

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

<b>Committee:</b>	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	17 September 2019
<b>Title:</b>	Cycling Strategy Update
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Frank Baxter

**Tel:** 01962 846819

**Email:** frank.baxter2@hants.gov.uk

### Purpose of Report

1. To report back to the Committee on key issues raised in October 2018 regarding cycling in Hampshire and recommend next steps.

### Contextual Information

2. In October last year, the Economy, Transport, and Environment Select Committee reviewed an update on Hampshire County Council's Cycling Strategy and heard feedback from local cycling advocacy groups on both the strategy, and their views on infrastructure in Hampshire. The Committee agreed to give consideration to this feedback and requested further updates from officers.
3. Key challenges raised by the local cycling advocacy groups are summarised as follows, current positions on each of these issues is set out in the section below:
  - a. That the current Cycle Strategy is not fit for purpose
  - b. Hampshire County Council cycling policy is perceived to be pro-car rather than prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
  - c. The design of cycle routes and schemes is lacking e.g. materials (often surfacing related) and quality (e.g. the overuse of shared use paths over fully segregated cycle facilities)
  - d. Dissatisfaction with the level of engagement in schemes, with a particular focus on s.278 works where the local consultation with cycle groups can be left to a developer to coordinate)
  - e. A call for Hampshire County Council to adopt cycle design standards
4. Subsequently, one of the advocacy groups, Cycle Basingstoke, has been invited to present to Cllr Humby and Cllr Oppenheimer with the attendance of Cllr Reid, Cllr Westbrook and officers, to give more detailed feedback on cycling infrastructure in the Basingstoke area.

## Updates on challenges raised at 2018 Committee

### a. “That the current cycle strategy is not fit for purpose”:

5. This point was discussed in some depth at the October Committee with reference to the initial aims of the strategy. At the time it was pointed out that the strategy is achieving what it set out to do. The strategy aim is “to develop plans *where HCC resources allow*” and is rooted in the practicalities and realities of available funding opportunities. However, it became apparent that the advocacy groups would like to see a higher ambition for cycling.
6. The advocacy group illustrated their concerns using examples. Most of the issues raised were very local in nature and very detailed. A new, refreshed county wide strategy would be unlikely to be comprehensive or detailed enough to address these concerns. This suggests that rather than review the strategy, it would be better to develop implementation plans for cycling at a local level. The Government are encouraging Local Highway Authorities to develop Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). There is, at present, no dedicated Government funding for these plans or the measures within them, however, LCWIPs enable the Local Highway Authority, Local Planning Authority and stakeholders to work together to identify walking and cycling networks, rather than isolated schemes, and prioritise delivery of future improvements in an evidence based and collaborative way.
7. Since the scrutiny meeting Hampshire County Council have completed an LCWIP in support of the Clean Air Zone project in Fareham/Gosport and used this plan to secure £464,000 of funding towards cycling infrastructure projects which must be delivered within a very short timescale. The development of this LCWIP and its subsequent funding success emphasises the potential of this approach although in this case it was highly targeted to a known funding opportunity.
8. Borough-wide LCWIPs are under development for both Gosport and Fareham to incorporate areas outside of the Clean Air Zone and to consider projects that could be delivered over a longer time frame.
9. We are currently developing further LCWIPs for Havant, Winchester City, Eastleigh, and the Southampton travel to work areas of Test Valley and New Forest. Most of these have been selected as a priority because of their potential to access a new funding opportunity, the Government’s Transforming Cities Fund to which we intend to submit bids in November 2019.
10. It is also worth considering that, if they are to be effective, LCWIPs should sit within the context of a multimodal transport strategy. This is because of the interconnectedness of all forms of transport and because most modes have to share the same physical space. This, crucially, means making choices about the relative priorities between modes in the local setting. Therefore, developing plans for walking and cycling should ideally be undertaken as part of a programme of area strategy development. Hampshire County Council has traditionally had Area Access Plans to undertake this function, but many of these were started over ten years ago but are being refreshed. With available resources not all of these can be done at the same time. Several area strategies

(Winchester City, Basingstoke Town and Waterside – New Forest) are currently under development and we intend to roll out a programme for the future. Current thinking for prioritising future areas is based on strategic need/case, population, local opportunities and likelihood of significant change in land use. On this basis, it is currently anticipated that Andover, Farnborough, Aldershot, Fleet and Urban South Hampshire would follow next in the current programme.

