



Equality Impact Assessment

Cycling on Greenways

For TfL – 23rd November 2007

Equality Works
Shepherdess Walk Buildings
2 Underwood Row
London N1 7LQ
Tel: 020 7251 4939, Fax: 020 7251 4585
Email: info@equalityworks.co.uk
Website: www.equalityworks.co.uk

Contents

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1 | Executive summary | 4 |
| 2 | The brief | 6 |
| 2.1 | Future trends..... | 7 |
| 2.2 | Gaps in knowledge | 7 |
| 2.3 | Existing knowledge..... | 8 |
| 3 | The legal and policy framework | 11 |
| 3.1 | Disability Discrimination Acts | 12 |
| 3.2 | Equality Impact Assessments..... | 12 |
| 3.3 | The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 | 13 |
| 3.4 | Least restrictive access | 13 |
| 3.5 | The Mayor’s commitment to cycling and walking..... | 14 |
| 3.6 | TfL’s Disability Equality Scheme | 14 |
| 4 | Issues arising from CoGIP | 16 |
| 4.1 | Previous consultation | 17 |
| 4.2 | Policy on shared use | 17 |
| 4.3 | Apparent prioritisation of cyclists’ needs | 18 |
| 4.4 | Minimising power differences between users | 20 |
| 5 | Positive impacts and sustainability measures | 21 |
| 6 | Negative impacts and mitigation | 24 |
| 7 | Recommendations | 27 |
| 7.1 | Classification of Greenways routes | 28 |
| 7.2 | Approving and funding Greenways..... | 29 |
| 7.3 | Encourage mutually respectful behaviour..... | 31 |
| 7.4 | Identify how monitoring and review can take place | 32 |
| 7.5 | Consider how to sustain the Reference Group..... | 32 |
| 7.6 | Promote Greenways..... | 33 |
| 8 | Conclusion | 35 |
| Appendix A – COG Ref Group Report | | 37 |
| 1 | Introduction | 37 |
| 2 | An Ideal Greenway..... | 39 |
| 3 | The Concept of Shared Use | 40 |
| 4 | Mutual respect and behaviour | 45 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 5 | Rebalancing the competing demands between cyclists and pedestrians..... | 45 |
| 6 | Design and maintenance of Greenways | 46 |
| 7 | Signage | 47 |
| | Appendix B – Questionnaires..... | 48 |
| | Appendix C – Desk research..... | 50 |

1 Executive summary

Equality Works was commissioned by TfL in (June 2007) to carry out a limited and qualitative equality impact assessment on cycling on Greenways. We focussed on the Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan.*

A key element of the work was the establishment of a Reference Group of disabled and non-disabled people to inform future developments. The Group met 5 times, and gave generously of their time and their energy to discuss their experiences and their differing perspectives on sharing Greenways.

The report describes their deliberations, which are integrated into the report, but also summarised separately in an Appendix. The report also outlines the current state of our knowledge, and the legal and policy frameworks. It explores some of the issues arising from CoGIP.

The heart of the document is the analysis of positive and negative impacts. Section 5 deals with positive impacts, and considers ways of sustaining them. Section 6 deals with negative impacts and looks at measures that will mitigate them. Section 7 lists the recommendations arising from assessing these impacts, and the thinking involved in discussing them. The recommendations highlight consultation, a developing classification system for Greenways, and enhancing the Green CRISP process, so that equalities is embedded within it.

We conclude that the positive benefits of Greenways outweigh the negative impacts, and that TfL has complied with its public duty to promote disability equality. But it is important to recognise that shared use Greenways represent a negative impact for some disabled people. Further work in interpreting the law, particularly in relation to proportionality, is recommended.

* All references in this report to CoGIP are to the 30 01 07 version.

2 The brief

“I have a disability, ASD (Autistic Spectrum Disorder). It is often not recognised as a disability, but it means that I’m uncomfortable with driving, or using buses and the tube, so cycling facilities are very important.”

Equality Works were invited by TfL to assist with a detailed and qualitative equalities impact assessment of the implementation of Cycling on Greenways.

This was a focused consultation activity, arising from the initial screening which (correctly in our view) identified that the main potential for adverse impact in the Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan (CoGIP) (1) relates to disabled people and others with mobility impairments, e.g. the very young and their carers, and older people.

A key element in the brief was to establish a Reference Group of disabled and non-disabled people whose views and experiences would inform implementation and future policy.

We started from the position that the Mayor, the GLA and TfL are all committed to cycling and walking as sustainable and socially inclusive modes of transport. We also know that most cyclists and most pedestrians behave well, and share space and other resources in a civilised fashion.

The CoGIP was the focus of our EqIA, and this document obviously has an emphasis on cycling; it is the responsibility of the CoG Forum, and of the Cycling Centre of Excellence, to promote and encourage cycling in London.

2.1 Future trends

According to one recent report (2), it is predicted that over the next 30 years:

- The proportion of the population over 65 will increase by 40%;
- The number of people aged over 65 will double;
- The proportion over 80 will increase by 100% and the number will treble;
- Over the same period the overall population will increase by less than 7%.

The growing disabled and older population will have social as well as economic implications, and those responsible for the provision of transport systems and built environments will need to recognise and address the need for more inclusive environments.

2.2 Gaps in knowledge

Although there is a substantial body of research in relation to disabled people and access to built and natural environments generally, we have been able to find very little work on the views of particular groups of the population about the risk of using Greenways, or the perception of risk and how it could be mitigated. We conducted a brief literature search,

constrained of course by the time available; and made indicative use documents that were written for different purposes.

The review of CRISPs (3) pointed out that a significant benefit of the CRISP process will be the audit trail on consultation and involvement.

We have found with other projects that quite a volume of consultation, both formal and informal, has happened, but it is lost or overlooked if it is not recorded and logged. This may be a particularly important point when smaller minorities (such as disabled cyclists; older people using Greenways; etc) are being sought, as their cumulative effect will be more powerful than relatively infrequent consultation activities.

2.3 Existing knowledge

As pointed out above, there is not as much recorded evidence as we would like to include here, and the work of the Reference Group is especially useful as a result. The main findings to date are summarised below. The research which already exists points to the key issues for disabled people and other vulnerable users: the potential for conflict with cyclists and other users. We highlight here issues which seem most important: a full list of documents consulted is in Appendix D.

2.3.1 The Greenways Handbook (4)

- Un-segregated shared use routes do not cater for blind and partially sighted people
- Different groups of users prefer separate routes, although they can be encouraged to share routes when necessary.

The handbook considers blind and partially sighted people, wheelchair users, those with pushchairs, and older people, but has almost no reference to other groups of disabled or vulnerable people (e.g. people with learning disabilities or those with mental health issues). Members of these two groups might benefit tremendously from those Greenways which are tranquil safe places for enjoying the open air. They might not benefit from Greenways which have the potential for stressful contact with other users, or where signage and information is not adequate.

2.3.2 Cyclists & Pedestrians – attitudes to shared use facilities

The research undertaken by the Cyclist Touring Club in 2000 (5) indicates that the effect of shared use was to increase levels of use, but not proportionately:

“...increase levels of cycling significantly, and to a lesser extent had increased walking. There was a problem identified of insufficient

guidance on how to use the routes and share space safely. More sections of the community expressed concerns about the safety of shared use facilities, and where possible on-road cycling facilities were preferred."

