

**REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety  
Advisory Panel**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	23rd June 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Off Road Shared Cycle Facilities
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director Community and Environment
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Philip O’Dell - Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A-</b> Living Streets – Policy Briefing 03/09 – Pedestrian and Cyclists  <b>Appendix B -</b> LTN 2/04 Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists – decision making flow chart

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the methodology to be adopted to determine the suitability of off road shared pedestrian and cycle facilities, and outlines measures that can be taken to mitigate any conflict.

### Recommendations:

That the panel recommends to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that the procedure outlined in the report be used to assess the suitability of off road shared cycle / pedestrian facilities.

### Reason:

To enable the Council to deliver cycle schemes and take account of the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in order to benefit the wider community and to be able to meet the objectives set out in Harrow's Local Implementation Plan.

## Section 2 – Report

### Background

- 2.1 Cycle facilities on the footway can either be segregated or shared. A segregated route separates the pedestrians from the cyclists by the use of a physical demarcation such as a raised solid white line. A shared route however, has no demarcation and the full extent of the footway can be used by both the cyclists and the pedestrians. Both options would need to be clearly signed and marked using appropriate construction methods in accordance with relevant guidance minimise safety concerns.
- 2.2 Shared facilities are only to be considered as a last resort after all other available options have been considered. One benefit of their use enables the less confident cyclists to avoid sections of the route with vehicular traffic which are either too dangerous or physically impossible to use due to geographical constraints. However, experienced / confident cyclists generally prefer to remain on the road as this is a much quicker and direct option. A number of such facilities have been closely monitored in the past by the Department of Transport (DfT) which revealed little evidence of cycle/ pedestrian conflict.
- 2.3 There are genuine concerns about shared use facilities expressed by different users, notably pedestrians and in particular the more vulnerable road users such as the mobility and visually impaired and those with hearing impairments. Officers take into consideration the points raised in The Living Streets (organisation representing the interests of pedestrians) policy document which is shown in **Appendix A**. These users can feel intimidated by cyclists sharing space and as a result they can be put off from using such facilities. However, it is important also to recognize the positive benefits that promoting cycling brings in terms of infrastructure changes through traffic calming, improved access (crossing points, ramped access points, level surface etc) as well as modal shift leading to reduction in traffic pollution / congestion and the health benefits of lifestyle changes.

## Enforcement of illegal cycling on footways

- 2.4 There are many requests received by the Council from the public to address issues with cycling on footways where it is not permitted and it is worth explaining the current position on this issue.
- 2.5 On 1st August 1999, new legislation came into force to allow a fixed penalty notice to be served on anyone cycling illegally on the footway. However, guidelines were also issued indicating that they should only be used where a cyclist is riding in a manner that may endanger others. The fixed penalty is not aimed at responsible cyclists who sometimes feel obliged to use the pavement out of fear of traffic and who show consideration to other pavement users when doing so.
- 2.6 The police, who are responsible for the enforcement, acknowledge that cyclists, particularly children and young people, are afraid to cycle on the road, and considerable sensitivity and careful use of police discretion is required, which is in line with the advice issued by the Home Office with regards to fixed penalty notices. In Harrow this can be enforced by the police, police volunteer officers as well as the police community support officers, but it cannot be issued to anyone under the age of 16.

## Shared cycle / pedestrian facilities

- 2.7 The consideration of what cycle facilities may be required starts with the planning of cycle routes. In built up areas where pedestrians are more prevalent, it is rarely acceptable to increase cycling provision to the detriment of pedestrian space. Therefore when considering routes for cyclists the first priority should always be to develop on road solutions. The DfT, in conjunction with the Cycle Touring Club (CTC), has devised the following hierarchy of provision as shown in the table below..

<b>Consider first</b>	Traffic reduction
	Speed reduction
	Junction treatment, hazard site treatment, traffic management
	Reallocation of carriageway space (e.g. bus lanes, widen nearside lanes, cycle lanes)
	Cycle tracks away from roads
<b>Consider last</b>	Conversion of footways/footpaths to share use cycle tracks for pedestrians and cyclists

- 2.8 Following these principles the main objectives in route planning are summarised as follows.

- shared facilities to be considered only as a last option.
- consult, liaise and inform relevant key stakeholders as appropriate to facilitate a smooth transition (HAD, Pedestrian Groups, Cycling Groups etc).
- ensure appropriate Road Safety Audits are undertaken.

- provide appropriate signage and markings, priority given to pedestrians at crossing points.
- lengths of route should be kept to a minimum.

Any cycle schemes developed at the concept stage will follow these basic objectives.

- 2.9 Should the planning of cycle routes not be able to remove the need for shared use facilities then there is technical advice provided by the DfT for use by local authorities which provides guidance on how to implement suitable cycle schemes. Local Transport Note 2/04 sets out a decision-making flow chart which details the thought process to be taken into consideration when considering whether to use on carriageway or off carriageway (adjacent and shared use) facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. This can be seen in **Appendix B**.
- 2.10 It is recommended that this decision-making procedure be the basis for making decisions on the use of shared cycle facilities in Harrow.

#### **Financial Implications**

- 2.11 There are no funding implications associated with the procedure outlined in the report. Funding for cycle schemes will be secured from the annual LIP allocation and costs managed within the available budgets.

#### **Risk management Implications**

- 2.12 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. This would include any cycle schemes. The risk register is included in the Community & Environment Directorate Risk Register.

#### **Equalities Implications**

- 2.13 An equality impact assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken and indicated this of low relevance at the screening stage. No adverse impact or illegal discrimination on any of the specified equality groups were identified. There are positive impacts of the procedure on all equalities groups, particularly, children and people with mobility difficulties.

#### **Corporate priorities**

- 2.14 The delivery of cycle schemes will contribute to achieving all of the council's corporate priorities:

Corporate priority	Impact
Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe	Cycling is relatively cheap and affordable by all and provides a viable alternative to the car for journeys of up to 5 miles. It improves general health and fitness, reduces pollution and emission of CO <sub>2</sub> , and helps tackle congestion. The council is actively promoting cycling by providing good safe infrastructure for cyclists in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards.
United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads.	The Council offers free cycle training/education for all adults and children within the borough so they can be aware of new infrastructure and how to negotiate various highway features.
Supporting and protecting people who are most in need	Early training is given to key stage 1 and 2 students, as well as training adults to take up cycling who have never cycled before.
Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses.	Town centres and local shopping centres are being opened up to cyclists by introducing secure cycle parking and route provisions at key locations which will help to attract both leisure and commuter cyclists making journeys of 2-5 miles.

### Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 25/05/11		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 3/6/11		

### Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

#### Contact:

Sajjad Farid – Project Engineer Parking and Sustainable Transport Team,  
Tel: 020 8424 1484, Fax: 020 8424 7662,  
E-mail: sajjad.farid@harrow.gov.uk

#### Background Papers:

- LTN 2/04 – Adjacent and Shared Use Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Traffic Advisory Leaflet 9/93 (August 1993)
- Harrow Transport Local Implementation Plan 2011/12 – 2013/14