



CYCLE CONTRAFLOWS

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Moving Traffic Regulation Orders) (Consolidation) Order 2014 in association with the Cycle Contraflow TRO.

The Cycle Contraflow programme is being delivered as part of Council's 2021/221 Active Travel Fund programme which is funded by the Department for Transport. The programme is designed to promote cycling as a replacement for journeys previously made by public transport, and as a practical alternative to the private car. It has been designed to create an environment that is safer for both cycling and walking, for trips to work and school, and is designed to encourage new cyclists, as well as those for whom active travel is the norm. Full details of the programme are available on the Council's website at www.plymouth.gov.uk/activetravelfund

The Cycle Contraflow programme is intended to increase network permeability for cyclists and help to provide quicker and more reliable journey times than equivalent trips by private cars. The programme supports the 'accessibility for all' requirements within the Department for Transport's Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance Local Transport Note LTN1/20¹. The routes created will be more direct than those available for private cars and will help to allow people to reach day to day destinations on routes that connect.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add;

Prohibition of Entry with an exemption for Pedal Cycles

- i. Maple Grove – at its junction with Beechwood Avenue
- ii. St Mary Street – at its junction with East Street

One Way except for Pedal Cycles

- i. Citadel Road – from its junction with West Hoe Road to its junction with Prospect Place in an easterly direction
- ii. Crowndale Avenue – for its entirety in an easterly direction
- iii. Apsley Road – from its junction with Sutherland Road to its junction with Dale Road in an easterly direction
- iv. Gordon Terrace – for its entirety in a westerly direction
- v. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Ermington Terrace to its junction with Gordon Terrace in a westerly direction

¹ [Cycle infrastructure design \(LTN 1/20\) - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

- vi. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Houndiscombe Road to its junction with Napier Terrace (main) in a northerly direction
- vii. Admirals Hard – from its junction with Cremyll Street to its junction with Durnford Street in an easterly direction
- viii. Elm Road – from its junction with Western College Road to its junction with Meadfoot Terrace in an easterly direction
- ix. Meadfoot Terrace – for its entirety in a south westerly direction
- x. Mount Street – for its entirety in a southerly direction
- xi. Prospect Street – from its junction with Armada Street to its junction with Camden Street in a northerly direction
- xii. Camden Street – from its junction with Mount Street to its junction with Prospect Street in an easterly direction
- xiii. Amity Place – for its entirety in a southerly direction

SCHEDULE OF REVOCATIONS

Prohibition of Entry

- i. Maple Grove – at its junction with Beechwood Avenue
- ii. St Mary Street – at its junction with East Street

One Way

- i. Citadel Road – from its junction with West Hoe Road to its junction with Prospect Place in an easterly direction
- ii. Crowndale Avenue – for its entirety in an easterly direction
- iii. Apsley Road – from its junction with Sutherland Road to its junction with Dale Road in an easterly direction
- iv. Gordon Terrace – for its entirety in a westerly direction
- v. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Ermington Terrace to its junction with Gordon Terrace in a westerly direction
- vi. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Houndiscombe Road to its junction with Napier Terrace (main) in a northerly direction
- vii. Admirals Hard – from its junction with Cremyll Street to its junction with Durnford Street in an easterly direction
- viii. Elm Road – from its junction with Western College Road to its junction with Meadfoot Terrace in an easterly direction
- ix. Meadfoot Terrace – for its entirety in a south westerly direction
- x. Mount Street – for its entirety in a southerly direction
- xi. Prospect Street – from its junction with Armada Street to its junction with Camden Street in a northerly direction

- xii. Camden Street – from its junction with Mount Street to its junction with Prospect Street in an easterly direction
- xiii. Amity Place – for its entirety in a southerly direction

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

Before statutory consultation started, the proposals for the 14 cycle contraflows were sent to Ward Members on 28 September 2021.

The proposed Cycle Contraflow TRO's were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 22nd October 2021.

Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 19th October 2021.

The consultation closed on 12th November.

There have been five representations received relating to the proposals included in the Traffic Regulation Order. Two were received within the consultation period (Table Two) and a further three were received after the consultation closed. The City Council is not required to consider late consultation submissions. However, the responses have been taken into consideration and hence are included in this report for completeness.

The representations are from both private residents and wider stakeholder groups.