Disabled people and the National Cycle Network (6) points to a "huge increase" in use by walkers and wheelchair users of upgraded routes. Sustrans acknowledges here the fears of disabled people concerning shared use, and recommends early consultation, good design and publicity and education. They also recognise that visually impaired people need some form of segregation to make them feel safe, and recommend "complete segregation of pedestrians and cyclists by means of a dedicated cycle track or a level difference" in urban areas where the level of use is high.

2.3.3 Groups representing disabled or vulnerable people – Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (7)

The research carried out indicated:

Cycling on footpaths and footways is a major problem, along with poor path surfaces, obstructions, poor location and design of street furniture, lack of safe road crossings, lack of tactile paving, overhanging vegetation and litter.

96% of visually impaired people think it essential or desirable to have no shared pavements.

The report presents many technical recommendations about how to make the environment safer for visually impaired people.

Inclusive design for getting outdoors (8)

I'DGO is a large-scale study undertaken to research the quality of life for older people and their access to the outdoors. In a recent survey the study found that:

- Only half of the people surveyed felt safe from cyclists, skateboarders and roller skaters.
- Two thirds of their participants prefer not to share routes with cyclists.
- Good guidelines exist, but are not always understood or followed.

Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (9)

GDBA did some research on visually impaired people in town centres with shared surfaces (using focus groups all over the UK, including London (Seven Dials)) showing that many avoid areas with shared surfaces.

Obviously town centres are not at all the same as Greenways but the conclusions would lead us to take careful account of visually impaired people when shared use is being considered. The key areas are:

- Safety
- Reduced confidence and increased anxiety
- Avoiding areas of shared use, thus losing choice and independence
- Inadequate consultation

Another planet: Disabled and Deaf Londoners and discrimination (10)

The interim results of the GLA's Disability Capital 2003 survey revealed a high level of verbal and physical abuse of disabled and Deaf people in public spaces.

Safety and freedom from harassment are therefore paramount issues for disabled and Deaf people. Pressure on scarce resources only increases the likelihood of exposure to discrimination.

3 The legal and policy framework

Disabled people have historically been excluded from equal use and enjoyment of the built and natural environments. The changing legislative and policy context over the last 12 years has started to reverse this trend.

3.1 Disability Discrimination Acts

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (11) makes it unlawful to discriminate against anyone on the grounds of his or her disability in connection with employment, public transport, education and the provision of goods and services. Parts II and III of the DDA 1995 apply to service providers' premises, a term that includes land. As explained in *By all reasonable means* the DDA 1995 covers the whole range of countryside services including guided walks, events, visitor centres, information, interpretation, signage, paths and trails and so on. The Act also covers everyone involved in providing a service to the public, including volunteers. The DDA 2005 covers all functions of public bodies, not just services, and therefore includes the provision of public footpaths and other rights of way.

The Disability Discrimination Act 2005 (12) was passed in April 2005 and amended the existing DDA. It brings significant changes. For example, it requires public bodies to positively promote disability equality and to have Disability Equality Schemes (DES) in place by December 2006.

3.2 Equality Impact Assessments

A public authority must include in its DES a statement of its method for assessing the likely impact of its proposed policies and practices on equality for disabled people.

The Code of Practice (13) that accompanies the DDA explains that:

“Impact assessment is not an end in itself but is merely the process which an authority will go through in order to identify and act on the need to modify policies and practices to have better regard to the need to promote disability equality”

Key factors in the Disability Equality Duty are relevance and proportionality. Some suggested criteria for assessing proportionality are:

- The number of people affected
- The nature of the general impact on people
- The scale and cost

Proportionality has been particularly difficult in this EqIA because we do not yet have very clear ideas on the numbers of people affected; or on the scale and cost of some of the key issues, such as:

- The proportion of Greenways that will involve shared or segregated use;
- The proportion of Greenways that will be used by speedy commuting cyclists and/or by vulnerable groups of pedestrians;

- The proportion of Greenways that are at all accessible to wheelchair users

We understand that many of these issues will be dealt with at a local level, where feasibility studies will be carried out in order to gain funding and approval for Greenways. The principles of relevance and proportionality will indeed be local in some cases, for example if Greenways pass near particular facilities such as special schools, places of worship, already accessible routes and venues. Any feasibility studies would be strengthened if they incorporated the issues that are likely to be important when an EqIA is later required.

3.3 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

In November 2000, Parliament passed the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) (14). This legislation improves public rights of way in England and Wales and creates a new statutory right of access on foot to mountain, moor, heath, downland and registered common land. It covers about 1.5 million hectares, 10% of land in England and Wales. CROW gives new powers, duties and responsibilities to highways authorities and others involved in countryside access management.

Under Section 69, highway authorities must consider the needs of disabled people when authorizing the erection of stiles and gates or other works on footpaths or bridleways. An authority may also enter into agreements with owners, occupiers or lessees of land to improve stiles, gates or other structures to benefit disabled people.

3.4 Least restrictive access

There is a principle of Least Restrictive Access (LRA) which is explained and used in a document called *By all reasonable means* (15). This principle requires that all work, whether planned improvement or ad hoc maintenance, must meet the highest possible access standards for that piece of work.

Where the highest access standards cannot be achieved – for example, because of insufficient funds, lack of consent by a landowner or practical difficulties – there should always be a clearly reasoned and documented justification for the decision to use a lower standard. LRA is an approach that helps raise the overall standard of access of a site, route or facility over a period of time. It complements the management zoning approach and ensures that within a particular zone there is the opportunity to aim for higher standards of access. It will also contribute to the decisions about relevance and proportionality.

3.5 The Mayor's commitment to cycling and walking

The Mayor, the GLA and TfL are all committed to cycling and walking as sustainable and socially inclusive modes of transport.

Most cyclists and most pedestrians behave well and share space and other resources in a civilised fashion.

The benefits of Greenways are well described in CoGIP (see Section 2). We recognise that all Londoners will benefit from Greenways because they will help to reduce congestion and pollution, and encourage fitness and well being. From the point of view of this EqIA the important beneficiaries are people who might otherwise be excluded or discouraged from enjoying open space in London: pedestrians, particularly those who benefit from being off road (parents/carers with young children, frail people, some people with learning disabilities); beginning cyclists; disabled cyclists; wheelchair users.

3.6 TfL's Disability Equality Scheme

(16) TfL's Disability Equality Scheme is the place where the Authority spells out its commitment to disabled people.

In September 2003, as part of the best value review 'Equalities for All' (17), the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the GLA group adopted the social model of disability.

The social model of disability means that TfL accepts that:

- It is society's response to a person's impairment or learning difficulties that creates disability;
- Discrimination against disabled people is just as oppressive as discrimination against other groups such as women, Lesbian, Gay men, Bi-sexual and Transgendered people or people from black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) groups.

TfL will therefore, focus on identifying and removing barriers that disabled people face when trying to access the transport system. To do that TfL needs to understand what prevents people from accessing the transport system on an equal basis.

TfL is committed to becoming the world's leading transport authority, delivering safe, reliable and integrated transport for all those who live in, work in, or visit London.

