



London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+)

Route alignment alternatives, night-time routes and LCN+ 'Spurs'

Status: Final
Version: 01
Date: 29 September 2007

0. Document Control

0.1 Author(s)

Nick Chitty, Principal Transport Planner, Transport for London

0.2 Document Summary

This document is for Project:

London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+)

Route alignment alternatives, night-time routes and LCN+ 'Spurs'

0.3 Document History

Version	Date	Changes since previous issue
01	29 September 2007	Final

0.4 Reference Documents

1. The London Cycling Action Plan (LCAP), TfL, February 2004
2. Capita Symonds Report:
Review of a sample of Final CRISP Reports for Compliance with the CRISP brief
(Document Reference CS 03669-03/D/12B)
3. TfL **Response to a Review of a sample of Final CRISP Reports for compliance with the CRISP brief**

0.5 Distribution

London Highway Authorities
LCN+ Steering Group
TfL Website
LCN+ Website

1. Introduction

The Review of Final CRISP reports (Capita Symonds for TfL, March 2007) states:

4.32 On some of the plans there appears to have been confusion on the meaning of the term "Alternative Route". In some cases the term has been used where there are, say, two ways of getting from A to B by similar types of road of similar length, and it has to be decided which should be developed as the LCN+ Link. In this case, one will form part of the eventual cycle network but the other will not.

4.33 In other cases the term has been used to describe a different way of getting from A to B that may be applicable at certain times of day or night, such as a route via busier roads that may have to be used when a more direct route across a park is closed. In such cases it may be more helpful to refer to one of the routes as a "night-time route" or similar, to clarify the relative status of the routes.

TfL's formal response to the Review of Final CRISP reports identifies the following action in Paragraph 5.3:

"TfL to issue guidance and clarification on 'alternative' routes."

This note addresses that action.

2. Network Identification history

LCN+ corridors were originally identified in 2002, following the recommendations of a specially convened Task Force and involving cycle user group representatives.

LCN+ routes are divided into Links within each of the 33 London boroughs. Each LCN+ Link has a reference number which is embedded in the 'MapInfo' electronic version of the LCN+ Link map. Link numbers are for project management purposes only and are not related to public cycle route numbering.

The LCN+ Project Management team at LB Camden retains, and manages changes to, the LCN+ map on behalf of TfL.

Link Rationalisation 2007

As part of the preparation of an LCN+ Programme to Completion by the end of 2007, the LCN+ length will be reduced from the current working length of c.1000km to the 900km commitment in the TfL London Cycling Action Plan.

3. CRISP studies – route alignment alternatives

The TfL generic CRISP brief, Stage 1 – Preparation, data collection, summary and dissemination, states that the organisation undertaking the study is to:

- *Agree with the client alternative routes to be studied, taking into account:*
 - *views of Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM) stakeholders*
 - *responses to questionnaires*
 - *routes shown on TfL London Cycle Guide maps*

The intention is that each Link alignment be optimised through the CRISP process so that, following appropriate interventions in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards, the final route reasonably satisfies the LCN+ objectives of providing a continuous, fast (best journey time), safe and comfortable network.

The aim of the LCN+ investment programme is to identify and enable physical interventions to be made to deliver these objectives.

In this context, those involved in CRISP studies, particularly the responsible highway authority, are required to look ahead to the future potential of the alignment under consideration, notwithstanding the conditions that are present at the time of the study.

4. Link alignment change control

The CRISP process includes for verification of the Link alignment and consideration of alternative alignments, and is the origin of the majority of Link alignment change proposals. The working assumption is that the originally identified Link alignment is the preferred alignment.

Change control for Link alignment is managed by LCN+ PM through the LCN+ variation process by submission of proposed changes, with appropriate justification, to the client, TfL's Cycle Programme Team.

These submissions are reviewed and the proposed re-alignment either agreed, or rejected with reasons, by TfL. LCN+ PM inform the highway authority and make any necessary changes to the LCN+ Link map. The map is re-issued periodically, incorporating any changes.

Link alignment proposals of the following type are not normally agreed by TfL as they are not considered to positively contribute to programme objectives:

- move from main roads to 'side streets'
- move from on-carriageway to off-carriageway
- change from location where cyclists and pedestrians are, or can be, segregated to those where cyclists and pedestrians share space

Exceptions to these may be agreed with appropriate justification. For example a dual three lane 40mph speed limit section of the A406 North Circular Road, where an acceptable off-carriageway provision was thought to be unfeasible, was considered inappropriate as an LCN+ route. An alternative alignment on parallel borough roads has been proposed and agreed.

Following completion of CRISP studies, Link alignments will be formally frozen. This process will be managed by the LCN+ PM team. Provision will be retained after freezing Link alignments to accept subsequent changes in exceptional circumstances, for example, to take advantage of beneficial development opportunities.

5. Night-time alternative routes

In view of their strategic nature, LCN+ routes should normally be accessible 24 hours a day.

London Cycling Design Standards paragraph 2.4.33 states:

If all access including pedestrian access is prohibited at certain times and the route is physically barred, this will not normally be suitable as an LCN+ route. Very exceptionally, if for example a route were only barred during the small hours of the morning, it could be considered for use as an LCN+ route. In such cases, signs should be erected at the points of closure to direct cyclists in the right direction, but otherwise signs along the deviation route will not normally be justified unless it is a cycle route in its own right.

Though representing a small proportion of overall network length (following Link Rationalisation 2007), some LCN+ Links are routed through land where cycling is not permitted and/or desirable at certain times such as parks and churchyards.

In these cases the identification and provision of alternative routes during times of restriction may be appropriate (though there may be some cases where an alternative is not practicable). Alternative routes in these situations have been identified in a number of CRISP studies and the routes are recorded and mapped by LCN+ PM. The length of 'night-time alternative' route alignments is not added to the LCN+ route length.

6. Spurs

While not a stated objective of CRISP studies, a number of studies have identified routes off the network which, if improved, are expected to increase the accessibility of LCN+ routes from the rest of the cycling network. These have been classified as 'LCN+ spurs' and have been recorded and mapped, by LCN+ PM. Their length is not included in the LCN+ network length.

7. Funding for Night-time alternatives and Spurs

Funding to develop schemes on spurs and night-time alternative routes is not usually provided from the LCN+ budget as the primary objective is to complete delivery of the core daytime network which will be used for the majority of trips.

Exceptions to this for night-time alternatives may be made where the highway authority can demonstrate that the restriction is particularly onerous for large numbers of users.

Boroughs may seek funding for improvements to these routes through the TfL non-LCN+ cycling budget, other non-cycling specific TfL budgets (such as Road Safety (20mph Zones) and Area based Schemes) and other sources such as developer contributions.

**Cycle Programme Team
Cycling Walking and Accessibility
Directorate of Road Network Performance
Transport for London
September 2007**