

MCCF Survey on Election Candidate Views on Improved Cycle Infrastructure

Improved cycling provision	X
Increased road safety	X
Properly built infrastructure	X

The Maidstone Cycle Campaign Forum have used their best endeavours to ask (using email addresses where published) all candidates standing for KCC and MBC at the local elections on 6th May to talk to us about their policies for improving cycling infrastructure in the town. Any candidates who are shown as not having made a response and wish to do so are invited to contact Maidstone Cycle Campaign Forum at info@maidstonecycling.uk.

The league table of number of responses by party was as follows:

	Lib Dems	14 responses - 61% of candidates
	Labour	13 responses - 72% of candidates
	Greens	10 responses - 56% of candidates
	Conservative	8 responses - 35% of candidates
	Independent *	4 responses - 14% of candidates
	Reform UK	2 responses - 100% of candidates
	The For Britain Movement	0 responses - 0% of candidates

Conclusion: The Lib Dems, Greens and Labour have the biggest numbers who are up for a discussion on improving sustainable transport options for Maidstone.

* Due to the lack of a party infrastructure it was less easy to contact these candidates which may have depressed the response rate.

How positive were the candidates about cycling friendly policies?

By averaging the responses by party we get the following picture:

Lib Dems	5 - Fully support
Greens	5 - Fully support
Labour	5 - Fully support
Independent	4 *
Conservative	3
Reform UK	3

There is a high degree of support across the parties for improved cycle infrastructure, increased safety and delivery of infrastructure to national standards (hopefully learning from the experience of the po-up cycle lanes in King Street.

* This is on the basis of a single input.

Conclusion

We do have very strong support across Maidstone candidates for improving Maidstone's cycling infrastructure. Support is particularly strong for the implementation of segregated cycle lanes across all respondents to the survey. All parties except Labour have individual doubts about the other four policies with the Conservatives having the most concerns. Based on the comments, these are mostly in relation to enforcement and feasibility.

The challenge for Maidstone has to be to turn the general support of nearly 50% of the KCC and Maidstone candidates into actual delivery of improved solutions to encourage more safe and convenient cycle journeys in the borough.

Details of the Survey:

Introduction:

Can we help people make short journeys on foot or by bike to make Kent a healthier place to live?

41% of UK journeys are just 1-2 miles, yet 61% of them are made by car for lack of safe, realistic alternatives (DfT) If just 40% of those trips were made on foot, by bike or by bus it would halve congestion and pollution and make our county a safer and healthier place to live.

The cycling advocacy groups from all over Kent have come together to create this questionnaire for candidates at the forthcoming elections. We propose 5 practical measures to bring about the transformation of our villages, towns and cities. Taken together the measures would be self-financing because they would reduce the annual costs to Kent of congestion (about £275m (INRIX)) collisions (about £300m (DfT)), and obesity and respiratory illnesses (about 1bn (Public Health England)). Please let us know which ones you will actively support if elected. We will be pleased to publish the results to our members and followers.

With the following questions:



Segregated cycle routes to increase level of sustainable travel

Segregated cycleways on all major routes so that local education, employment, leisure and retail journeys can be undertaken safely and conveniently using sustainable means.



Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) to facilitate local walking and cycling

Introduction of LTNs to provide environments in which people feel safe walking and cycling in their neighbourhood. The principle of LTNs is to ensure that residential streets are primarily for local community use and are safe and comfortable for children, adults, older people and people with disabilities.



20mph speed limits to improve safety

20mph speed limits in villages, towns and cities so that people feel safe and more comfortable in a quieter and cleaner local environment.



Kent Vision Zero

Kent's strategy to reduce fatalities and injuries on Kent's roads bringing together road engineering, enforcement and education to achieve a dramatic safety improvement.



Use of national infrastructure standards - LTN1/20

Application of the Department for Transport's 'Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20)' to enable cycling and walking to become the natural choice for short journeys or as part of a longer journey. LTN1/20 is now the definitive national standard defining effective cycle infrastructure and moving away from measures which have proven to be ineffective such as white lines and shared paths.