This is underpinned by TfL's commitment to:

- Promote equality of opportunity;
- Promote good relations between different groups/communities;

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination;
- Provide accessible transport for all.

One of the important aspects of a Disability Equality Scheme is that disabled people should be involved in its development, monitoring and review.

In developing its first Disability Equality Scheme, TfL has involved disabled people across London and the process has been supported by disabled consultants who live and work in London.

A number of different techniques have been used to get disabled people's views. These ranged from a public 'paper' consultation, to a conference, face-to-face meetings with disabled people and their organisations, and a Citizens' Jury.

This is the context into which this and other EqIAs fit – it is essential to consult and involve disabled people in the development of access schemes of all kinds.

4 Issues arising from CoGIP

“We all need to share the Greenways and I wish cyclists and people with dogs to be able to use the Greenways, but we all need to consider each other and take responsibility for the upkeep of these assets.”

We have used this section to highlight key issues arising from the existing version of the plan:

- The need for ongoing consultation
- Clarifying the policy of shared use, segregated use and adjacent use
- Apparent prioritisation of cyclists' needs
- The need to recognise different power positions of Greenways users

4.1 Previous consultation

There has been widespread consultation on cycling on Greenways, most particularly via the CoG Forum, and much of this is included in CoGIP (see for example, 2.8, 2.13, 2.15). As far as we can see no specific consultation or engagement has been undertaken until now with disabled people, and this is of course required by the DDA, which is the main reason for setting up the Reference Group. It is important to recognise, as TfL does, that traditional methods of consultation will not necessarily yield representative participation from groups who have historically been excluded. This means that some outcomes, for instance un-segregated shared use, are adopted because the consultation was perhaps not inclusive enough.

The initial screening for EqIA did not identify equality target groups, as CoGIP was thought to have a low impact, except on disabled people. Accordingly our EqIA has concentrated on issues to do with disabled people.

However, consultations carried out in other contexts help to draw attention to the needs of other potential users: all equality groups share a fear of crime and conflict, so personal safety – enhanced by lighting, signage, clear information, high volumes of usage, maintenance, enforcement measures – is very important in planning Greenways.

4.2 Policy on shared use

The overall policy position seems to be that shared use should be a **last resort** – to be used when all other possibilities for a particular route have been exhausted; but a better alternative than not using the route at all.

The Greenways Handbook (4)

The Handbook points out that shared use is a barrier for some and should be avoided wherever possible (Greenways Handbook Section 2, p 22). It should be adopted only when all other measures have been exhausted:

Because it is not the users' preferred option and there are genuine concerns for blind/partially sighted people the introduction of shared-use paths should be as a last resort and over short distances, where there is no other option and where it is seen as a high priority in the network. (Greenways Handbook, Section 3, p 14)

Later the document presents a hierarchy of solutions to be considered before shared use (Section 3, page 14).

Local Transport Note 2/04 (18)

A similar point is made in LTN 2/04: before considering the introduction of shared use or adjacent use along an existing pedestrian route, all possibilities must be explored for improving conditions for cyclists within the carriageway.

CoGIP

Section 1.13 states that adjacent use, or segregated shared use, is preferred. Section 2 makes clear that Greenways will be available and accessible to all users, and that the needs of vulnerable groups will always be taken into account.

However, we suggest that this position is undermined in CoGIP by repeated references to shared use, rather than distinguishing adjacent use or segregated use.

4.3 Apparent prioritisation of cyclists' needs

In the report, the needs of cyclists are usually highlighted even where other users' needs are as great or greater. For example:

4.3.1 CoGIP 8.26

The presence of steps can be a barrier to cyclists, pushchair and wheelchair users, for example where a road bridge over a canal is connected to the towpath via a flight of stairs, making it difficult to join the towpath. London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) (19) paragraph 2.4.10 illustrates possible solutions using a channel or narrow ramp alongside the steps. Some designs are also suitable for folded pushchairs.

What is missing from this paragraph is an explicit recognition that these solutions do not help wheelchair users, who are thereby rendered "invisible".

Another example:

4.3.2 CoGIP 8.28

During summer months it will be necessary to keep verges mown, to prevent growth spreading on to the main path of the Greenway. This is particularly important where brambles or nettles are likely to grow, as these can present a hazard to cyclists wearing shorts, including children. Obstructions in the verge that could interrupt mechanical mowers should be avoided.

The hazard presented by brambles and nettles to cyclists wearing shorts is far less than their potential impact on blind and visually impaired people, who will be less able to take evasive action, even after the damage has been done. Wheelchair users will also have problems if paths are overgrown.

A further vivid illustration of the priority afforded to the cyclist perspective is the Conclusion: see for instance **11.6** and **11.8**.

4.3.3 CoGIP 11.6

Criteria for the selection of routes for shared-use Greenways have been established. These include whether the route forms part of a strategic long distance route, and whether the route meets the objective of having all areas of London within easy cycling distance of a shared-use Greenway. Other considerations are known high existing demand, value for money, land acquisition and legal status issues, and whether the link will contribute to other objectives such as providing a possible route to the Olympics.

The criteria selected for inclusion here do not include any references to disabled people, or to pedestrians of any kind.

4.3.4 CoGIP 11.8

The design of shared-use Greenways will follow the criteria set out in the LCDS published by TfL in 2005. The objective is to provide a width of 3.0m wherever possible for shared use paths, with a minimum of 2.0m, and to remove physical barriers such as gates that interrupt the passage of cyclists. The design is to take account of the particular maintenance requirements likely to arise from the landscaped environment through which Greenways pass.

This paragraph is written entirely from the perspective of cyclists. Barriers such as gates are much more problematic for wheelchair users than they are for cyclists, and should be removed to achieve compliance with the DDA, recognising that cyclists too will benefit from this measure, as they do from ramps and improvements to surfaces.

4.4 Minimising power differences between users

4.4.1 CoGIP 1.17

Lastly the position is weakened by presenting conflicts that may arise between users of Greenways as even-handed, as in this paragraph:

The two key issues for which management strategies will be required on shared-use Greenways are the avoidance of conflict between users, and crime reduction. The former can best be achieved by promoting the use of good manners on the part of both cyclists and pedestrians, and by making it clear what the default procedure should be when users pass each other. The latter will be assisted by greater numbers of passers-by being present as a result of increased use.

4.4.2

In **CoGIP 9.17** there is some acknowledgement of the greater power of cyclists in this arena, and the fact that they need to display respect towards pedestrians.

Nonetheless, cycling on paths that are shared with pedestrians without due care can create conflicts between users. TfL intends to work with key partners and promoters through partnerships and the Cycling on Greenways Forum to explore, develop and share best practice management strategies including crime and conflict reduction. Objective 7.2 of the London Cycling Action Plan (20) set out TfL's intention to develop guidance and awareness campaigns that promote respect towards pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

4.4.3

We suggest that, given the comparatively greater levels of hostility and harassment faced by disabled people in their everyday lives compared with non-disabled people, it is essential to recognise that positive action needs to be taken to secure disabled people's access rights on Greenways.

5 Positive impacts and sustainability measures

“My top priorities for a Greenway are the pleasure of being able to get out of the polluted traffic, the relaxation of being in a rural setting, watching the wildlife and just being de-stressed.”

