DS.203
Cycle tracks on footways and footpaths

Rev.	Status	Created by	Date	Approved by	Date
A	Draft	D.Farnham/C.Agyei-Frempong	23.03.12	D.Waters	27.03.12
B	Draft	D.Farnham	29.07.13	M.Hill	07.08.13

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Notes

a. This standard explains requirements about where cycle tracks may be used and how they should be designed.

b. See standard DS.900 for definitions of terms used in this design standard. Note in particular the definitions for ‘should’, ‘will’, ‘may’, ‘level 1 departure’, ‘level 2 departure’ and ‘approving officer’ as used to describe requirements.

c. See SSDM/PR procedure PC.082 about the status of any revised version of this standard that may be issued during the active life of a project.

d. See the SSDM webpages at www.southwark.gov.uk/ssdm for a list of frequently asked questions about the design of streets and spaces.

1.2 Discussion

a. Where pedal cycles are legally allowed on what was (or would be otherwise) a footway or footpath then - for statutory purposes - that feature becomes a cycle track. Cycle tracks may be either ‘shared use’ or ‘adjacent use’.

b. Where they are ‘adjacent use’ then the cycle track is divided into separate sides for pedestrians and cyclists. These are delineated either by a special raised kerb or some other physical or visual distinction (like a kerb step or clear change in surface materials).

c. Where they are ‘shared use’ then pedestrians and cyclists mix together to the entire width of the track. No distinction into sides is provided.

d. Cycle tracks are distinct from cycle lanes. Cycle lanes are marked lanes for cyclists in a road carriageway whilst cycle tracks are ways for cyclists that are provided on what might otherwise be considered to be a footpath of footway.

e. Designers often make the error of thinking that cycle tracks can also be used as routes for occasional access by service, waste and recycling vehicles. They cannot. By definition they must be for pedal cyclists and pedestrians only (the only type of motor vehicles permitted to use them being emergency response vehicles). Where occasional access by other types of motor vehicle is required then designers should consider instead creating narrow carriageways that are signed as prohibited ‘routes for use by pedal cycles only’ (with appropriate exceptions) using signs as TSRGD diagram 955 and associated Traffic Management Orders.

   See Table 3 - Minimum required effective width values for sections of 'shared use' cycle track

f. Appendix A for further background discussion.

2 Use Requirements

NOTE: Improvements to streets and spaces should create safe and attractive conditions for cyclists of all abilities to use the carriageway. This should be achieved by applying the requirements in other SSDM/DSR design standards as well as network management principles. Doing so successfully will avoid the need for cycle tracks on footways and footpaths and the potential issues that can follow from these. Use requirements for cycle tracks in the sub-sections that follow reflect this preference for providing for cyclists within the carriageway.

Type of cycle track	Footways	Footpaths
'Adjacent use'	Proposals will be considered after a level 2 departure is granted confirming that other options to make the carriageway safe for cyclists have first been properly considered and discounted owing to inappropriateness.	No restriction on use. Encouraged where space permits in order to improve permeability for cyclists.
'Shared use'	Proposals will be considered after a level 2 departure is granted confirming that introduction of 'adjacent use' arrangements has first been considered (as above) and discounted owing to inappropriateness. Conformation of subsequent design proposals will be subject to the special departure procedures explained in SSDM/PR procedure PC.010.	

Table 1 - Summary of use requirements for cycle tracks

2.1 'Adjacent use' cycle tracks

2.1.1 New facilities

Footways

a. Within footways a level 2 departure will need to be agreed before proposals to introduce new 'adjacent use' cycle tracks will be considered. As part of the departure request it will need to be shown that other options to make the carriageway safe for cyclists have been substantively explored and that none of these would be appropriate. Significant supporting information to demonstrate this to the satisfaction of approving officers should be submitted. Once this departure is granted then proposals for 'adjacent use' designs will be considered, though the acceptability of these will be subject to design requirements being met.

Footpaths

b. Within footpaths, new 'adjacent use' cycle tracks may be created on footpaths away from the carriageway in order to provide permeability for cyclists. No departure authorisation is required to do so providing design requirements are met (see note 1). See however note 2 about an alternative method of providing access for cyclists which may be preferable in some instances.