11. It was evident that Hampshire County Council was not clearly showing what investment in cycling infrastructure was happening. Large sums of funding have been secured for cycling measures as part of major schemes and significant activity is taking place related to cycling training and promotion.
12. In order to better show capital spend on cycling and walking the County Council have begun to report against a new capital sub programme for walking and cycling measures. The table below is an extract from the most recent capital programme report. It highlights known and planned expenditure on such scheme over the next two years. In total for the year 2019-20 spend on cycling and walking infrastructure represents a significant of the total transport capital program.
13. Future years programmes are still in development and are not yet fully formed. However, there is an increasing level activity associated with feasibility works and on LCWIPS and new bidding opportunities which is a positive indicator that future capital programme will include further cycling schemes. A significant proportion of the County Council feasibility resources is currently allocated to six Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPS) in this years programme.

*Table showing the walking and cycling sub programme*

Walking & Cycling Sub-Programme As at July 2019			
<b>19/20</b>			
1260	Access improvements to Kings School, Winchester	£	300,000
1471	Hook to Dilly Lane Cycle Route	£	445,000
1849	Andover Railway/Environmental Improvements	£	325,000
2153	Romsey Road, Winchester - Clifton Terrace Crossing	£	481,000
2223	Jermyns Lane Footway to Braishfield, Romsey	£	350,000
2246	Andover - Roman Way/Viking Way/Smannell Rd TC	£	300,000
2547	Bishops Waltham Centre Access Imp	£	271,000
2648	Hambledon Road, Waterlooville Toucan crossing & cycling improvements	£	250,000
2650	West End High Street Access Imp	£	250,000
2760	Whitchurch Access & TM	£	388,000
2884	Andover: Access to Town Mills car park and Riverside Improvements	£	1,303,000
3028	Whitehill & Bordon - Budds Lane	£	3,420,000
3050	Fareham: NO <sub>2</sub> Cycle Infrastructure	£	464,000
<b>20/21</b>			
2213	A340 Safety & Accessibility Imp	£	300,000
2604	Horndean Access Imp	£	450,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>9,297,000</b>

**b. Hampshire County Council cycling policy is perceived to be pro-car rather than prioritising walking, cycling and public transport:**

14. The October Committee highlighted that the advocacy groups perceive that Hampshire County Council is pro car and may even have an anti-cycling culture. Hampshire County Council seeks to balance its approach to all modes within the framework of the Local Transport Plan. This is increasingly important in the context of the Climate Emergency declared by Hampshire County Council this year. It is somewhat inevitable that there will be divergence on some issues between what advocacy groups would like to see, and what can be achieved whilst maintaining this balance. Accepting and recognising this difference will be important in building a productive relationship in the future. This does not preclude us from reviewing our current practices and the relative balance in light of Hampshire recently declaring a Climate Emergency.
15. As above, Cycle Basingstoke presented to Cllr Humby and others earlier this year, setting out their views on cycling infrastructure in Basingstoke delivered by both Hampshire County Council and developers. Cycle Basingstoke did not attend the scrutiny meeting but wanted to share their examples of where they felt Hampshire County Council was lacking in its cycle culture. They set out a number of issues including widths of paths, directness of routes, quality of materials, use of barriers/bollards etc which we feel can be addressed. On this basis, two events are planned for September to undertake a deep dive into these issues and see how Hampshire can improve its cycle culture. The first will take the form of an officer workshop using the presentation set by Cycle Basingstoke and facilitated by one of the country's leading cycling infrastructure specialists. The aim of the workshop is to identify processes, decision points, stakeholders and standards that have resulted in the issues raised. It will set out a series of suggested improvements for future practice where possible and practicable. These suggestions will be presented to Members and Cycle Basingstoke in a subsequent presentation, for their feedback.
16. If this format is successful, we will seek to hold a larger, County-wide event in Spring 2020.

**c. The design of cycle routes and schemes is lacking e.g. materials (often surfacing related) and quality (e.g the overuse of shared use paths over fully segregated cycle facilities):**

In practical terms, this point is linked to cycle design standards and is therefore covered in e) below

**d. Dissatisfaction with the level of engagement in schemes, with a particular focus on s.278 works where the local consultation with cycle groups can be left to a developer to coordinate):**

17. The points raised by the advocacy groups do suggest that there is a need to communicate and work together better so that more open and constructive dialogue and challenge can take place. A cycle champion role was suggested

but this has been tried in other authorities and we should learn from this experience. If, as inferred, there is a culture in Hampshire County Council which means our planners, engineers and designers are really unaware of cycle issues then such an action is likely to alienate rather than support a genuine evolution of culture. In addition, it could easily have the reverse impact with cycle issues becoming one individual's responsibility rather than a systematic shared responsibility.