The positive impact of Greenways is well rehearsed and disproportionately benefits some equality target groups. For instance, people with lower incomes, some disabled people, some frail older people will gain enormously from having accessible and tranquil places for recreation and enjoyment.

However the positive impacts of **shared use** are harder to define.

This table highlights positive impacts, and suggests measures that will help to sustain those impacts over time.

| Positive impact | Measures to ensure sustainability |
|--|---|
| Some disabled people, especially wheelchair users and disabled cyclists, might benefit from Greenways because the access, the surfaces and widths will be more appropriate for them | TfL to integrate into Green CRISP (21) access standards, covering surfaces and widths and other requirements designated by the proposed classification system and safety measures recommended by the Reference Group. |
| Disabled people and other vulnerable users are more likely to use Greenways, even shared use Greenways, if the recommendations of this report are taken into account. | Use and apply guidance. Monitor and audit. Continue to use and develop Green CRISP process. Ensure that publicity and promotional material targets concerns of those who otherwise might not use shared Greenways. |
| The greater participation of disabled people in Greenways could have the benefit of promoting positive attitudes towards disabled people – which is part of the general duty outlined in the DDA. | Continue to involve and engage disabled people in Greenways policy and decisions. |
| TfL’s policy on shared use complies with their public duty to promote good relations between people of different racial groups, women and men, disabled people and non disabled people, thereby supporting social cohesion across equality target groups | Implement measures to promote shared use where feasible and reduce conflict enforced through the Green CRISP process. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>There is a positive impact for TfL in that creating accessible and safe environments contributes to meeting the Disability Equality Duty which applies to TfL and all managing authorities.</p> | <p>TfL's determination to meet its obligations under the DDA builds trust between TfL and disabled people, which is an ongoing task, and will ensure that disabled people use Greenways – conferring benefits on them and all other users.</p> |
| <p>The requirement to carry out this EqIA has afforded TfL the opportunity to consider current and future needs of disabled people and other equality target groups.</p> | <p>TfL CCE to prioritise the needs of vulnerable cyclists and pedestrians into their formal planning processes.</p> |

6 Negative impacts and mitigation

“The worst thing about using Greenways is the potential for conflict with pedestrians – and some other cyclists who assume the right to go too fast and too close to others in a more ambling mood. There’s also some poor visibility at junctions.”

The Reference Group had vigorous discussions and highlighted many negative aspects of shared use, most of which are incorporated into the table below.

The Reference Group also discussed issues such as:

- Volume of use
- Width of Greenways
- Management of demand, now and in the future
- Access standards
- Maintenance
- The potential for regeneration
- Crime monitoring and reduction
- All these issues are discussed further in Appendix A.

| | Negative impact | Mitigation |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Disabled people and other vulnerable groups are frightened by shared use: | They avoid using Greenways. | Promote Greenways as accessible and safe (the more used the better) Use the classification system (see below) |
| Frightened of physical harm. | | Provide and advertise safety measures such as lighting; signage, emergency phones, etc. Reassure people about the behaviour of cyclists (using Code of Conduct as one tool). |
| Frightened of harassment. | They avoid using Greenways. | Actively encourage managing authorities to include safety and enforcement measures in their bids to eliminate or reduce harassment and harm to cyclist and pedestrians. |
| Frightened of finding the Greenway inaccessible during | They avoid using Greenways. | All of the above, plus provide targeted and very specific information |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| their journey. | | about accessibility |
| Beginning cyclists, or cyclists enjoying the protection of their parents and carers, might fear conflict with speeding commuter cyclists. | They avoid using Greenways. | All of the above. |
| Cyclists are irritated by pedestrians, especially the slow ones. | Fewer cyclists use Greenways. | As above. |
| A small % of shared use serves to harm the reputation of Greenways | Fewer people from all groups use Greenways; and disproportionately fewer from disabled groups. | All of the above. |
| More resources will be needed to "manage" shared use properly. | This will be seen as more expensive for managing authorities. | All of the above. Managing authorities will be encouraged to consider cost in relation to the proportionate positive and negative impacts of local schemes. |

7 Recommendations

7.1 Classification of Greenways routes

The Reference Group proposed a classification system which TfL will need to further develop and integrate into its work in conjunction with CoGIP **section 7.10:**

...each route will be given a unique identifier name and, where this is deemed useful, be divided for reference purposes into numbered sections.

There will sometimes be benefit in devising a system of identification for each section, such as start and end street names or perhaps entry and exit points.

The Reference Group highlighted the benefits of TfL producing a London map of Greenway routes incorporating this classification system, to be available, in print and online, so that potential users can decide whether or not they wish to use this route. The information should also cover the accessibility of the route, so that users know what to expect.

The table below outlines an exploration by the Group of the issues that TfL could use to classify Greenway routes A, B, or C, similar to the designation of different road routes. There is no necessary reduction in quality implied by the classification, but differences in issues such as accessibility.

| Classification | Definition | Regulation |
|----------------|---|---|
| A | Defined as high speed and high capacity (likely to be extremely wide, multi use and suitable for all groups with good surfaces. This would include segregation and separate facilities for the different groups. There would be no barriers and enough space for wheelchair users and prams. <i>Examples: The Mall, Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens</i> | Lane segregation by physical means, speed restrictions, Warden controlled, regularly maintained |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| B | Defined as medium speed and capacity (Cyclists may be impeded) Medium width. Medium volume, (max speed to be defined). Likely appropriate signage to indicate classification, monitoring warden/CCTV regularly maintained to be used by leisure users. <i>Example: Paths in parks</i> | |
| C | Defined as low speed and low capacity. (likely to be narrow in width), not good surfaces and cyclists may be required to dismount. Suitable for walkers. No skaters allowed. Short lines of sight. Less than 100 users an hour <i>Examples: Canal tow paths, river banks, alleyways</i> | Speed calming measures (gates, slow surfaces, measures to make cyclists dismount, but NOT to deter path users on foot or in wheelchairs |

7.2 Approving and funding Greenways

The Reference Group made the following recommendations in relation to funding Greenways. These ensure that consideration of disabled people's needs is built in from the start, as required by the DDA.

7.2.1 Evaluate volume of use

It will be helpful to ensure that an evaluation of the volume of existing or potential cyclists and pedestrians using the Greenway is carried out for each application for funding. This should be set against the width of the route and the type and characteristics of the Greenway e.g. whether the route is a commuting route or a leisure Greenway. This information will help greatly in decisions regarding relevance and proportionality.

7.2.2 Identify how to manage demand

The existing system of approving a Greenway route will need to consider the management of demand in terms of current and future levels of cycling and walking on route, in the words of the Reference Group,

“through soft engineering” (education, promotion campaigns, bye-laws and codes of practice) and “hard engineering” (physical restriction or barriers that make it difficult or impossible to cycle or reduces the speed of cyclists) where cycling is incompatible with or poses a danger to pedestrians or other modes of transport.

7.2.3 Ensure access standards are met

“I think shared surfaces are too dangerous for many disabled people, but especially for people with visual impairments. Disabled people are effectively excluded from areas where shared surfaces are implemented.”