Party	Answered?	Person	Support Segregated cycle routes	Support LTNs	Support 20mph Speed Limits	Support Kent Vision Zero	Support DforT LTN1/20	Average Response	% Response	Average Response
Conservative	Answered	CANNON Tom	5	0	1	3	4	3	35	
		COOPER Paul Charles	4	5	5	5	5	5		
		DINLEY Will	3	1	0	4	3	2		
		FORECAST Stan	2	3	3	4	4	3		
		PARFIT-REID Lottie	5	3	5	5	5	5		
		PRENDERGAST Shellina	5	4	5	5	4	5		
		WEBB Simon Noel	4	5	4	3	4	4		
	GARTEN Patrik	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		
	NO Data	BRAJKISHORE Sanjiv Kumar	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	BRYANT Heidi Jacqueline Ann	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	CARTER Paul	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	CATLEY Andrew James	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	CHAPPELL-TAY Karen Louise	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	CHOWDHURY Mitu	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	COOKE Gary	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	DOGRA Harprit Singh	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	HAHNEFELD Scott	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	HOLMES Peter David	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	MCKENNA Lewis John	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	PERRY John Anthony	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	RUSSELL Claudine Jane	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	SPOONER Denis Charles	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
	TRZEBINSKI Ziggy	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
Green		GREENAN Donna Louise	5	5	5	5	5	5	56	
		JEFFERY Stuart Robert	5	5	5	4	4	5		
		JESSEL Caroline Rosemary	5	4	5	4	5	5		
		MCDONALD Ian Francis Stewart	2	4	4	5	5	4		
		OLIVER Ciaran Dominic	5	5	5	5	5	5		

Party	Answered?	Person	Support Segregated cycle routes	Support LTNs	Support 20mph Speed Limits	Support Kent Vision Zero	Support DforT LTN1/20	Average Response	% Response	Average Response
Independent	NO Data	PARR Susan Theresa	5	3	4	5	5	4	72	5
		SHALICE James Edward	5	5	5	5	5	5		
		SUMMERSGILL Mike	5	4	5	5	3	4		
		THOMPSON Stephen Roy	5	5	3	5	5	5		
		TURNER Christopher John Vease	5	5	5	5	5	5		
	BATTRUM Gemma Sue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	CHEESEMAN Steven Mark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	EAGLE Derek Roy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	KEHILY Claire Louise	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	MCDONALD Ian Francis Stewart	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	MILHAM Kimberley Joan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	MILHAM Simon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	MUGGERIDGE Stephen Fraser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	POWELL Eddie	5	3	5	5	4	4	14		4
Labour	NO Data	BUTLER Gary	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		GOOCH Fay Lynette	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		HAMMOND Kate	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		HOTSON Eric Ernest Charles	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		KENWARD Yolande Ann	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	MUNFORD Steve	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	BURNS Jo	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	CLEATOR Maureen	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	HARPER Paul	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	WILKINSON Dan	5	5	5	5	5	5			
Answered by proxy	ALLEN Natalie Victoria	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	COATES Patrick	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	COATES Richard John	5	5	5	5	5	5			

Party	Answered?	Person	Support Segregated cycle routes	Support LTNs	Support 20mph Speed Limits	Support Kent Vision Zero	Support DforT LTN1/20	Average Response	% Response	Average Response	
Liberal Democrats		LUCHMAN Dennis	5	5	5	5	5	5			
		MILLER Bob	5	5	5	5	5	5			
		RANDALL John Edward	5	5	5	5	5	5			
		RANDALL Marlyn	5	5	5	5	5	5			
		REAY David John	5	5	5	5	5	5			
		ROBERTS Kim	5	5	5	5	5	5			5
	NO Data	BARWICK Sarah Joan	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	GROGAN Jim	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	LYONS Theresa Ruby	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	MCKAY Lesley Frances	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	TODD Marsha Grace Beverley	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	ARNOLD Tay	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	CLARK Brian Eugene	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	61		
	COX Martin Ashley Richard	4	4	5	5	5	5	5			
	DALEY Dan	3	3	5	5	5	4	4			
	GOFFREDI Stephen James	4	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	HASTIE Michelle	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	JOY Denise June	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	PASSMORE Chris	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	RICHARDS Martin Hougard	4	5	4	4	5	4	4			
	THOMPSON Mike	5	4	5	4	4	4	4			
	TORIC-AZAD Zeina	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
	VIZZARD Bryan Charles	4	5	4	5	5	5	5			
	WEBSTER-WHITING Ben	5	4	5	5	4	5	5			
	WILBY Paul John	5	5	5	5	4	5	5		5	
	NO Data	BURROWS Sam Michael	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	CHITTENDEN Ian Stephen	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	COCKERSOLE Andrew Francis	0	0	0	0	0	0				