NOTE 1: Introduction of 'adjacent use' cycle tracks in these circumstances (else alternatives as note 2) is encouraged to improve permeability for cyclists.

NOTE 2: An alternative to defining 'adjacent use' cycle tracks on footpaths and through other spaces that would otherwise be pedestrian only (such as squares) is to create narrow carriageways and sign these as prohibited 'routes for use by pedal cycles only' using signs as TSRGD diagram 955 and associated Traffic Management Orders. Whilst these will require similar delineation features to their edges as 'adjacent use' cycle lanes, they have a few distinct advantages. The first is that associated corduroy and tramline tactile surfaces will not generally need to be introduced with them as they would with a cycle track. This helps reduce street clutter. The second is that they can also be used as paths for occasional servicing, waste or recycling vehicle access (providing

they are sufficiently wide and appropriate access exceptions are included in associated Orders). As discussed in '1.2e', similar access cannot be provided on cycle tracks.

2.1.2 Existing facilities

Former footways

a. Where existing 'adjacent use' cycle tracks are encountered on former footways within a project area then they should be reviewed with the intention of designing them out if appropriate - where necessary by improving conditions for cyclists within the carriageway (see note). Where this is not possible or appropriate then they should be updated in accordance with current standards. In order to ensure alternately that this review occurs and that cycle tracks are not removed without consideration, both retention and removal will require agreement to a level 1 departure. This will be subject to the details of the review findings. Normally local people should be consulted and their views considered as part of this.

   NOTE: It is important to appreciate the difference between 'designing out' adjacent use cycle tracks and simply 'removing' them without any thought. 'Adjacent use' cycle tracks will only be removed where: (1) The location has been assessed to see whether any issues that first required their introduction still apply. Where officers are satisfied that things have changed such that the track is no longer required then they may proceed to remove it (though subject to road safety audit as below). (2) Other improvements are to be carried out (as necessary) to address any remaining issues so that the street can be used safely by cyclists without the need for the track. (3) A Road Safety Audit (RSA) audit of proposals has been completed as SSDM/PR procedure PC.040.

Former footpaths

b. Existing instances of 'adjacent use' cycle tracks on former footpaths should be reviewed and upgraded for conformity with current design standards.

2.2 'Shared use' cycle tracks

2.2.1 New facilities

a. Where new cycle tracks are necessary then 'adjacent use' arrangements as section 2.1 should be favoured (see note). Nonetheless, in certain circumstances 'shared use' arrangements may be acceptable.

   NOTE: Very brief sections of 'shared use' cycle track may be included along primarily 'adjacent use' cycle tracks at junctions with other cycle tracks, footways, footpaths and locations where pedestrians require access to crossing points at the carriageway edge. However, the length of those sections should not be any longer than that strictly required for functional purposes. Approving officers may at their discretion instruct adjustment or removal of such occasional sections where they are not satisfied that these are required.

b. Given 'a' a level 2 departure will need to be agreed before proposals to introduce new 'shared use' cycle tracks will be considered. Departure requests will only be considered after introduction of an 'adjacent use' cycle track has first been explored and such arrangements have been either:

   i. shown to be unachievable in design terms following substantive exploration of different potential arrangements. Normally this will require production of not less than 3 alternative 'adjacent use' design proposals.

   ii. rejected by local people following consultation - with those same local people indicating a majority preference for a 'shared use' arrangement through their consultation response (see note).

   After this first departure is granted then further departures to permit a 'shared use' arrangement will then be considered. However, introduction of 'shared use' cycle tracks is considered to be an Equalities Sensitive issue. Consequently an EqS Departure will be required for that further departure in accordance with the procedure explained in SSDM/PR procedure PC.010.

2.2.2 Existing facilities

a. Where existing 'shared use' cycle tracks are encountered with a project area then they should be reviewed with the intention of designing them out if appropriate - where necessary by improving conditions for cyclists within the carriageway (see NOTE to '2.1.2a'). Where this is not possible or appropriate then they should be updated in accordance with current standards. In order to ensure alternately that the feasibility of designing out 'shared use' arrangements is properly considered (and also to avoid inappropriate removal) both retention and removal of 'shared use' cycle tracks will require agreement to a level 1 departure. This will be subject to the details of the review findings. Normally local people should be consulted and their views considered as part of this.