The Greenway route must meet existing access standards in terms of the width, quality of service and enabling disabled people with physical and sensory impairments, people with learning difficulties and mental ill health to benefit equally. All guidance on standards, covering signage, surfaces, widths, lighting, obstacles, etc, should routinely refer to accessibility.

It would be sensible to remind managing authorities of the possibility of taking positive action to ensure access for disabled people, particularly when new building work is being undertaken.

A balance must be struck between the needs of a blind pedestrian who might need way-finding indicators and tactile services and those of wheel chair users who may require wider and smoother surfaces, unimpeded by tactile indicators.

The Reference Group would prioritise step free access to Greenways, to meet the legal requirement under part 3 of the DDA 1995 coupled with the right to roam enshrined in law.

7.2.4 Monitor crime and conflict levels

“I come back from work and the path is dark. I believe there are plans to light it and open late (by 2012) but I think there should also be community patrols on at least to start with, because as a woman on my own I would feel nervous if it were deserted, even when lit.”

TfL would be able to require managing authorities to incorporate as part of their application for funding, a review of the levels of crime and conflict present along the Greenway route analysed by race, gender and disability.

7.2.5 Plan for future demand

Planning needs to take into account the future change in the demographic profile of users of Greenways and the characteristics of Greenway routes as part of ensuring managing authorities cater for both the existing context and future requirements.

7.2.6 Green CRISP

We recommend that TfL examines the evolving Green CRISP process to see if it is possible to use it to incorporate the demands of the EqIA process – for example;

- By making it clear that consultation and engagement with disabled people are mandatory;
- By illustrating the positive and negative impacts that have been identified relating to Greenways, to help people think through their local issues;
- By suggesting measures that can be taken at local level to mitigate any negative impacts identified;
- By promoting good practice from other parts of the Greenways network, e.g. on signage, safety measures, as well as more obvious access measures;
- By providing a common framework for monitoring Greenways;
- By requiring local data that contributes to the assessment of relevance and proportionality.

We further recommend developing an equalities checklist that would form an integral part of the Green CRISP process.

7.3 Encourage mutually respectful behaviour

Based on the research by the Cycling Touring Club (5) that shared use tends to increase numbers of cyclists rather than walkers, and to balance the potential negative impacts of this, TfL should continue to promote and fund schemes and projects that educate and train people new to cycling such as the “BikeAbility” nationally accredited standard delivered in Schools. Greenways are actually used in these projects by the novice cyclists.

It may be necessary to explore other safety measures such as encouraging cyclists to:

- Wear helmets;
- Wear safety equipment;
- Have some form of identification on their bicycle;
- Take a cycling proficiency test;
- Comply with a code of practice.

The Reference Group urged that TfL avoid compulsion around these issues as they felt that personal safety is a matter of personal choice.

There are several existing codes aimed at cyclists and pedestrians (see for example, Sustrans (22)) and we suggest that TfL promotes and then uses the most suitable of these, after consultation with disabled people and other potential users of Greenways.

This recommendation would contribute to the public duty to eliminate harassment.

7.4 Identify how monitoring and review can take place

In order to continue to identify the impact of shared use, adjacent use, and segregated use Greenways, it will be important to benchmark existing and anticipated volume of users, and to assess the quality of their experience when using Greenways.

This may be what is anticipated in *Appendix B, Framework for Outcome Monitoring*, which was not available at the time of this review.

We recommend that the framework provides some specific guidance and suggestions to help gather consistent, full and relevant data from each of the managing agents. For example, provide information on how to conduct 'mystery shopping' evaluation; how to gather monitoring data from users; etc. In the case of Greenways it may be useful to have information about different types of disability, as the access, information and signage needs of different groups are different. Consultation with disabled people will be needed to support this view.

This recommendation is part of the requirement placed on TfL to meet the public duties – in race, disability and gender equality.

7.5 Consider how to sustain the Reference Group

The establishment of the Reference Group by Equality Works was an important part of the project, and took considerable work. Group members have contributed generously of their time and energy. We would recommend that TfL considers how the group might be sustained, with a very clear remit, as a future resource to assist with consultation and scrutiny. It may be helpful to build into the process an automatic change in the membership over time as part of its terms of reference.

7.5.1 Re-balance the CoGIP to reflect the needs of pedestrians as well as cyclists

We started from the assumption that cycling and walking should be promoted and encouraged as sustainable and socially inclusive modes of transport; and that both groups behave well and share resources well for most of the time. Nevertheless we feel that CoGIP does not always take

proper account of disabled and other pedestrian users of Greenways. We therefore recommend re-balancing the needs of these various groups, and reflecting that in the work of the CoG Forum and the other parties involved in Greenways. There are a variety of ways of doing this, and some suggestions are given below.

7.5.2 Ensure pedestrian /disabled peoples' representation on the CoG Forum

To ensure a balance between needs of cyclists and pedestrians, and non-disabled and disabled users of Greenways, we recommend that pedestrians and disability group representatives should be part of the CoG Forum.

7.6 Promote Greenways

We recommend that TfL continue to promote Greenways to all groups as accessible, tranquil, enjoyable places.

7.6.1 Promote safety on Greenways

As many groups of potential users are fearful, either of physical harm, or of conflict with other users, it is important to promote the safety of Greenways in as many ways as possible. The following all have a contribution to make:

- Signage (including signage that uses a variety of media, and takes into account the needs of those with learning disability for consistency- see guidance from DCLG (23) and the EHRC (DRC) (24, 25).
- Up to date and accurate information about Greenways (in conjunction with the classification system) – maps; accessibility; shared use; length of sections; points of interest / rest / refreshment / facilities along the way
- Lighting
- Help points
- Enforcement measures, such as policing on cycles; informal surveillance (by analogy with Neighbourhood Watch)

7.6.2 A simplified CoGIP

Produce a simplified version of the CoGIP, which can be used as a communications and promotional tool.

7.6.3 Clubs

Use clubs and other informal surveillance methods to encourage and promote greater usage, especially by vulnerable groups (e.g. there is a Mencap Cycling Club, and a cycling club called Brakethru for people with learning disabilities). There is a possible connection with school walking routes, and with other networks of friends and neighbours and voluntary groups.

7.6.4 Parallel work streams

It will be very helpful to create synergy with parallel work streams.

8 Conclusion

“My priority would be to educate users on the needs and mindsets of other users. Cyclists must think Pedestrian, and pedestrians must think Cyclist.”

Greenways are an excellent resource for the people of London, and should be promoted to all possible users.

We believe that the positive impacts of Greenways outweigh the negative impact of shared use, but it is very important to record that shared use of Greenways, where there are not segregated areas for cyclists and other users, represents a negative impact for some disabled people, and TfL will want to do everything it can to mitigate this.

TfL has complied with the DED in the following ways:

- Shared use is one expression of social cohesion, and makes a contribution to the duty to promote good relations between groups of people;
- Consultation with disabled people is a major feature of the Green CRISP process;
- The current and future needs of disabled people have been taken into account, in particular via the access design standards;
- Safety and enforcement measures, including the promotion of good behaviour, are part and parcel of TfL's procedures, and contribute to the duty to eliminate harassment.

We believe that TfL has the commitment, the authority and the resources to make Greenways popular with all groups of users, particularly if the recommendations in this report are implemented.

