

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

**RESPONSE TO THE DFT CONSULTATION ON**

**“Policy, Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling  
Local Transport Note 1/04”**

**13 August 2004**

**The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents  
Response to  
“Policy Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling – Consultation”**

**The views of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents on the DfT “Policy Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling Local Transport Note 1/04” – Consultation”.**

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

RoSPA welcomes the opportunity to comment on this document, which sets out the policy context for the promotion of walking and cycling. Walking and cycling offer positive benefits to road safety by giving people alternatives to using cars and the opportunity to increase their road knowledge and skills. However, they need to do so in a safe, attractive environment.

It is important that where good facilities are provided for cyclists and pedestrians that these facilities are maintained to a high standard and that behaviour which decreases their safety is discouraged. For example, where cars are parked on a cycle and pedestrian route adjacent to the road, this forces pedestrians and cyclists into the flow of motorised traffic and increases their danger. Wide pavements can encourage shop keepers and restaurateurs to site advertising boards and tables on the pavement, making what should be a wide safe pavement for pedestrians, narrow and uncomfortable and dangerous for visually impaired users.

Proper maintenance is important. Lack of maintenance, particularly of white lines, may result in vehicles entering or obstructing cycle lanes, and cyclists not using the facility because it has become uncomfortable or dangerous. RoSPA would recommend that measures to ensure the continuing safety of facilities, such as maintenance schedules and the prevention of illegal car parking on routes, are built into the planning process.

The Guidance also makes no mention of the importance of the continuity of routes, which sometimes end arbitrarily at a local authority boundary. There should be encouragement for local authorities to plan routes jointly so that routes cross boundary lines.

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

### ***Question 1***

*The Document states that the minimum requirements (3.2) for pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure are that they should be Convenient, Accessible, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive. Do you agree that these adequately encapsulate the infrastructure requirements?*

### **RoSPA Response**

RoSPA agrees that that the minimum requirements (3.2) for pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure are that they should be Convenient, Accessible, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive. We would also add the addendum that they be maintained to that level.

**The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents**  
**Response to**  
**“Policy Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling – Consultation”**

**Question 2**

*The document refers to “design pedestrians” and “design cyclists” (3.4). They are sub-divided into four and five design types respectively. While there is no desire to increase the number of categories, are you content with the way they have been defined?*

**RoSPA Response**

RoSPA is happy with the definitions for the design types.

**Question 3**

*The hierarchies of provision (3.6) have been included to encourage designers to consider proposals for infrastructure improvements in the round. This is felt necessary because traffic volume and speed reduction measures are often neglected in favour of solutions, which are easier to install. Do you think they have been given adequate prominence?*

**RoSPA Response**

Traffic volume and speed reduction measures are clearly shown in table 6 as the types of provision which should be considered first and paragraph 3.6.2 clearly lists the benefits of reducing traffic volumes and speed. It is difficult to see how they could be given more prominence.

**Question 4**

*The speed-flow diagram (3.7) has been adapted from an existing one and is meant to demonstrate the suitability of various types of provision in principle only. Values along the axes have been deliberately omitted because they were considered inappropriate without getting into more detail such as carriageway widths etc. Is it useful in its present form?*

**RoSPA Response**

Many users of this document will prefer to think graphically so the diagram in 3.7 does have the benefit of providing a graphic encapsulation of the options available for the selection of a cycle route. However it might benefit from greater emphasis on traffic reduction and speed reduction, which according to the Hierarchies of Provision in Table 3.6 should be the first considerations.

**Question 5**

*Key planning issues have been tabulated in 3.8. Are you content with the table contents?*

**RoSPA Response**

It is important that any plans for changes in the infrastructure, not only meet the needs of present pedestrians and cyclists, but positively encourage others to start using these travel modes. Table 3.8 illustrates the key issues, but is not intended to be exhaustive. RoSPA is content with the table's content.

**The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents**  
**Response to**  
**“Policy Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling – Consultation”**

**Question 6**

*Audit and review of improvement schemes are dealt with in 3.9. Has the subject been given sufficient weight?*

**RoSPA Response**

The review and audit systems are important parts of the design process and they provide excellent opportunities for input and positive involvement in a scheme from the people who will use it and live with it.

In paragraph 3.9.2 the sentence ‘In some cases, it may be desirable to involve the local community or user groups in audit and review procedures as part of the consultation process’ gives insufficient weight to the importance of these people and RoSPA would like to see it rewritten to reflect a positive encouragement to include local people and users in the review and audit process when it is at all possible.

*Question 7*

*The advice on cycling along contraflow bus lanes (4.10) is that cyclists may be safer using a minimum width bus lane rather than having to use the alternative route. Do you agree?*

**RoSPA Response**

Where the alternative route is more dangerous than the use of the contraflow bus lane would have to be advised. It may be worthwhile building into the design process the provision of information and training for users on the safest way to tackle the entry and exit points since these carry the highest risks, and should be considered as part of the audit process.

*Question 8*

*The flowcharts at the back of the document have been prepared to assist designers in the decision-making process during scheme planning. Are they sufficiently clear? Can the flowcharts be improved?*

**RoSPA Response**

RoSPA considers that arrangements for future maintenance should be included at the end of the design process for both the walking and cycling infrastructure. It is not only important that facilities are Convenient, Accessible, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive but they stay that way. This can only be achieved by proper maintenance, so the creation of a suitable maintenance schedule should be part of the planning process.

**The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents  
Response to  
“Policy Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling – Consultation”**

*Question 9*

*Any other comments on LTN 1/04?*

**RoSPA Response**

RoSPA would reiterate the earlier comments that it is important that the design process include considerations of how the Convenient, Accessible, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive nature of the facilities be maintained.

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.