BWA early submission to the Bristol LCWIP

1 Introduction

BWA welcomes the invitation to engage with the developing LCWIP via regular stakeholder group meetings. The LCWIP is an opportunity to develop a list of prioritised investment-ready plans, as part of a shift to measures that support walking, based on core walking zones (CWZs) and key walking routes (KWRs).

2 Key elements that BWA would like to see in the LCWIP

A walking network map. The Department for Transport guidance for LCWIPs requires development of a walking network map, and a prioritised list of improvements. At the first stakeholder meeting, expectations were set that the LCWIP might deliver perhaps a list of 10 funding packages, but it should also lay the foundations for how subsequent funding packages will be chosen. This surely requires a Bristol-wide map showing CWZs and KWRs.

Templates for possible future funding packages. As well as describing a list of 10 initial funding packages, the LCWIP could describe templates for future funding packages. As an example of what might be produced, a Transport for London document classifies possible funding packages in four ways:

- A: Residential area/local centre
- B: Town centres and high streets
- C: Transport interchange
- D: Connections to town centres and high streets

For each type, it lists possible project aims (outcomes) and possible measures (outputs).

Transport for London	Scenario A Residential area / local centre	Scenario B Town centres and high streets	Scenario C Transport Interchange	Scenario D Connections to town centres and high streets
Neighbourhoods Schemes example scenarios				
Description	 Local streets Local amenities 	 Town centres / high streets and vicinity Broad range of land use Local and regional attractors 	 Concentration of transport modes, with high demand at particular times 	 Local streets and connectors Close proximity to town centres and high streets
Project aims (outcomes)	Active and social streets Reduced traffic dominance	 Improved social and economic vitality Improved walking and cycle provision 	 Easy and safe place to navigate Improved routes to interchanges 	 Town centre and high street benefits opened up to surrounding area More sustainable travel to town centres and high streets
Possible measures (outputs)	 Modal filtering Timed closures to vehicles New play streets Behaviour change initiatives Replace car parking with cycle parking 	 Wider footpaths Timed restrictions to vehicles Dynamic freight and servicing Re-allocation of car parking New pedestrian crossings New cycle parking 	 Signage and wayfinding Cycle parking New, safe cycle routes to stations Reduced parking provisions Improved pedestrian crossings 	 Filtered permeability New pedestrian crossings Pedestrian priority at side roads Bus priority measures Measures to reduce road danger at junctions

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

Clear selection criteria for schemes. It is a challenge to decide what criteria to use to define CWZs and KWRs and to evaluate and prioritise amongst the many improvements that could be made.

For instance, core walking zones could be based on:

- the hierarchy of retail centres see map 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

There are many possible criteria for prioritising types of improvement:

- where pedestrian levels are high, or where there are barriers to walking
- leisure routes or routes to shops/employment/community centres
- urban routes or routes through parks
- many small interventions or one large intervention like a new bridge across the Cut
- dominated by traffic, poor pedestrian experience
- severance issue
- benefit in reduced journeys by car

- streets that currently pose the greatest health threats in terms of noise, air pollution and road danger.

Design standards: whilst developing design standards is outside the scope of the LCWIP, they are important to delivering quality schemes, so the LCWIP should at least refer to design standards for walking schemes. This might be the Transport Development Management guide. We suggest Bristol might also look to TfL's Healthy Streets guidance and tools.

Improved data gathering: plan to capture much more data about walking frequency, duration, direction and purpose in order to measure the effects of infrastructure improvements and to allow better prioritisation of schemes in the future.

3 Other suggestions

Other things that the LCWIP might consider:

- continuous pavements could be a part of the proposals, possibly funded by the roads maintenance budget
- members of the public could be invited to submit sites for walking improvements via an online 'Bugbears' website
- as well as larger schemes, the LCWIP could consider small interventions, where there are opportunities for community involvement. TfL's approach to this is at: <u>http://content.tfl.gov.uk/small-change-big-impact.pdf</u>
- members of the community with local knowledge can be a resource in developing schemes. Some neighbourhood groups have previously done on walking networks.
- the Council's new human-scale royalty-free mapping could become a useful tool for planning walking improvements.