It has been difficult to reach firm conclusions about relevance and proportionality – key to the Disability Equality Duty - because the scale and cost of the measures needed to make Greenways accessible and safe for all to use, are not yet finally decided. CoGIP will need to return to this issue of proportionality, as will TfL. It is possible that a specific piece of research should be commissioned to consider the issues of proportionality in relation to Greenways across London, and to the way those issues play themselves out at a local level. We recommend that guidelines are issued to those involved in Greenways to make sure that their schemes take proportionality into account.

Appendix A – COG Ref Group Report

1 Introduction

This report collates the views and opinions of the Reference Group members established as part of an equality impact assessment required by Transport for London on the Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan.

Equality Works has been commissioned to facilitate and support the process of conducting an equality impact assessment and this report interprets, as far as possible, the aggregated views and opinions of five Reference Group meetings.

Method

5 Reference Group meetings were held between September and November 2007 at Parnell House, 25 Wilton Road, London SW1.

The duration of each focus group was 3.5 hours excluding lunch.

The composition of the Reference Group was as follows:

Cycling on Greenways Reference Group Statistics

| Gender Statistics | | numbers | percentages |
|-------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|
| Men | | 8 | 47% |
| Women | | 9 | 53% |
| Total in the reference Group | | 17 | |
| Ethnicity Statistics | | | |
| BME | | 2 | 12% |
| White | | 15 | 88% |
| Total in the reference Group | | 17 | |
| Age Statistics | | | |
| Age Range | 36-45 | 2 | 12% |
| | 46-55 | 4 | 24% |
| | 56-65 | 3 | 18% |
| | Over 65 | 8 | 47% |
| Total in the reference Group | | 17 | |
| Disability Statistics | | | |
| Disabled | | 8 | 47% |
| Non-disabled | | 9 | 53% |
| Total in the reference Group | | 17 | |
| Greenway Usage Statistics | | | |
| Cyclist only | | 6 | 35% |
| Pedestrian only | | 6 | 35% |
| Both | | 5 | 29% |
| Total in the reference Group | | 17 | |

Each session was designed to highlight a particular area of the CoGIP document and we focused on helping the cyclists and the pedestrians in the room to see each others' points of view and to challenge themselves in relation to the Greenway concept.

The needs of the Reference Group participants in terms of ensuring that the process was accessible were addressed through commissioning a sign language interpreter for one participant with a hearing impairment, producing information in Braille and supporting one participant with a visual impairment and sending information in advance by email or post so that participants could prepare for the Reference Group meeting.

Plain English was constantly used, and efforts were made to be clear and concise, giving participants enough time to work through the complexity of the questions and document their findings on flip chart/A4 paper to be collected by the consultants.

This culminated in the Reference Group report set out in appendix A of this report.

2 An Ideal Greenway

2.1 Benefits for all

The Reference Group explored the positive benefits of different Greenway routes that they had personal experience of using and the group was able to identify some key features of Greenways that would present positive benefits to some users and could therefore be considered by TfL when designing and approving Greenway proposals.

The Countryside Agency defines Greenways as *“A network of largely off-highway routes connecting people to facilities and open spaces in and around towns, cities and the countryside. They are for shared use by people of all abilities on foot, bike or horseback, for commuting, play or leisure. Greenways link to other networks for non-motorised users – such as the National Cycle Network, towpaths beside the inland waterways, National Trails and other rights of way. Greenways can also link stretches of ‘quiet’ minor roads”*

2.2 Ideal features

These benefits centre on Greenways incorporating trees, ponds and a rural and tranquil environment providing Londoners with the opportunity to have contact with nature. In the words of the Reference Group “the countryside in London.” Ideal Greenways incorporate particular features such as clear signage, pleasant walking experience, well maintained paths, facilities for sitting and relaxing along the route such as benches, well used by a wide range of cyclists and pedestrians. In addition, wide Greenway paths allow access for both cyclists and pedestrians provided that there are rules regulating behaviour for users of Greenways including rules for dog owners to keep dogs under control, and volumes of users are maintained at acceptable levels. It may be necessary to integrate CCTV facilities as part of a Greenway scheme to complement any enforcement measures planned by the managing authority such as wardens or Community Support Officers. The group emphasised that there should be a clear link between the width of the Greenway route and the designation and volume of the users, either pedestrian or cyclist or both.

2.3 Specific benefits

The group emphasised that Greenways provide freedom from motor traffic and a sense of peace and a place where there is an opportunity for some pedestrians to walk their dog, particularly important for people with guide or working dogs. This will also provide an opportunity for people with motorised wheelchairs.

2.4 Negative aspects

The Reference Group also identified negative aspects of Greenways routes and this presented significant disagreements, particularly between group members who were oriented towards either cyclists or pedestrians. However, the negative aspects that were agreed, centred around the narrowness of the Greenway paths, with poorly designed paths being too narrow and having poorly maintained surfaces, lack of signage, suitable lighting and no restriction on the speed of cyclists that may present a danger to pedestrians. Some Greenways also lacked environmentally friendly amenities, e.g. dog bins, litterbins, benches and toilet facilities.

2.5 Specific Issues

Particular concern was discussed in which vulnerable and disabled pedestrians would be at additional risk since they would not be able to see the cyclists approaching if they were blind or visually impaired, or hear the cyclists approaching from behind if they had a hearing impairment.

In a limited number of Greenway sites this risk would also impact upon children both as cyclists and pedestrians. In addition high speed cycling would be intimidating for people who are less confident as cyclists.

3 The Concept of Shared Use

3.1 The concept

The Reference Group explored in detail the concept of 'shared use'. The Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan at a number of places puts forward the argument for shared use on Greenways whilst acknowledging that the concept can create conflict between pedestrian and cyclist.

3.2 Adjacent use

In section 1.13 the Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan states

"...Where sufficient space is available, properly designed adjacent use is preferred over shared use, i.e. with pedestrians segregated from cyclists either by lining, different surface texture or by landscaped strip. Provided that a pair of adjacent paths are properly designed, the perception of collision risk will be lower than for a shared use path, particularly for more vulnerable users".

This will also improve the quality and functionality of the path. The risk of segregating pedestrians and cyclists is that neither party would be encouraged to consider the other's needs and therefore take personal responsibility to regulate their own behaviour. There are also limitations in

how segregated use either in favour of pedestrians or cyclists can be applied to Greenway routes.

3.3 Changing emphasis

Although the Reference Group accept that shared use might be a consideration in developing Greenway routes the emphasis should be on adjacent or segregated routes in the majority of cases, with shared use and full integration between cyclist and pedestrians being adopted only as a last resort where there is no opportunity for adjacent or segregated routes, and provided that a higher design standard is implemented coupled with regulation to maintain safety, security and mutual respect.

3.4 Funding Greenways

The Reference Group generated suggestions as to how the TfL Cycling Centre of Excellence could better select and approve Greenway routes based on criteria the Reference Group believes would be more compatible with the practicalities of achieving shared use.

The Reference Group would urge TfL to ensure that a detailed evaluation of the volume of existing or potential cyclists and pedestrians using the Greenway is carried out for each application for funding. This should be set against the width of the route and the type and characteristics of the Greenway e.g. whether the route is a commuting route or a leisure Greenway.