18. An alternative approach would be to foster a more collaborative dialogue between cycle representatives, planners, designers and engineers. Actions that might support this include:
  - Workshopping the concerns raised by the representatives with planners, designers and engineers as part of the County wide event referred to above
  - Reviewing how and when cycle plans and strategies are engaged and consulted on
  - Initiating a process of cycle and pedestrian audit and review for all new highways schemes
  - For all major schemes, undertake an independent cycle assessment by a trained assessor
  - Communicate feasibility findings with cycle representatives so they can see why, in some circumstances, we are unable to deliver more ambitious cycle schemes

**e. A call for Hampshire County Council to adopt cycle design standards:**

This section also reflects point c) as they are closely linked.

19. Hampshire County Council does not have its own bespoke cycle design standards. This is because a "one size fits all" approach is not considered appropriate for Hampshire's geography or for different road classifications. Moreover, guidance has already been developed by others. Hampshire County Council use the Government's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) for major and strategic roads, Manual for Streets 2 for more local roads, Local Transport Note (LTN) design standards and other highway authority industry standards such as the London and Cardiff Cycle Design Guides, and apply them with professional judgement and skill depending on the local specifics of the scheme, its location and road class hierarchy (i.e. Strategic Road Network, A roads, B Roads, C Roads, Unclassified). For this reason, it is not felt appropriate or necessary to develop Hampshire County Council standards.
20. It may be useful to develop a policy stance in terms of some design principles that are faced on a frequent basis, or are the most contentious. These could be selected and developed with cycle, pedestrian and mobility group representatives as part of a County wide event workshop. They may include:
  - use of shared use pedestrian and cycle facilities, instead of segregated on or off-road facilities. These are widely agreed not to be the favoured

solution by cycle and walking representatives, designers and planners. However, they are often the only compromise option available to not having cycle schemes at all, where space is at a premium. Taking a stance against future shared facilities would need to be considered carefully but would be something on which clarity of policy would be beneficial.

- Prioritising active modes. In achieving a balanced distribution of road space, it can be challenging in practice to reallocate highway space towards walking and cycling. It is sometimes the case that pedestrian amenity is reduced in order to ensure that the highway still functions within capacity for motor vehicles. Alternative approaches should be investigated, for example, recognising that most cars carry only one person each, space could be allocated based on its potential to move the most road users.
- End of Route signs. End of Route signs. These are often used to denote where a cycle route leaves a shared path to join/cross the carriageway and can be interpreted by users that the Highway Authority has “given up” on cyclists at this location often where space is at a premium at junctions that are tricky to manoeuvre by bicycle. However, to pedestrians, this signage may be interpreted to assure them that they have priority. End of Route signs are now rarely used in new schemes but the historic proliferation of such signs has left a legacy. Cyclists would like to see them removed and some authorities have already done so.
- Cyclist Dismount signs and tight or narrow barriers. These signs and barriers are often used in subways, no cycling zones such as pedestrianised town centres, or sometimes in place of End of Route signs, or during works on the highway. Again, some authorities have started to replace the signs and use different designs of barriers and bollards to reflect that many disabled people find cycling easier than walking and use bicycles or adapted cycles as mobility aids. In addition, an increasing number of families are opting to travel by cargo bike which are longer and heavier than standard cycles. For some, walking, wheeling or lifting a cycle might be physically impossible. Signs to encourage courteous use of these spaces, and alternative barrier arrangements could be investigated.
- The type of cyclist we design for is important. Designing facilities useable by unaccompanied 12 year olds may require one approach, and designing for confident commuters another, although the ultimate ideal might be to provide segregated direct facilities that can accommodate both. A design considered child safe is often segregated or shared, on footway, leisure focused and in many cases indirect. Such routes may frustrate commuters. Routes should be designed based on key criteria such as: safety, directness, comfort, coherence, attractiveness and adaptability.
- Cycle Parking. As with cyclist dismount signs, many authorities are changing their approach to providing cycle parking to better cater for users of adapted bikes and cargo bikes. As a developer of cycle schemes, Hampshire County

Council could develop a cycle parking policy for its own schemes, and work with Local Planning Authorities to review their own cycle parking standards.