A summary of the representations received on the contraflow proposals are in Table One:

Table One: Summary of all representations received

No.	Road	Number of representations			
		Support	Support with amendments	Oppose with amendments	Oppose
1	Maple Grove		1		
2	St Marys Street	1			
3	Citadel Road	1			
4	Crowndale Avenue		1		
5	Apsley Road	1			
6	Gordon Terrace	1			
7	Napier Terrace	1			
8	Admirals Hard		1		1
9	Elm Road		1	1	
10	Meadfoot Terrace	1			1
11	Mount Street	1			1
12	Prospect Street	1			1

13	Camden Street	1			1
14	Amity Place	1			
	TOTAL	10	4	1	5
	Overall programme	1			1

The information presented in the table above can be summarised as follows:

- 6 of the contraflows were supported with no specific opposition
- 5 of the contraflows received objections
- 1 contraflow received an objection, with a proposed amendment
- 4 contraflows received support, with proposed amendments
- The overall programme received one representation that was supportive, and one that objected.

The statutory consultation was preceded by a survey considering the wider Active Travel Fund programme in summer 2021. The survey was undertaken by an independent market research company. 2,008 responses were received. The survey results therefore have a margin of error of circa 2.18% at the 95% confidence level, based on the total population size estimate of Plymouth. (262,100 (ONS, Mid-Year Estimates 2019)).

Over two thirds of respondents to the survey thought it was either extremely or very important to promote walking and cycling in Plymouth and 59% either agreed or strongly agreed that the cycle contraflow programme would encourage them to walk or cycle in Plymouth. A summary of the results is available online (www.plymouth.gov.uk/activetravelfund).

Table Two: Representations received within the consultation period

Consultee Number	Consultation Feedback	Council Response
1	<p>Overall PCyC supports the proposed contra flows.</p> <p>We emphasise that the signs at each end of the contraflow: SR002 at the start and SR001 at the end are clearly visible to both cyclists and motorists.</p> <p>If not already specified the speed limit on all roads with a contraflow needs to be 20mph.</p> <p>i. Maple Grove – at its junction with Beechwood Avenue (drawing 0002) If car parking remains on both sides cyclists going down a quite steep gradient will meet traffic turning in off Dale Rd in the middle of the road</p> <p>ii. Crowndale Avenue Lower Compton – for its entirety in an easterly direction (drawing 0001) PCyC supports this proposal but notes that this route is used as a rat-run so traffic heading North on Chapel Way needs to be slowed down</p>	<p>Thank you for your response of 1 November. The schemes that are currently proposed have been selected from a larger list on the basis that they have been assessed as being appropriate for a cycle contraflow without wider measures such as 20 mph speed limits. In order to be effective and minimise signage and confusion, 20 mph speed limits are generally better applied to wider areas rather than an individual Street. Area wide 20 mph speed limits are beyond the scope and budget of this project, and therefore not currently proposed. However, due to the nature of the roads in question, it is expected that the majority of vehicles will not be travelling in speeds in excess of 20 mph. Furthermore, the road markings and signage reducing the apparent lane width available to vehicles, and alerting them to the potential presence of oncoming cyclists, may further reduce vehicle speeds.</p> <p>Maple Grove is currently a two-way street as is indicated by the roadmarkings at the southern end, and so there is no indication to northbound drivers that they should not be expecting oncoming traffic. Intervisibility is reasonable for right turning vehicles which are most likely to come into conflict with contraflow cyclists.</p> <p>To clarify further, the current situation is that cycling is already permitted north along Maple Grove, but not through the no entry signs at the southern end at the top of the hill.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Crowndale Avenue proposals and will look to include additional roadmarkings to highlight the presence of contraflow cyclists emerging from the junction between Chapel Way and Crowndale Avenue</p>

