

**THE ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS
RoSPA**

RESPONSE TO THE DFT CONSULTATION ON

**“Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists
Local Transport Note 2/04”**

13 August 2004

**The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents
Response to
“Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists – Consultation”**

**The views of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents on the DfT
“Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrian and Cyclists
Local Transport Note 1/04” – Consultation”.**

GENERAL COMMENTS

RoSPA welcomes the opportunity to comment on this document, which provides guidance regarding the appropriateness of shared use as a way of creating cycle routes. Walking and cycling offer positive benefits to road safety by giving people the opportunity to increase their road knowledge and skills. However, they need to do so in a safe, attractive environment.

RoSPA agrees that shared use facilities should be seen as a final option, and considered only if on-road facilities are not possible.

All the users and potential users of a scheme have an important input to the planning process and consultation with them should be a continuous part of the process to ensure that the final results fully meets the different needs of the users.

RoSPA supports the proposal that when a new shared facility is introduced, a monitoring process is undertaken to check that users are able to use the facility safely and in relative harmony, and to assess changes in accidents or casualties associated with the facility.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Question 1

Site assessment (Ch 4) has been given greater prominence in this LTN. Do you agree that the issue has been given the right amount of attention?

RoSPA Response

Site assessment is rightly given prominence in this new document, but there is no mention of consultation with current and potential users of the route. It is essential that their views and needs are understood, especially as many pedestrians may be concerned at proposals to convert a footway into shared use with pedal cyclists. This is particularly important with users and potential users who have a disability.

Question 2

The note builds on earlier advice to consult potential users and other interest groups properly (Ch 5) to ensure that the views of all relevant parties are heard before deciding on an adjacent or shared use facility. Is the balance right?

RoSPA Response

RoSPA would like to see this consultation process happening at the start of the process. Also the document makes specific reference to consulting with people with a visual disability but no specific reference to wheelchair users who can have difficulties dealing with split level facilities.

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents
Response to
“Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists – Consultation”

Question 3

Segregation between pedestrians and cyclists (6.1) is not recommended if the combined width is generally less than 3m. Is this figure large enough or should segregation only be contemplated at a higher minimum width?

RoSPA Response

RoSPA are content that this figure is realistic if not ideal.

Question 4

Segregation by level is sometimes achieved using a 45 degree chamfered kerb. This detail can be useful for, for example , people with pushchairs wishing to cross a cycle track in a pedestrianised area. Do you think a chamfered kerb is generally preferable to a vertical kerb, and if so, why?

RoSPA Response

A chamfered kerb is preferable to a vertical kerb because manual wheelchair users need to be able to back wheel balance to deal with a vertical kerb and not all of them have this ability. A chamfered kerb also reduces the danger of trips and falls for other pedestrians. RoSPA supports the use of a chamfered kerb as opposed to a vertical kerb.

Question 5

Any other comments on LTN 2/04?

RoSPA Response

RoSPA feels that all the users and potential users of a scheme have an important input to the planning process and consultation with them should be a continuous part of the process to ensure that the final results fully meets the needs of the users.

The Society thanks the Department for Transport for the opportunity to comment on these proposals. We have no objections to our response being reproduced or attributed.

Road Safety Department
RoSPA
Edgbaston Park
353 Bristol Road
Birmingham B5 7ST
Tel: 0121 248 2000.