2.3 Statutory requirements

a. Cycle tracks on footways may only be introduced where a statutory prohibition exists (see note). However, this does not necessarily require a traffic management order. A resolution of the council or other public notice may suffice.

   NOTE: This is as per Direction 7 of the TSRGD.

b. Similar to cycle tracks on footways, those on footpaths may only be introduced where a statutory prohibition exists (see note to 'a'). However, that statutory prohibition must be created via the procedure outlined in the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 (see note).

   NOTE: This Act provides for objections.

3 Design requirements

3.1 Requirements for both ‘adjacent use’ and ‘shared use’ cycle tracks

3.1.1 Cyclist design speed

a. Cycle tracks should be configured to limit cyclists to speeds of ≤ 12mph for ‘shared use’ sections and ≤ 15mph for ‘adjacent use’ sections. Design proposals must satisfy approving officers that they are likely to achieve this. Approving officers may instruct modifications or reject proposals where they are not convinced that they would be successful in doing so. Potential methods include:

   i. introduction of advisory signage (see standard DS.317 for further information)

   ii. application of landscaping treatments to surfaces (see section 3.1.5)

   iii. creation of horizontal deflection through the overall configuration of the track or placement of street furniture. This may include occasional width restrictions (see 3.1.3b)

   iv. creation of vertical deflection at the commencement or end of the track (e.g. when mounting the footway to join the track) or at other points between (see sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.5).

NOTE: Designers are reminded that proposals that generate substantial clutter (from signage, street furniture or tactile surfaces) are unlikely to be approved.

3.1.2 Tactile surfaces

a. See standard DS.207 about the use of corduroy, tram line and ladder tactile surfaces to cycle tracks.

3.1.3 Entrance and exits to tracks for cyclists

a. At the end of any length of cycle track, a cycle access dropped kerb or other exit detail must always be provided to allow users to return to the carriageway along with associated signage advising them to do so (see standard DS.317 for further information on this and other signage requirements).

b. Points of entry for cyclists to cycle tracks should always create tight gateways that will encourage an immediate reduction in the speed to levels compatible with close contact with pedestrians. Accordingly:

   i. a cycle access dropped kerb should always be provided. Such features should be relatively narrow. See standard DS.205 for further information about their design.

   ii. bollards or other vertical width restriction features (see note) should be provided in the centre of the dropped kerb or enclosing it to either side. These may be left out by agreement to a level 1 departure. See section 3.1.4 for passing width requirements.

   iii. designers should consider locating entry and exit points slightly away from natural design lines for cyclists in order to prevent a ‘racing line’ from being taken that may allow users to enter the cycle track at significant speeds. However, a balance must be struck that considers the risks of inconveniencing cyclists, inadvertently encouraging them to use other unintended points of entry, or creating arrangements that would require unadvisable manoeuvres.

NOTE: Alternatives to conventional bollards could include street trees, stone seating cubes or any other item of high street furniture. However, in many instances introduction of bollards is likely to be necessary anyway in order to accommodate signage related to the cycle track. Consequently, using these to also enforce width restrictions may help reduce clutter on balance.

c. Points of entry or exit to cycle tracks should always be located with regard to the highway visibility requirements in standard DS.114.

d. Points of entry or exit to cycle tracks from the carriageway should never be located within bus cages or in proximity to these.

3.1.4 Speed reduction and access control pinch points

a. Except as explained in section 3.1.3, pinch points formed by vertical items of street furniture should not normally be deployed as regular speed reduction features along cycle tracks. However, occasional instances may be introduced at the discretion of approving officers at points of potential conflict between users and/or pedestrians. They may sometimes also be necessary as access restriction features to deter improper use of tracks by other vehicles (though see standard DS.213 for further discussion on this point).

b. In order to avoid undue risk to cyclists whilst remaining effective for their other purposes, the overall passing width (see note 1) within a cycle track as it navigates a permitted pinch point should be within the following ranges (as appropriate):

   i. 1.2-1.5m where access can be provided to both sides of a central restricting features

   ii. 1.4-.1.8m where access can only be provided between two restricting features (see note 2).

   Wherever possible, designing tracks to have a central restricting feature as 'i' should be preferred.

