an online questionnaire to gauge the opinions of CTC members and others on these questions. You are encouraged to read more about the debate and give us vour responses.

Join in at ctc.org.uk/ campaigns.