	<p>vii. Admirals Hard, Stonehouse– from its junction with Cremyll Street to its junction with Durnford Street in an easterly direction (drawing 0008) PCyC supports this long-standing proposal to create a direct route for cyclists to the Cremyll Ferry. Both Durnford St. and Cremyll St. need to have a 20mph speed limit if not already specified.</p> <p>viii. Elm Road – from its junction with Western College Road to its junction with Meadfoot Terrace in an easterly direction (drawing 0012) PCyC supports this proposal, but would point out that with current traffic density turning right uphill from Elm Road onto Mannamead Road is often difficult for motorists and can be very dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>We would also emphasise that clear signage is required at the end section of some existing contra-flows. One example is the section from the bottom of Lambay Hill to the Barbican, where it is not clear to motorists that they will meet oncoming cyclists.</p> <p>PCyC supports the following proposals:</p> <p>i. Citadel Road, Hoe– from its junction with West Hoe Road to its junction with Prospect Place in an easterly direction (drawing 0001)</p>	<p>Durnford Street and Cremyll Street are already part of a 20 mph zone.</p> <p>The right turn from Elm Road onto Mannamead Road is already a permitted manoeuvre, it is acknowledged that this manoeuvre could be challenging at busy times. Cyclists that do not feel safe to make the right turn manoeuvre have the option to walk along the footway to cross at the signalised crossing. Options to improve the connection here could be to provide an additional crossing or a shared use facility on the East side of Mannamead Road but these options are beyond the budget and scope of this programme.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment, this existing scheme is not part of this program but we have raised this concern with the Council’s Road Safety team who are looking to address this.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>ii. St Mary Street Stonehouse– at its junction with East Street (drawing 0038)</p> <p>iii. Apsley Road – from its junction with Sutherland Road to its junction with Dale Road in an easterly direction (drawing 0002 +3)</p> <p>iv. Gordon Terrace – for its entirety in a westerly direction (drawing 0002+3) legitimises existing use by cyclists</p> <p>v. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Ermington Terrace to its junction with Gordon Terrace in a westerly direction (drawing 0004)</p> <p>vi. Napier Terrace – from its junction with Houndiscombe Road to its junction with Napier Terrace (main) in a northerly direction (drawing 0004+5)</p> <p>ix. Meadfoot Terrace – for its entirety in a south westerly direction (drawing 0012)</p> <p>x. Mount Street – for its entirety in a southerly direction (drawing 0017)</p> <p>xi. Prospect Street – from its junction with Armada Street to its junction with Camden Street in a northerly direction (drawing 0017)</p> <p>xii. Camden Street – from its junction with Mount Street to its junction with Prospect Street in an easterly direction (drawing 0018)</p> <p>xiii. Amity Place – for its entirety in a southerly direction (drawing 0021)</p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>
2	<p>I have never since such a ludicrous plan for a cyclist contra flow in the following streets Prospect, Camden and Mount Streets. All these</p>	<p>Thank you for your email of 9 November objecting to the proposals to allow people to cycle in a contraflow direction on the existing one-way system on Prospect Street, Camden Street and Mount Street.</p>

<p>streets are only one lane due to residential parking and are some of the worse maintained roads in the area.</p> <p>All cyclists need to do is navigate the existing oneway system. None of the streets in the oneway system are miles apart just a few metres. And as for joyriding in Drake's Ward there are certainly more attractive places to ride a bike than a residential area with rubbish strewn around and regular fly tipping.</p> <p>There is a school in Mount Street which is very busy in the morning and mid-afternoon with parents dropping off and collecting their children apart from delivery vans, taxi's and normal residential traffic during the daytime.</p> <p>Whoever thought this plan up should go back to the drawing board study areas for cycle paths and certainly not contraflow systems in one lane residential streets.</p> <p>There will be accidents and cyclists will end up on the footpaths putting residential pedestrians in harms way.</p> <p>I have attached some photos for your information to this email and undercover on two separate emails.</p>	<p>The purpose of the proposals is to help make it easier and more convenient for people to cycle for everyday journeys, not just for leisure. Plymouth City Council has declared a Climate Emergency and with road transport representing circa 30% of the city's carbon emissions, a proportion that is increasing, it is necessary that we help make it easier for people to walk and cycle. There are of course also significant health and decongestion benefits with increased levels of cycling.</p> <p>The available width on the roads mentioned is limited, but has been assessed as being sufficient to allow contraflow cycling on these roads. It is worth noting that there are residential streets in Plymouth that have a similar width available that are two-way for all traffic, cycles of course require less width than cars and vans. The proposed designs have all been reviewed as part of a Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>We note your concerns about the maintenance of the roads and have shared them with the Council's Highways maintenance team. If the proposals are approved, we will review the road surface before the work takes place with a view to patching sections that are particularly deteriorated.</p> <p>We are also sorry to hear about the rubbish and fly tipping and have passed on this concern, with the photographs, to our Highways maintenance/cleansing team.</p>
--	--

