# Cycling Infrastructure in new developments

# Proposed check list for developers, planners and stakeholders when considering a planning application.

# 

Developers must comply with NPPF, Local Plan and [standard guidelines](#_Standards_for_cycling) for cycling (listed below), in particular MfS and LCDS. These can be used in grading different aspects in the checklist. LCDS also uses the Clos tool when auditing a cycle route. The checklist can be used at all stages of the planning process, especially at the pre-planning to allow for allocation of space and budgeting costs. It is also helpful for stakeholders when looking at plans.

Quick, easy to understand, pictorial guidance is given in [www.makingspaceforcycling.org](http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org). which explains the main principles of good design.

## Background

The main deterrent to cycling cited by the public is safety, they want protection from motor vehicles and they are asking for cycle routes. People do not use cycle routes if they are disconnected, slow, inconvenient and hazardous (lots of obstacles). This deters women and older people more than fit young men.

Propensity for cycling tool, the local Cycling Strategy and LCWIPs can be used in deciding where strategic cycle routes are needed and how the developer should contribute. Cycle routes must have a purpose, be useful and usable; strategic routes and network must provide fast, direct, safe routes to all destinations for all types of cycle.

**DIRECT** cycle routes between housing, new developments and major destinations make cycling the most pleasant, easy and quick way to travel around.

**CONVENIENT** infrastructure means avoiding stop-start travel caused by obstructions, diversions, sharp corners, loss of priority at side roads and narrow pavements shared with pedestrians. Gaps in a route or network form the weakest link making it unusable.

**QUICK** - Cycling can be quicker and more reliable than using the car if the right infrastructure standards are adopted.

**INCLUSIVE** Infrastructure does not discriminate against those with a range of special needs – those on adapted bicycles, adults with children, people carrying large loads, blind/partially blind, the less strong, people without a car. Shared use footways are not acceptable as they can create more problems than they solve and usually lead to cycle routes which zigzag from one side of the road to the other, problems going up and down kerbs, and lots of delays at side roads making cycling more strenuous, slower and hazardous.

CHECKLIST Use this check list to help decide

* where cycle routes are needed and
* how road layout can facilitate cycling
* whether the application conforms to the NPPF and the Local Plan.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Connectivity | Cycle route available?  If yes, grade 0 (no good) to 5 excellent  If No, state the distance by car | | What action is needed to make existing cycle route useful and usable?  What improvements and changes are needed?  Is a new route or cycling alternative required?  If so, where should it go |
| List all destinations using these categories | Yes | No |  |
| Nearest town centre |  |  |  |
| Nearest retail centres |  |  |  |
| Nearest social, leisure and sporting centres |  |  |  |
| Employment areas |  |  |  |
| List education establishments |  |  |  |
| preschool |  |  |  |
| Primary |  |  |  |
| secondary |  |  |  |
| tertiary |  |  |  |
| Neighbouring villages |  |  |  |
| Nearest train station(s) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Road network  List neighbouring roads |  |  |  |
| Arterial roads |  |  |  |
| Rural roads |  |  |  |
| Road closures |  |  |  |
| ROWS list all nearby |  |  | Will they be affected? Can wide footpaths be extended or upgraded to restricted byways? |
| Existing cycle routes and quiet roads popular with cyclists |  |  | Will they be adversely affected? What measures need to be taken |
| Severance problems |  |  |  |
| Cycle routes proposed by developer |  |  | What is their function? What do they connect? How do they make cycling more advantageous than using the car. Separate from pedestrians? Protected from motor traffic? Complies with standards? |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Permeability (MfS) | | | | |
| How many access points on the boundary |  |  | | There should be many more access points for walking and cycling than for motor transport |
| List adjacent areas | Access  Point? | | |  |
|  | Yes | | No |  |
| access to houses on cycle routes |  | |  |  |
| cut throughs, shortcuts? |  | |  |  |
| Cycle routes provide shorter distance than motor routes |  | |  |  |
| Good Access to buildings |  | |  |  |
| Grid layout? |  | |  |  |
| Filtered permeability? |  | |  |  |
| List junctions. Cycle provision? If yes, grade according to safety, convenience, cycle priority, mixed with peds. |  | |  |  |

#### Cycle Parking (see Cambridge Cycle Campaign and local Parking SPD or similar)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Comments |
| Close to building entrance? |  |  |  |
| Shelter from weather |  |  |  |
| Secure lock up |  |  |  |
| overlooked |  |  |  |
| Good access |  |  | For example do you have to lift the bike over a kerb |
| Well designed? |  |  |  |
| Quantity |  |  |  |
| Sufficient space |  |  |  |