   NOTE 1: These widths are inclusive of the additional clearance values given in Table 2.

   NOTE 2: Where widths exceed 1.5m then they are likely to be ineffective for the purposes of deterring access at speed by motorcyclists. It should be appreciated however that none of these widths will outright prevent access for motorcyclists as anything accessible to pedal cyclists is also likely to be accessible to them. See standard DS.213 for further related discussion.

3.1.5 Other landscaping and surface design issues

a. Modular units should be used to the majority of the surface of cycle tracks (see note 1). Any use of bituminous mixture surfacing will require agreement to a level 1 departure. Approving Officers should be satisfied that such proposals would not prejudice meeting the various concerns described in 'b' (see note 2). See standard DS.322 about the potential use of coloured surfaces where use of bituminous mixtures or other monolithic surfaces is permitted.

   NOTE 1: Research shows that use of modular surfaces (particularly those that provide some tactile or audible feedback) promotes moderate speed reductions.

   NOTE 2: In general, significant uninterrupted lengths of bituminous mixture surfacing should not be permitted as this is likely to be interpreted as being a 'vehicle surface' and therefore encourage greater speed. However, brief lengths of bituminous mixture surface differentiated by substantial bands of modular unit at regular intervals may be considered by approving officers at their discretion. A banded pattern of 8-10m lengths of bituminous mixture surfacing with interspacing 4-6m lengths of modular paving has been found to be acceptable in the past.

b. The landscaping of cycle tracks should seek to balance the following concerns to the satisfaction of approving officers.

   i. <u>Linear emphasis</u>

      Proposals should avoid the creation of a strong linear emphasis that may serve to visually narrow the footpath or footway and/or encourage inappropriate speeds from cyclists. This is likely to be of particular importance where 'adjacent use' arrangements are used. See also note 1.

ii. Pedestrian priority:

Landscaping proposals should convey the legitimacy of pedestrian use to all parts of the track whilst at the same time providing required delineation for accessibility purposes.

iii. Visual differentiation

As per standard DS.219, landscaping proposals must provide for visual distinction between surfaces that are for pedestrians only and those that vehicles (including cyclists) can use. In practice this will mean that 'shared' cycle tracks must use a visually distinct surface to preceding sections of footway, whilst the side of any 'adjacent use' cycle track that is for cyclists must use a visually distinct surface from that which is for pedestrians only. See also note 2 and see standard DS.322 about the potential use of coloured surfaces where use of bituminous mixtures or other monolithic surfaces is permitted.

iv. Comfort for cyclists

Proposals should not create any discomfort for cyclists except for the purposes of restricting speeds within maximum limits (see section 3.1.1).

NOTE 1: Introduction of horizontal banding details across the track may help avoid this. Where 'adjacent use' cycle tracks are proposed then extending the materials used on the side for pedestrians as bands across the side for cyclists at intervals may help break up the linear effect whilst keeping acceptable visual differentiation between the two sides.

NOTE 2: See NOTE 1 for a possible compromise that may help avoid over-emphasis of the linear nature of the track in 'adjacent use' arrangements.

3.1.6 Track widths

a. See sections 3.2 and 3.3 for standard minimum effective widths for 'adjacent use' and 'shared use' tracks respectively.

b. Where vertical items (including all but the smallest of kerb steps) bound a side of a cycle track used by cyclists then - unless a level 1 departure is agreed - the additional clearance values given in Table 2 should be added to the minimum effective widths given in sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Feature located within cycle track or along its edge (see note 1)	Additional value to be added to effective width to that side (see note 2)
Flush surface or kerb step that is ≤25mm high.	None
Kerb step that is > 25 to ≤ 150mm high.	200mm / or distance required by Use Envelope of item (see note 3) – whichever is the greater
Vertical feature that is > 150mm to ≤ 600mm high	250mm / or distance required by Use Envelope of feature (see note 3) – whichever is the greater
Vertical feature that is > 600mm high.	500mm / or distance required by use envelope of feature (see note 3) – whichever is the greater
NOTE 1) Examples of vertical features include bollards, lighting columns, benches and seats, litter bins, cycle stands, hedges, walls, railings and parked cars. 2) Normally additional values will need to be applied to both limits of a track. For instance, in the case of a 'shared use' cycle track that ran along a former footway parallel to a carriageway, +500mm may need to be provided to the back edge of the track along the garden walls of bounding premises and +200mm along the front edge owing to the edge of carriageway kerb step. 3) See standard DS.208 for further information about Use Envelopes.	