Table Three: Representations received outside the consultation period

Consultee number	Consultation Feedback	Council Response
3	<p>1. This is a bad idea.</p> <p>1.1 I witness many times a day, every day of the week, cyclists disregarding the Law and cycling the wrong way down one way streets. All this relaxation of the Law will do is to get cyclists more and more into the mentality that cycling down a way way street in the wrong direction is the norm.</p> <p>1.2 This is dangerous for pedestrians who currently can step off of the pavement after checking for oncoming traffic. Pedestrians will have no way of knowing which ones of a small proportion of one way streets allow cyclists to go against the traffic flow. I am confident that there will be collisions between pedestrians and cyclists if this arrangement is permitted.</p> <p>1.3 Accordingly, I submit that this proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>2. As regards Admirals Hard, such an arrangement would be contrary to "unless there are safety, operational or cost reasons why this is not feasible, i.e. in this case "safety". At the junction between Admirals Hard and Durnford</p>	<p>Thank you for your email of 14 November raising concerns about the proposed cycle contraflow programme generally, and specifically on Admirals Hard.</p> <p>Your concern that allowing people to cycle in a contraflow direction in some locations would encourage them to generally cycle the wrong way down one-way streets is acknowledged. However, it could be argued that continuing to prohibit people from cycling in a contraflow direction where it is considered safe for them to do so, may actually be more likely to have such an effect. Keeping one-way streets one-way for cycling, only where there is a safety concern, may actually encourage greater compliance because people cycling will be better able to understand the rationale.</p> <p>To reduce the risk of pedestrians stepping into the path of cyclists, road markings and signage will make it clear that cycles can be expected in both directions. In the case of Admirals Hard, this includes a marked cycle lane with cycle symbols and arrows pointing in the contraflow direction, along with coloured surfacing denoting the start and end of the cycle contraflow.</p> <p>Regarding Admirals Hard specifically as it approaches Durnford Street, the width between the kerbs is 3.4 m at its narrowest section which is considered sufficient for this arrangement because the road is not heavily trafficked and the majority of vehicles using this road have a width of less than 2 m. Replacement of a small section of cobbles with asphalt surfacing will also create a more usable road width at the eastern end and provide a more level surface for pedestrians to cross. In addition, Admirals Hard is within a 20 mph zone, and vehicles are generally not observed to be travelling at excessive speeds on this short stretch of road.</p>

	<p>Street, Admirals Hard's highway width narrows to allow just one vehicle's width. Cyclists turning into Admirals Hard from Durnford Street will be confronted by oncoming vehicles blocking their route, leading to conflicts, road rage and inevitable accidents. Accordingly, if this proposal does go ahead, I submit that Admirals Hard should be excluded from the changes.</p>	
4	<p>I'm a little confused as to what is actually being proposed ... It reads as though you intend closing access, apart from Pedal Cycles, to the roads listed.</p> <p>My interest (having lived in this area for 33 years) and with a business in Meadfoot Terrace [Amber Health, Beauty & Sports Injury Clinic at 14 Meadfoot Terrace], my concern is Elm Road and Meadfoot Terrace.</p> <p>Ref Elm Road ... Elm Road is split into 3 sections, from Mannamead Road it is one way for about 200 metres until the junction / turn into Meadfoot Terrace. No current concerns apart from the potential riding of pedal cycles in the wrong direction up a reasonably busy section. How many Cyclists are you planning to kill?</p> <p>Elm Road then moves to a two way section, where all drivers seem to understand that 15 to 20mph is a good speed. Few cars travel down this section, and even fewer travel up the hill</p>	<p>Thank you for your email of 15 November.</p> <p>To clarify, no change to the permitted motor vehicle movements are proposed as part of this programme. All sections of Elm Road that are currently two-way will remain as such. The only change in terms of the permitted movements is that on the one-way sections of Meadfoot Terrace and Elm Road, cyclists will be permitted in a contraflow direction. This would appear to address some of the main concerns that you have raised.</p> <p>Regarding the concern raised about cyclists being allowed to travel northbound on Meadfoot Terrace because some vehicles have been seen travelling fast (around 30 mph) in the southbound direction, contraflow cycling has been deemed to be workable on this street. Visibility between people cycling and those driving is good, and drivers will be alerted to the potential presence of cyclists through the use of signage and road markings including cycle symbols and direction arrows on the carriageway. In addition, cyclists will be travelling relatively slowly uphill here.</p> <p>Thank you for sharing the photographs of the vegetation growth; these have been passed on to our maintenance teams.</p>

