



LCWIP: BWA Proposals for an overall Framework and for Scheme Priorities - October 2018

1 Introduction

1.1 Context of previous BWA submissions

Bristol Walking Alliance has made two submissions so far to the LCWIP process. In our first submission to Bristol LCWIP, in March 2018, we said that some of the key elements it would like to see in the LCWIP are:

- A walking network map
- Templates for possible future funding packages
- Clear selection criteria for schemes
- Design standards
- Improved data gathering

In our second submission, in June 2018, we suggested focusing Core Walking Zones (CWZs) on development areas and Key Walking Routes (KWRs) on extending the existing primary and secondary pedestrian routes outward from the centre.

Since then, we understand that walking in Bristol city centre will be considered as a separate matter in the City Centre Framework (to which we are contributing) and we have been shown some initial ideas on how CWZs and KWRs might be defined.

This third submission sets out further ideas on CWZs and KWRs, offering a framework within which they can be identified and some specific suggestions for an initial set of related infrastructure schemes.

1.2 Fitting the LCWIP methodology into how schemes are framed

We are aware that this exercise is new for all involved, including BWA. We are all feeling our way.

The government has specified a framework of CWZs and KWRs. CWZs and KWRs may be the right building blocks for the *framework*, but they are not necessarily right for framing *schemes*.

Schemes based on a CWZ or KWR are likely to be significant schemes that are *multi-modal* (ie they include changes not only to the walking infrastructure, but also to the cycling, public transport or private vehicle infrastructure). The driver for the scheme is likely to be something other than

improving walking: the walking improvements typically piggy-back a scheme for another purpose. That is the reality of how fundable schemes are framed. For example, town centres, transport hubs, hospitals, areas of new housing development, and main roads are all likely to entail multi-modal schemes. The LCWIP needs to recognise that many of its schemes are of this nature.

That is the reality of how fundable schemes are framed - at least currently. If Bristol were to follow Manchester's example, it could be different. In its Beelines project, Manchester has made a step-change in the amount of funding committed to walking and cycling, and has created a programme of schemes specifically to make improvements for walking and cycling. Bristol could do the same, but the draft Bristol Transport Strategy gives no indication that it will. BWA will make that point in responding to the BTS consultation.

The multimodal schemes chosen for the initial list of LCWIP schemes are likely to be chosen on the basis of what schemes are known to be in the pipeline – which looks to be how the council's first draft list of schemes has been chosen. This is the right thing pragmatically – choosing opportunistically is the way to get walking improvements done. But it is not how the first schemes would be chosen if one followed the logic of the government LCWIP guidelines.

It is disappointing to recognise that many walking improvements will continue to be opportunistic, as multi-modal schemes come along. It makes the LCWIP seem less of a ground-breaking platform for walking improvements than we thought. It is therefore very important that the LCWIP should include as many *walking-only* schemes as possible, even though they may not be based on a CWZ or KWR.

1.3 Structure of this document

This document considers the two parts of the LCWIP separately: first the long-term framework for identifying and prioritising improvements in the walking environment, and second prioritisation and choice of initial schemes.

We should look to see how other local authorities are framing schemes. A brief survey is included in an appendix.

2 A framework for improving the walking infrastructure

For both CWZs and KWRs, the kinds of infrastructure improvements that we believe should be considered include:

- Minimise impediments to walking:
 - Assist traversing barriers: e.g. roads, railways, waterways
 - Remove permanent obstructions: e.g. narrow footways, badly sited street furniture
- Ensure convenience and accessibility:
 - Reinforce pedestrian desire lines
 - Be accessible for all users e.g. dropped kerbs, ramps to avoid steps
- Be safe, welcoming and healthy:
 - Minimise poor air quality by avoiding traffic-laden roads
 - Offer shade and reduce pollution by planting street trees
 - Provide open green spaces, seating and toilet facilities
- Ensure all new pedestrian facilities are high-quality:
 - Build all of the above into new developments

2.1 Criteria for choosing Core Walking Zones

The choice of CWZs that would be 'eligible' for selection within the plan has been left open for debate. In the Bristol LCWIP, the Council team has suggested that the City Centre is a separate CWZ that would be addressed in the City Centre Framework currently being developed.

In our first submission, we said that CWZs could be based on:

- the hierarchy of retail centres – see map of town centres etc in Core Strategy
- areas of future new housing development – see maps in the Local Plan review and Urban Living SPD document
- safe routes to schools
- transport hubs – rail stations and bus stops
- hospitals
- community and leisure centres

The council's initial work, presented in the workshop on 4th October, chose:

- retail centres, called town centres in the Core Strategy
- areas of future new housing development (such as Hengrove Park) in the Local Plan
- some other destinations (Symes Avenue, Southmead Hospital, Lawrence Weston).

We think it is important not to exclude potential CWZs and KWRs too early in the process, for instance by focusing too much on town centres. The following are alternative approaches:

- identify a potentially large number of zones, based on existing or anticipated footfall. This list would then be prioritised according to the extent to which the kinds of infrastructure improvements listed previously could make a significant difference. However assessing the cost-benefit of a long list of possible schemes is difficult.
- analyse the needs specific to each type of destination, and then prioritise those needs. For instance, this might lead to prioritizing improvements near schools. This approach is easier

Though in our second submission we suggested that CWZs should have a radius of 2km, current council thinking is to limit this to a 1km radius. This puts the responsibility on KWRs to support longer-distance walking.

2.3 Criteria for choosing Key Walking Routes

KWRs should be chosen looking at the amount of pedestrian traffic over longer distances, particularly for walking to work or to education or for leisure. The chosen KWRs should include routes with significant amounts of existing footfall as well as those with most scope for increasing the amount of footfall.