Table 2 - Clearance values (or additional widths) to be added to minimum effective widths for cycle tracks

3.1.7 Treatments where tracks cross side roads

a. Continuation of cycle tracks over side roads is to be avoided and will require agreement to a level 1 departure (see note 1). Any departure to permit this should always be provided initially In Principle Only. Geometric arrangements for such crossings will be agreed on a case specific basis with approving officers (see note 2). The suitability of these should always be raised as a Point Of Enquiry for a Road Safety Audit (RSA – see note 3). Proposals should be reviewed in light of the findings of the RSA Audit Report and amended if appropriate before any Final Confirmation to the departure is provided. Normally this review will take place within a following Quality Audit (see note 4).

NOTE 1: National guidance and research highlights the significant potential for conflict, confusion and incident between street users where cycle tracks cross side roads. This is one of the main reasons why guidance discourages the use of cycle tracks in most circumstances.

NOTE 2: Potential options are likely to include: (a) setting back the crossing some distance down the side road; and (b) providing a cycle lane in the main road carriageway in the vicinity of junctions that track users are re-routed to in order to cross the side road. In the case of (a), depending upon the design it may be possible to introduce restrictions requiring other roads users to giveaway to the track where it crosses the side road, though the TSRGD limits the circumstances in which this is acceptable. Also in relation to (a), designers should note the spatial implications of setting crossings back down side roads as footways will need to be wide enough to accommodate the set back. Where 'adjacent use' arrangements are used this is also likely to complicate arrangements for pedestrians. Allowing tracks to cross directly on desire lines close to the edge of the major road carriageway is unlikely to be appropriate in most circumstances. In all instances, visibility between road users will be a key consideration.

NOTE 3: See SSDM/PR procedure PC.040 for further information about Road Safety Audits, including how Points Of Enquiry are to be raised.

NOTE 4: See SSDM/PR procedure PC.022 for further information about Quality Audits.

3.2 Further requirements for 'adjacent use' cycle tracks

3.2.1 Delineation between side for pedestrian and side for cyclists

a. See standard DS.202.

3.2.2 One-way vs. two-way working on side for cyclists

a. The side of the adjacent use track designated for cyclists should always be designed assuming use in both directions by cyclists.

NOTE: Irrespective of track width or signage suggesting one-way working, cyclists will almost always use tracks in both directions. As this can have road safety implications it is important that designs accommodate it.

3.2.3 Effective width of side for pedestrians

a. The minimum effective width specified in standard DS.208 should be provided.

NOTE: In the event of any conflict, this is to take precedence over achieving minimum widths on the side for cyclists.

3.2.4 Effective width of side for cyclists

a. A minimum effective width of 2.0m (2.5m preferred) should be provided (see notes). Approving officers may instruct the use of greater minimum values at their discretion where pedal cycle flows are considerable.

NOTE 1: The effective width of the side of an 'adjacent use' cycle track that is for cyclists is that uninterrupted width available to users on that side before accounting for the presence of vertical objects or features at the limits of the width. Where objects or features are present then further clearance values as section 3.1.6 must be added to the effective width since cyclists will typically try to keep some distance from them in order to avoid collision. The extent of the clearance value required for a particular item or feature will vary with its height. Some addition of clearance values to the effective width will almost always be necessary owing to the presence of things like: street lighting columns; up stand kerbs or parked cars at the carriageway edge; or boundary walls and railings. The minimum effective width values stated recognise this.

NOTE 2: See section 3.1.4 for minimum widths at pinch points.

NOTE 3: Whilst recent guidance from the Department for Transport in LTN 01/12 'Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists' recommends provision of a minimum 3m width for two-way segregated cycle tracks, this is considered to be overly generous given the likely intensity of flows in most locations and the potential risk of encouraging inappropriate speeds. Moreover, given the significant constraints on available widths in central London streets, adoption of such minimum widths would probably exclude introduction of 'adjacent use' arrangements in the majority of circumstances. Given the strong public preference for 'adjacent use' arrangements over 'shared use' arrangements (see Table 3 - Minimum required effective width values for sections of 'shared use' cycle track

Appendix A) it is considered appropriate and sensible to permit narrower widths. Notwithstanding this, where cycle flows are expected to be considerable, greater widths should always be considered and may be instructed by approving officers as explained elsewhere.