The existing system of approving a Greenway route will need to consider the management of demand in terms of current and future levels of cycling and walking on route, in the words of the Reference Group, "...through soft engineering" (education, promotion campaigns, bye-laws and codes of practice) and "hard engineering" (physical restriction or barriers that make it difficult or impossible to cycle or reduce the speed of cyclists) where cycling is incompatible with or poses a danger to pedestrians or other modes of transport.

The Greenway route must meet existing access standards in terms of the width, quality of service and enabling disabled people with physical and sensory impairments, people with learning difficulties and mental ill health to benefit equally from the Greenway route. A balance must be struck between the needs of a blind pedestrian who might need way-finding indicators and tactile services and those of wheel-chair users who may require wider and smoother surfaces, unimpeded by tactile indicators. The Reference Group would prioritise step-free access to Greenways, to meet the legal requirement under part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 coupled with the right to roam enshrined in law.

The approval of Greenway routes should also place a heavy emphasis on social, economic and environmental regeneration ensuring that the managing authorities submit proposals that achieve a net improvement in the facilities available to the general public.

It is essential that TfL also require managing authorities to incorporate, as part of their application for funding, a review of the levels of crime present along the Greenway route analysed by race, gender and disability.

The Reference Group felt that TfL should take into account the future change in the demographic profile of users of Greenways and the characteristics of Greenway routes as part of ensuring managing authorities cater for both the existing context and future requirements.

3.5 Classification of Greenway

The Reference Group proposed a classification system which TfL may wish to further develop and integrate into its work in conjunction with section 7.10 in the Cycling on Greenway Implementation Plan

“...each route will be given a unique identifier name and, where this is deemed useful, be divided for reference purposes into numbered sections.

There will sometimes be benefit in devising a system of identification for each section, such as start and end street names or perhaps entry and exit points.”

The Reference Group highlighted the benefits of TfL producing a London map of Greenway routes incorporating this classification system available online.

The table below illustrates how TfL could classify Greenway routes A, B, or C, similar to the designation of different road routes.

| Classification | Definition | Regulation |
|----------------|--|--|
| A | <p>Defined as high speed and high capacity (likely to be extremely wide, multi use and suitable for all groups with good surfaces. This would include segregation and separate facilities for the different groups. There would be no barriers and enough space for wheelchair users and prams.</p> <p><i>Examples: The Mall, Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens</i></p> | <p>Lane segregation by physical means, speed restrictions, Warden controlled, regularly maintained</p> |
| B | <p>Defined as medium speed and capacity (Cyclists may be impeded) Medium width. Medium volume, (max speed to be defined). Likely to be used by leisure users.</p> <p><i>Example: Paths in parks</i></p> | <p>Appropriate signage to indicate classification, monitoring warden/CCTV regularly maintained</p> |
| C | <p>Defined as low speed and low capacity. (likely to be narrow in width), not good surfaces and cyclists may be required to dismount. Suitable for walkers. No skaters allowed. Short lines of sight. Less than 100 users an hour</p> <p><i>Examples: Canal tow paths, river banks, alleyways</i></p> | <p>Speed calming measures (gates, slow surfaces, measures to make cyclists dismount, but NOT to deter path users on foot or in wheelchairs</p> |

3.6 Conflict over shared use

The Reference Group ran into heated discussions and at times conflict regarding the concept of shared use. If shared use is applied uniformly to all Greenways it represents the potential for conflict between e.g. older people as pedestrians and younger people as cyclists, or between disabled people as pedestrians and able-bodied people as cyclists. The Reference Group believed this concept could not be applied uniformly in this way, as it would be incompatible with the Greenways concept as defined by the Countryside Agency.

The Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan accepts that the two key issues for which:

“...management strategies will be required on shared-use Greenways are the avoidance of conflict between users and crime reduction. The former can best be achieved by promoting the use of good manners on the part of both cyclists and pedestrians, and by making it clear what the default procedure should be when users pass each other. The latter will be assisted by greater numbers of passers-by being present as a result of increased use. In the past there have sometimes been concerns about mixing cyclists and pedestrians on paths through green areas such as parks and on towpaths. However experience has shown that with properly designed facilities, the two modes can comfortably co-exist and that the incidence of collisions is minimal.”

3.7 Diverse needs

The Reference Group explored the diverse needs of all users including mothers and children, dog walkers and animals; however, for the purposes of exploring the main impact, the group looked at the needs of five groups of potential users of Greenways to illustrate both where the conflicts might arise and the possible solutions that could be identified and incorporated into the Cycling On Greenways Implementation Plan. These five groups are:

- Disabled people as pedestrians
- Older people as pedestrians
- Disabled people as cyclists
- Older people as cyclists
- People with children and caring responsibilities

3.8 Auditing and enforcement

The Reference Group highlighted the need to ensure that all Greenways are audited so that Greenway routes incorporate good standards of lighting and signage with consideration being given to some form of enforcement measures, although the group did not agree on what form this would take, such as wardens or CCTV.

If auditing and enforcement is to be effective the approval and funding processes should include the requirement that managing authorities maintain Greenway routes to acceptable standards and where appropriate fund regular audits, enforcement measures and safety features.

4 Mutual respect and behaviour

4.1 Guidance

The research undertaken by the Cyclist Touring Club 2000 indicates that the effect of shared use was to

“...increase levels of cycling significantly, and to a lesser extent had increased walking. There was a problem identified of insufficient guidance on how to use the routes and share space safely. More sections of the community expressed concerns about the safety of shared use facilities, and where possible on-road cycling facilities were preferred.”

The Reference Group proposed that as part of the Cycling On Greenways Implementation Plan, TfL to promote and fund schemes and projects that educate and train people new to cycling such as the “BikeAbility” nationally accredited standard delivered in Schools. Greenways are actually used in these projects by the novice cyclists.

It may be necessary to explore other safety measures such as encouraging cyclists to:

- Wear helmets
- Wear safety equipment
- Have some form of identification on their bicycle
- Take a cycling proficiency test
- Comply with a code of practice

The group urged that TfL avoid compulsion around these issues as they felt that personal safety is a matter of personal choice.

5 Rebalancing the competing demands between cyclists and pedestrians

5.1 Mayor’s commitment

In 2004 the Mayor made a manifesto commitment to:

“Work with the London boroughs and the Royal Parks to open up cycle corridors to and through key green spaces and along London’s waterways”.

This commitment is being delivered through the TfL business plan and is being managed by TfL’s Cycling Centre of Excellence (CCE). This has resulted in a specific budget allocation linked to the Cycling On Greenways Implementation Plan that complements existing funding in managing authorities and other bodies that own Greenway routes.

5.2 Objectives

The Objectives of the Cycling on Greenways programme are to:

- Improve travel choice and quality by the provision of cycle routes through “green” areas
- Avoid loss of amenity to pedestrians and disability groups
- Strive to improve amenity wherever possible
- Create an environment that will encourage new less confident cyclists to cycle and gain skills and experience
- Promote cycling as a leisure activity
- Ensure all areas of London are within easy reach of a Greenway by cycle
- Develop routes with consideration to local plans and aspiration for parks and waterways, making them spaces to enjoy
- Though an increase in cycle use, support long-term personal safety and health, thus helping to reduce transport, social and health inequalities
- Improve the level of service of cycle networks in London by seeking to link Greenways with existing and developing on-road networks such as the LCN+
- Provide alternative ways to access employment opportunities
- Reduce crime through an increase in informal surveillance through higher route usage
- Develop levels of use and standards of behaviour in line with best practice in other countries.