Walking routes across the city centre we assume will now be incorporated by inclusion in the City Centre Framework document.

The most significant KWRs are still likely to be those going to and from the city centre. Existing well-used routes will include Park Street/Whiteladies Road, Gloucester Road/Cheltenham Road, and over Gaol Ferry Bridge to Bedminster and Southville.

Routes to new development areas could also contribute significantly to the increase of pedestrian traffic into the city centre, especially to Lawrence Hill, St Philips Marsh and Bedminster Green, so should also be included.

3 Setting priorities and choice of initial schemes

3.1 Type of scheme package

Some possible funding packages are listed below. As argued in 1.2 above, the LCWIP should include as many walking-only schemes as possible, even though they may not be based on a CWZ or KWR. Some of the following funding packages are therefore not based on a CWZ or KWR.

- based on a CWZ.

- in the centre of the CWZ
 - continuous pavements across side turnings
 - improvement in street crossings
 - wider pavements in places
 - removal of obstructions on the pavement
 - improvement of the public realm
 - changes in loading and servicing restrictions
 - pedestrian-only/pedestrian-priority areas
 - car parking changes
 - enforcement of no pavement parking, including bollards
- on routes to the centre of the CWZ
 - removing route barriers and missing links
 - adding filtered permeability
 - signage to the destination

- based on a KWR.

- pedestrian priority across side turnings (if a main road)
- improvement in street crossings (if a main road)
- wider pavements in places
- removal of obstructions on the pavement
- enforcement of no pavement parking, including bollards

- a low-car residential area

- adding filtered permeability
- pedestrian priority across side turnings off any main road
- control of car parking
- street interventions to calm motor traffic
- play streets
- public realm improvements around any local centre or community facility

- no-car zone around schools

- an exclusion zone enforced during morning and afternoon pick-up times.

- route barriers and missing links

- address a single large barrier or missing link eg Gaol Ferry Bridge, a new King Street Bridge, OR
- address a number of small barriers and missing links across Bristol (see Bristol Bugbears and NP lists of improvements for candidates)

- a particular type of improvement, implemented gradually across Bristol via the road maintenance programme, eg

- pedestrian priority across side turnings
- wider pavements
- informal crossing-points and pavement build-outs

3.2 Choice of initial schemes

It is necessary to produce an initial ordered list of schemes for which funding will be sought. The choice of schemes is up for debate.

It is important in the initial choice of schemes to set a pattern for future schemes. Ideally, the initial list should include one of each of the following types of scheme:

- based on a CWZ
- based on a KWR
- low-car residential area
- a no-car school zone (pilot scheme)
- a single large barrier or missing link
- a number of small barriers and missing links across Bristol
- an improvement delivered via the roads maintenance programme (pilot scheme).

The LCWIP list of schemes should distinguish between multi-modal schemes and walking-specific schemes. Possibly most CWZ- and KWR-based schemes are likely to be multi-modal. The other types of scheme suggested above are more likely to be walking-only, or at least walking- and cycling-only, and it is particularly important that the LCWIP list should include such schemes.

Conclusion

LCWIP has to set a framework for choosing walking infrastructure schemes that is more than just a list of the top ten current projects. We have suggested that the choice of initial projects should include representatives of different types of scheme, both large and small, in order to evaluate their relative impact and so to better set future priorities.

Bristol Walking Alliance

15 October 2018

Appendix: learning points from other cities

1 Manchester

Beelines is a new initiative, published at <https://www.tfgm.com/made-to-move/beelines>. This document is not in itself a LCWIP, but is useful to see how schemes are packaged

Much of it is based around adding crossing points across busy roads - see the district maps. Indeed walking and cycling are nowhere dealt with separately. That may be a good way of packaging a scheme: if you put in a cycle superhighway (aka segregated cycle lane), then that's the time to improve the pedestrian route alongside it. If you put in a crossing point, or cycle filter, then you improve it for pedestrians at the same time.

2 London

TfL may not be preparing a LCWIP: they are ahead of the game and maybe don't need to. They do however have a Walking Action Plan – see <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/mts-walking-action-plan.pdf>. It is multi-faceted, and wider in scope than a LCWIP. Most relevant is Chapter 6 – Building and managing streets for people walking. Its interventions are:

- "transformational schemes to make streets better places for people to walk and spend time"
- Liveable Neighbourhoods,
- pedestrian safety improvements at junctions,
- walking improvements alongside new cycle routes,
- pedestrian crossings.

In our first submission, we pointed out the four headings that TfL have identified in their Liveable Neighbourhoods schemes:

A: Residential area/local centre

B: Town centres and high streets

C: Transport interchange

D: Connections to town centres and high streets

Each of these is given their own criteria for project aims and possible outcome measures.

See <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs/liveable-neighbourhoods>. Specifically Table 2 on page 20 of <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-liveable-neighbourhoods-programme-26-07-17-final.pdf>.

3 Leicester

Leicester has a clear vision, led by the Mayor. There is more emphasis on the pedestrian and good public realm than on cycling. See <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/your-council/city-mayor-peter-soulsby/my-vision/connecting-leicester/>

4 Other cities

See snapshots of other cities at

<http://www.urbantransportgroup.org/resources/types/reports/active-travel-solutions-changing-cities>

5 Overall learning points:

- CWZs and KWRs may not be the right framework for schemes
- a combination of big schemes and little schemes is needed
- one element should be crossing points
- one element should be walking improvements alongside new cycle routes
- a visionary leader helps !