3.2.5 Extension of raised table crossings in the carriageway across tracks

a. Where 'adjacent use' cycle tracks

   i. are located on footways that run parallel to the carriageway; and

   ii. a level difference exists between the side for pedestrians and the side for cyclists (e.g. a kerb step)

then, where a raised table feature exists in the carriageway, that feature should be extended to span over the side of the track that is for cyclists so that it interfaces broadly at-grade with that for pedestrians.

NOTE: This is in order to simplify ease of crossing for pedestrians and to avoid them having to negotiate a change in level.

3.2.6 Buffer strips between side for cyclists and the carriageway

a. If an 'adjacent use' cycle track runs parallel to the carriageway (and the side for cyclist's is against the carriageway edge) then, where possible, a narrow buffer strip as 'a' should be introduced along the carriageway edge of the track - particularly if the main carriageway is busy and vehicles pass close to the its edge. Approving officers may instruct the inclusion of such features where they consider it appropriate and where sufficient space exists to accommodate them. However, at space constrained sites, omission of buffer strips should not be prioritised over other demands (such as provision of adequate effective widths for both pedestrians and cyclists – for which see 'd').

b. Where they are to provided, buffer strips should

   i. run parallel to the edge of carriageway kerb line and be located immediately behind it

   ii. be 250-450mm wide

   iii. be composed of modular precast concrete blocks, clay pavers, or natural stone setts that visibly contrast with the side surface of the side of the cycle track that is for cyclists. That contrast does not need to be extreme. However, it must be reasonably appreciable.

c. Continuous white line road markings should not be used instead of or in conjunction with buffer strips.

NOTE: This is as per the recommendations of LTN 1/12 'Shared use routes for pedestrians and cyclists'

d. Buffer strips should be excluded when determining the effective width of the side of the cycle track that is for cyclists (see section 3.2.4).

3.3 Further requirements for 'shared use' sections of cycle tracks

3.3.1 Width of track

a. The minimum effective width (see note) for sections of 'shared use' cycle track should be as Table 3, appropriate to the location.

NOTE: The effective width of a 'shared use' cycle track is that uninterrupted width that is available to users before accounting for the presence of objects or features at the limits of that width. Where such objects or features are present then further clearance values as section 3.1.6 will need to be added to the effective width as cyclists will typically try to keep distance from those features to avoid collision. The extent of the clearance value that is required for a particular item or feature will vary with its height. Some addition of clearance values to the effective width will almost always be necessary within cycle tracks owing to the presence street lighting columns, up stand kerbs at the carriageway edge or boundary walls and railings. The minimum effective width values below recognise this.

SSDM/RP Specification Area in which the 'shared use' cycle track is located	Required minimum effective width (metres) – see note 1
Any Specification Area - where within 20m of an Underground or Overground rail station	3.75m
Any Specification Area – where outside busy pedestrian accesses to premises that are likely to generate many pedestrian movements (see note 2)	
World Centre	
Town Centre (Zone A) - see note 3	
Town Centre (Zone B) - see note 3	3.0m
Heritage	
Village	
Docks	
General	
NOTES 1) Additional clearance values as section 3.1.6 will nearly always need to be added to the minimum effective width values in this Table. 2) Examples are likely to include public buildings, and large shops and offices. Designers should use their common sense in identifying such busy premises. However, at their discretion approving officers may instruct that premises be considered as such, subject to reasonable justification. 3) See standard DS.207 for details about the limits of *Town Centre (Zone A)* and *Town Centre (Zone B)* Specification Areas.3)	

Table 3 - Minimum required effective width values for sections of 'shared use' cycle track