## Summary

21. In summary, following the October Committee meeting, the points raised by cycle advocacy groups have been reviewed by officers in detail to identify where things are working well, where improvements can be made, and where an alternative approach may be required.
22. Work is underway on several Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans, the County Council have created a sub program for cycling within the highways capital programme. The County Council has also listened to the feedback from the advocacy groups and is taking steps to explore its current cycle culture and see if this could be improved. This has included a “deep dive” test into one area which is resulting in a specific review of scheme delivery in Basingstoke in September. Provided this format is useful we propose to hold a walking and cycling conference in Spring 2020 to extend the approach to all advocacy groups, and wider user groups and to test a number of design standard principles. A summary of these actions is set out in the table below:

<b>Action</b>	<b>Estimated programme</b>
Continue to develop LCWIPs	6 plus this financial year, future programme to be determined
Cycle Basingstoke workshops	September 2019
Walking and cycling conference (subject to success of Cycle Basingstoke workshops)	Spring 2020
Foster a more collaborative dialogue between cycle representatives, planners, designers and engineers	“How” we do this could be a topic of the Walking and Cycling Conference – Spring 2020
Develop policy stance on key issues	The key policy areas could be identified at the Walking and Cycling Conference – Spring 2020

## **Appendix 1: General update**

### **General progress update**

#### ***Fareham - Air Quality exceedance, and LCWIPs***

In response to a directive from Government to reduce an air quality exceedance in Fareham (close to Quay Street Roundabout) to within the acceptable limit “in the shortest possible time”, a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) was developed relating to the specific geographic scope for the air quality management area.

The LCWIP used a strong evidence base to identify schemes to encourage a modal shift towards cycling away from private car use. The directive constrained the scope of these schemes to those that could be delivered in 2019.

The package is made up of the following improvements:

- a minor improvement to replace missing tactile paving on an existing shared use path on Heritage Way in Gosport;
- widening an existing cycle bypass lane into the verge at the junction of Foster Road and South Street;
- two elements on Marine Parade in Lee-on-the Solent. The first of these measures is removal and relocation of a low-use bus shelter from an existing shared use path. The second is some minor resurfacing of the former hovercraft slipway to provide a missing link in the existing local cycle path;
- widening an existing footway link between Seamead and Linkway in Fareham, to create a shared use path;
- conversion of an existing Pelican crossing on Burnt House Lane in Fareham to a Toucan crossing;
- widening the existing footway along a stretch of Peak Lane in Fareham to create a shared use path;
- widening the carriageway at Longfield Avenue in Fareham to accommodate a new refuge island; and
- widening an existing crossing refuge island on West Street in Fareham, near to the railway station
- New signage across the full length of the four priority routes.

The total funding achieved from Government for these works was £463,400.

#### ***Gosport – Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) extension***



The plans for the extension of the BRT have been amended to incorporate the concerns raised by walking and cycling groups. The new enhanced scheme improves on previous design options by retaining Rowner Road bridge and the segregation of walkers and cyclists from the busy traffic at the Rowner Road junction.

### ***East Hampshire - Green Grid Green Loop***

The Green Grid Green Loop (GGGL) aims to provide a comprehensive network of walking and cycling connections between the existing and new town development and a range of schools, sports and recreational facilities and natural green spaces. Additional funding has been awarded by the EM3 LEP, bringing the total bid funding to over £5m. A further bid has been submitted to EHDC's s106 fund. Budds Lane is the largest section of the GGGL and is expected to be complete on site by October 2019.

The Town Council in Petersfield are seeking the support of Hampshire County Council to co-develop plans for improvements in Petersfield. The aim of the Town Council is to make walking and cycling into town a better option. Funding for a future scheme is currently expected to come from multiple local sources and the County Councils market towns initiative.

### ***Farnborough - Lynchford Road***

The Lynchford Road Major Scheme is being designed to incorporate a segregated cycle route, which will be a considerable improvement over the existing shared use footway provision. Subject to detail design, the intention is to incorporate appropriate priority over side road crossings, consistent with best practice elsewhere in the UK and on the continent.

### ***Basingstoke - Brighton Hill***

Brighton Hill Roundabout is subject to a major scheme which has been successful in securing funding. It is a key junction along the A30 SW Corridor, for which there is an aspiration to provide a strategic cycle route. The improvements at Brighton Hill Roundabout incorporate proposals that would form part of this strategic route as well as providing connecting links to nearby residential areas. The designs are being developed using the latest guidance in Interim Advice Note 195/16 and the London Cycle Design Standards.

Subject to prioritization within future studies budgets it is anticipated that further feasibility work will be undertaken to develop proposals for a strategic cycle route along the A30 SW Corridor.

### **Southampton Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) Tranche 1 – Hut Hill and Totton in New Forest and Eastleigh**

In collaboration with Southampton City Council, Hampshire County Council was successful in securing funding for delivery of cycle scheme for Hut Hill in Eastleigh and Totton going into the Waterside in the New Forest. The scheme have moved into a delivery phase.