	<p>from the MOT Garage unless wanting to save a major detour into Meadfoot Terrace. I am not aware of any accidents in 30 plus years on the section. Why change what is working. It would help if the bushes at the side on the road were trimmed. See photos. Why change this to a one way system, which may increase traffic speed and possibly kill a couple of cyclists. MID Section - leave as is, two way.</p> <p>The lower end of Elm Road (about 400 yards) is a wide two lane road and SHOULD NOT BE MADE A ONE-WAY STREET</p> <p>Ref: Meadfoot Terrace - currently a one way street, cars (well BMW Drivers) do tend on odd occasions to travel at about 30 mph down Meadfoot Terrace, until they see that they have to stop before entering College Avenue or have to stop whilst our Clients are reversing into the Salon Car Park area. Allowing cyclists to pedal cycle up the hill of Meadfoot Terrace (currently they walk pushing the odd Bike) is a pretty stupid proposal. Once again, how many cyclists are you planning to kill?</p> <p>Photos of the Area. See attachments. See Seven attachments related to Elm Road and Meadfoot Terrace.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>5</p>	<p>The roads in Drake Ward listed below are in this proposal</p> <p>Maple Grove, Apsley Road, Gordon Terrace, Napier Terrace, Mount Street, Prospect Street, Camden Street, Amity Place.</p> <p>I have tried to raise these plans with residents as they know nothing about these proposals. There have been some small notices on the streets but for some reason no letters have been sent to residents to alert them of the proposals.</p> <p>I have never seen such a limited consultation on a cycle scheme proposal.</p> <p>I would suggest that you extend the consultation period and do it in a way that the residents can properly engage with. I would suggest some direct mail and street level consultation meetings.</p> <p>The link below about the proposals is unreadable and means that residents can't see the ideas that you have.</p> <p>There is no urgency on this so let's ensure full transparency</p> <p>The people of Drake deserve better. Can you please re-advertise?</p>	<p>Thank you for your email of 24 November to Councillor Dreaan regarding the recent consultation on a number of proposed cycle contraflows in Drake Ward.</p> <p>The Cycle Contraflow programme is being delivered as part of Council's 2021/22 Active Travel Fund programme, full details of which are available on the Council's website (www.plymouth.gov.uk/activetravelfund). It is funded by the Department for Transport.</p> <p>The Active Travel Fund programme is designed to promote cycling as a replacement for journeys previously made by public transport, and as a practical alternative to the private car. It has been designed to create an environment that is safer for both cycling and walking, for trips to work and school (with 68 cycle casualties in 2020 alone, 14 of which were serious, this is something that we are committed to addressing), and is designed to encourage new cyclists, as well as those for whom active travel is the norm.</p> <p>The Cycle Contraflow programme is intended to increase network permeability for cyclists and help to provide quicker and more reliable journey times. It supports the 'accessibility for all' requirements within the Department for Transport's Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance Local Transport Note LTN1/20.</p> <p>Promoting active travel, and encouraging more trips to be made by sustainable transport, as this scheme seeks to do, is a key part of the Council's Climate Emergency programme.</p> <p>The consultation on the cycle contraflows was undertaken in accordance with the statutory consultation procedure. Eighteen A4 notices were put up on the relevant streets in Drake for at least 3 weeks.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation process was considered appropriate for the cycle contraflow proposals because of their modest nature, in terms of their scale and impact. The proposals relate purely to cycling movements and there are no proposed changes to vehicular movements on the streets in question and no impact on parking.</p>
----------	---	--

		<p>The proposals for the 14 Cycle Contraflow TROs were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 22nd October 2021.</p> <p>Details of the proposals were also sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 19th October 2021.</p> <p>With regard to the clarity of the consultation materials the title of the order, which featured on the notice, was "cycle contraflows"; the scheme drawings, whilst lacking some detail, also make clear the overall intention to allow people to cycle in a contraflow direction and the on street notice also advised that a hardcopy could be sent to residents if required. No other complaints have been received regarding the consultation approach. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that the resolution of the drawings could be improved and we will look into improving the resolution of the plans for future consultations.</p> <p>Thank you again for your comments on the consultation. I hope the information above is helpful in responding to your concerns.</p>
--	--	---

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Transport considers the representations received and the Plymouth City Council responses to those representations, and approves the required Traffic Regulation Orders.

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.