Appendix A - Background

1.1 General approach

a. SSDM Strategic Design Policies (as found in the SSDM/FP Framework Plan) commit the Highway Authority to providing paths for vulnerable pedestrians through all streets and spaces that are free from vehicle traffic and prioritising their needs ahead of other street users. They also commit it to a road danger reduction approach to design. This broadly involves designing out risks at source rather than introducing management measures that may inconvenience those placed at potential risk. Cycle tracks (which are often provided due to actual or perceived safety risks for pedal cyclists on carriageways) are problematic in both of these respects. In terms of issues for cyclists themselves, national guidance and research[1] highlights the scope for confusion and subsequent incident between road users (including cyclists) where tracks cross side roads and at other points of access and conflict. For these and various other safety related reasons, guidance advises that cycle tracks should only be considered as a last resort after other approaches to providing for cyclists have been properly explored and discounted (including reducing traffic speeds and volumes in the carriageway). In terms of issues for pedestrians, consultations with local people that were carried out to inform development of the SSDM showed strong opposition to the introduction of cycle tracks in general, and the use of 'shared use' cycle tracks arrangements in particular. People consulted strongly favoured providing for cyclists in the carriageway wherever possible and using 'adjacent use' arrangements where cycle tracks were unavoidable. An Equality Impact Assessment undertaken in support of the SSDM also identified cycle tracks as features that could impact negatively on vulnerable people. This supports findings from national attitudinal surveys that found that cycle tracks are strongly opposed by blind and partially sighted people[2]. Other national research with older people has drawn similar conclusions[3]. Again, where these were unavoidable then 'adjacent use' arrangements were preferred as pedestrian users could then keep clear of cyclists and have greater certainty about where they might encounter them.

b. SSDM Strategic Design Policies also commit the Highway Authority to reducing clutter and improving sense of place within streets. Both 'adjacent use' and (to a lesser extent) 'shared use' cycle tracks are likely to produce significant clutter due to the need for substantial associated signage, tactile way-finding surfaces and other measures – particularly where they must negotiate points of conflict (e.g. at track ends, crossings with side roads or other tracks etc...). Whilst obviously secondary to road safety and equalities concerns this is still an important consideration.

c. Both the SSDM and Southwark Network Management Policy (NMP) recognise that a contributing cause behind requests for cycle tracks is often the legitimate concerns of cyclists about safety and permeability in the carriageway. Consequently, both documents include shared aims to promote design that will make carriageways the safest and most attractive place for all vehicles - including cyclists. Related measures include the continued roll-out of borough wide 20mph speed limits and improvements to network permeability. This strategy aims to improve conditions for cyclists whilst avoiding issues around safety and accessibility for pedestrians. Consequently, the SSDM also includes a Strategic Design Policy to reduce conflict between street users.

1.2 Current approach

a. Given the above the Highway Authority considers that - on balance - the preferred method of providing for cyclists ought to by improving carriageway environments to make these safe and comfortable for cyclists and that this should be preferred to the creation of cycle tracks in proximity to (or within) pedestrian space. As per the recommendations of national guidance, cycle tracks should only be considered after other options have been explored and found to be inappropriate. In order to ensure this takes place the Highway Authority considers it appropriate to restrict the availability of cycle tracks as an option for designers until it can be demonstrated that this has

[1] See Department for Transport, (2010a) Local Transport Note 1/10 Cycle infrastructure design; Department for Transport, (2012) Local Transport Note 1/12 Shared use routes for pedestrians and cyclists; Department for Transport, (2007) Manual for Streets; Department for Transport (2010b) Manual for Streets 2; S.Reid and S.Adams (2011) TRL report PPR 580 – Infrastructure and Cyclists Safety.

[2] See TNS-BMRB, (2010) The impact of shared surface streets and shared use pedestrian/cycle paths on the mobility and independence of blind and partially sighted people.

[3] See Newton, R. and Ormerod, M., (2007) Inclusive design for getting outdoors, Design Guidance for Street Environments.

occurred. Where cycle tracks are found to be necessary then ‘adjacent use’ cycle track arrangements should be used as these are less problematic for the vulnerable people who take priority as per the SSDM Strategic Design Policy on Street User Priority. Because of apparent public opposition and the particular issues they may cause for vulnerable pedestrians, ‘shared use’ arrangements should not be used except in exceptional circumstances. Where use of ‘shared use’ arrangements is necessary then they should be designed in consultation with expert representatives of vulnerable people in order to meet their needs as is appropriate.