### Standards for cycling infrastructure

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GUIDELINE** | **TAKE HOME MESSAGE** |
| [NPPF](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810507/NPPF_Feb_2019_print_revised.pdf) | There must be provision for cycling |
| Basingstoke Local Plan  Policy CN 9 Transport  Basingstoke Cycling Strategy  Area policies  LTP  Development SPD  Parking SPD  Community plans and neighbourhood plans | There must be provision for cycling  direct, convenient and safe routes  New developments Connected and Permeable for cycling  Sufficient cycle parking, right design in right place |
| MfS | pedestrians and cyclists have priority,  importance of road layout design for permeability  filtered permeability  movement versus place functions |
| LTN 2/08 CID | coherent, direct, comfortable, attractive, safe |
| LTN 1/12 | shared use can create more problems than it solves |
| LCDS London Cycling Design Standards | cycle superhighways, priority at junctions and side roads  anticipate and design for increased numbers |
| Sustrans guidelines revised | more direct and inclusive routes  approves LCDS |
| [DMRB CD 195](http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/vol6/section3/CD%20195%20Designing%20for%20cycle%20traffic-web.pdf) | Protected cycle tracks beside strategic roads  Design speed important as bike unstable below 12kph |
| Propensity for cycling tool | Direct, fast, safe Designed for all types of cycle and users |
| Public sector equality duty and Equality Impact Assessments under the Equality Act 2010 and 2015 | [Inclusive cycling](https://www.cyclinguk.org/blog/what-inclusive-cycling) Does the design discriminate against those with protected characteristics e.g. females, very young, disabled, elderly, with low income and no access to a car |

### Some other Information and Training Sources

[Propensity for cycling tool](https://www.pct.bike/)

A 3 day course delivered by Brian Degan and John Dales at Northumbria University, Newcastle<https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/newcastle-cdt-day-1-as-delivered> [*https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/newcastle-cdt-day-2-as-delivered*](https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/newcastle-cdt-day-2-as-delivered)

[*https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/intersecting-cycling-and-feminism-or-how-we-talk-inclusively-about-women-cycling*](https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/intersecting-cycling-and-feminism-or-how-we-talk-inclusively-about-women-cycling)

<https://www.slideshare.net/Katsdekker/keynote-at-women-cycling-conference-2018>

<http://www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cycleparking/guide/>

[www.ciltuk.org.uk/AboutUs/ProfessionalSectorsForums/Forums/Cycling/TheHub.aspx](http://www.ciltuk.org.uk/AboutUs/ProfessionalSectorsForums/Forums/Cycling/TheHub.aspx)

#### “Going Dutch” – a few examples of good implementation in Britain

Waltham Forest – filtered permeability for cycling

Manchester beelines

Exeter - cycling and buses but no cars in city centre. integrates new shopping malls either side.

Bristol and London - cycle lanes segregated from motor and pedestrian traffic cycle superhighways

Conversion of Queen Square Bristol from a through zone for motor traffic to a quiet zone with mainly cycling and walking

### Commonly used acronyms and terms

CID Cycle Infrastructure Design

CIL community infrastructure levy states what money the developer must provide

LCWIPs Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plans (possible to apply for funding these)

Local Plan - this will list the conditions which the developer has to comply with. It is supplemented by SPDs and has subsections for different aspects, for example CN9 refers to transport in the Basingstoke Local Plan.

LEP Local Enterprise Partnership. This is a partnership between businesses and local councils to secure economic growth. It cuts across county and district boundaries. Money from the Economic Growth Fund can be obtained from central government to support increased growth e.g. changes to Black Dam roundabout off the M3 junction 6 roundabout. In theory any transport changes are supposed to improve cycling, but in practice this is glossed over.

LTP Local Transport Plan this is a 5 year budget, both a bidding document for a budget from central government and also sets out the objectives for Hampshire and each of the areas.

MfS Manual for Streets

DMRB Design Manual for roads and bridges

LTN Local Transport Note

MfS Manual for streets

[NPPF](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810507/NPPF_Feb_2019_print_revised.pdf) [National Planning Policy Framework](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810507/NPPF_Feb_2019_print_revised.pdf) in particular section ( paras 102 – 111)

SPD Supplementary Planning Document

Section 108 a document setting out financial contribution from developers

Section 278 states what infrastructure the developer must build

CIL Community Infrastructure Levy - may require developer contribution

### Terminology and definitions see separate document

Correct terminology is important for clarity and avoidance of confusion, not all planners are familiar with the guidelines or terminology. People are often unaware of the deficiencies of cycle routes, detail is important. See Cycle Basingstoke ppt Designing for Cycle Traffic – the mismatch between guidelines and what is built.

Cyclists are not a homogenous group anymore than car users. It is preferable to use terms such as cycle transport, cycle traffic, people who cycle, want or need to cycle, cycling. The word cyclist can have perjorative associations and may conjure up the picture of lone or occasional cyclists, whilst cycle traffic creates a picture of lots of people cycling and the need for appropriate infrastructure.