The Reference Group would request that TfL amend its objectives to increase the priority given to pedestrians, given that pedestrians make up the majority of the Greenway routes users. This should be reflected in the title of the Cycling On Greenways Implementation Plan emphasising ‘shared use of Greenways for cyclists and pedestrians’ or “BALANCING THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS OF GREENWAYS” possibly as a sub-title to the plan.

6 Design and maintenance of Greenways

The Reference Group suggested that the COG Implementation Plan could improve the design and maintenance of Greenway routes through ‘designing out’ speed by applying obstacles that are compatible with allowing pedestrians to freely use the route incorporating standards of accessibility for disabled and older people. Where there are high volumes of pedestrians this has the effect of slowing down cyclists and where

cyclists are in large numbers this has the effect of increasing the potential for conflict and collision between pedestrian and cyclist.

The maintenance of routes and paths must be to a high standard as it benefits all pedestrians and cyclists simultaneously.

7 Signage

The Reference Group reviewed a range of different signs provided by TfL and commented on the need for TfL to put in place a London wide design standard for signage which is consistent with colours, notation, and symbols currently used on road signage as this would aid recognition.

The group emphasised the importance of locating and positioning signs at the right height, both at the beginning of a Greenway route and repeatedly along the route, coupled with appropriate lighting so that signage is fully accessible to all users.

There is a link between good signage, appropriate lighting and safety and security on Greenways and any strategy adopted by TfL to improve Greenway routes should take this into account.

Appendix B – Questionnaires

87 questionnaires were distributed and 43 were received, giving a response rate of 49%. Some of the questionnaires were returned by people who would have liked to be members of the Reference Group but were unable to join it.

Collated responses

The general findings from the supplementary survey summarised below:-

Key reasons for use were predominantly leisure and exercise with some respondents indicating the Greenways are used as a commuter route to work or school.

The survey revealed that Greenway routes represent the opportunity for Londoners to experience peace and quiet away from motorised traffic. They also provide a means of getting close to wildlife and nature.

Some respondents felt that the Greenway routes run the risk of promoting shared use creating potential problems for different users with different needs.

The need to segregate was highlighted as a means of addressing conflict with key measures to be considered as part of Greenway Schemes such as addressing safety, poor surfaces and ensuring that obstacles, refuse and vandalism are removed creating accessible spaces for both cyclists and pedestrians.

Respondents emphasised that regular maintenance is a factor in ensuring that Greenway routes are used.

Recommendations

- TfL to avoid *"....demonising particular types of users, rather encourage all users to share space responsibly. Encourage mutual respect and understanding between all users by taking practical measures such as education through well designed leaflets and signage."*
- TfL to publish Greenway maps and information and promote to wider community such as 'Multi-Modal Docklands Connections maps'
- TfL to incorporate both shared use accompanied with adjacent and segregated usage
- TfL to promote Greenways by making available in key positions around London and throughout the Greenway networks covered

cycle stands that are secure and at close proximity to other forms of public transport such as train and tube stations

- TfL to ensure that its promotion campaigns are localised, working with local community organisations, using key websites or transport hubs as a means of disseminating information

Appendix C – Desk research

The desk research that has been done for this EqIA has highlighted several issues, which have also arisen, naturally, in the discussions of the Reference Group. The issues fall into the following categories:

2.1 Policy and legal framework

- Mayor's vision
- Government policy and legislation
- TfL's commitment to disability equality

2.2 Definitions

- Shared use
- Shared space
- Shared surfaces
- Adjacent use
- Conflict

2.3 Views of users, including disabled/vulnerable people

- GDBA
- VIPs
- Older people
- Hampstead Heath

2.4 Funding

- Green CRISP/funding

2.5 Statistics

- Usage
- Business case

2.6 Guidelines

- Various sets of guidelines

2.7 Safety

- Road safety/accidents
- Personal safety/criminals

2.8 Hard engineering

- Surfaces
- Signage
- Barriers
- Lighting

2.9 Soft engineering

- Information
- Education
- Awareness campaigns
- Codes of conduct
- Enforcement

Most of this research has provided background information, enabling us to understand the context of the CoGIP. For reasons of time and space it is not proposed to summarise all this reading here.

The most useful parts of the research are those which provided information on:

- Policy issues (see Section 2.3 and 3);
- The views of disabled people about shared use of Greenways (see Section 2.3.3);
- The hard and soft engineering which could be used to mitigate the negative impacts of cycling on Greenways

and those which helped us to think about the CoGIP in detail (see Section 4).

Not all the documents we consulted are referenced in the report.

| Doc no | Title | Source | Date |
|----------------|---|---|------------|
| | Referenced in the report | | |
| 1 | Cycling on Greenways Implementation Plan | TfL | Jan 2007 |
| 2 | Adjacent facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists | Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind & Partially Sighted People | June 2004 |
| 3 | Review of a sample of Final CRISP reports | TfL (Capita Symonds) | March 2007 |
| 4 | Greenways Handbook | CA | |
| 5 | Attitudes to shared use facilities Cyclist Touring Club | | 2000 |
| 6 | Disabled People and the National Cycle Network: Information Sheet FF05 | Sustrans | June 1998 |
| 7 | Adjacent facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists | Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind & Partially Sighted People | June 2004 |
| 8 | Inclusive design for getting outdoors | I'dgo | June 2007 |
| 9 (i) | Shared Surface Street Design: Report of focus groups held in Holland | Guide Dogs | |
| 9 (ii) | Shared Surface Street Design Research Project – The Issues: Report of Focus Groups | Guide Dogs | 2006 |
| 9 (iii) | Guide Dogs Research on Shared Surfaces: Update on the research project and campaign July 2007 | Guide Dogs | Sept 2007 |

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|------------|
| 10 | Another planet: Disabled and Deaf Londoners and discrimination | GLA | 2003 |
| 11 | Disability Discrimination Act | | 1995 |
| 12 | Disability Discrimination Act | | 2005 |
| 13 | Code of Practice on Disability Equality | EHRC (DRC) | |
| 14 | Countryside Rights of Way Act | | |
| 15 | By all reasonable means... | CA (Sensory trust) | |
| 16 | Disability Equality Scheme | TfL | 2007 |
| 17 | Equalities for All | GLA | |
| 18 | Adjacent and shared use... | DfT LTN 2/04 | 2004 |
| 19 | London Cycle Design Standards | TfL | |
| 20 | London Cycling Action Plan | TfL | 2004 |
| 21 | Green Cycle Route Implementation Plan (Green CRISP) | TfL | |
| 22 | Keep safe, be courteous and enjoy your cycling... | NCN/Sustrans | |
| 23 | Signage and way-finding for people with learning disabilities | DCLG (ODPM) | 2004 |
| 24 | Improving signs for people with a learning disability | DRC | |
| 25 | Good signs: improving signs for people with a learning disability | EHRC (DRC) | March 2004 |
| | Not referenced in the report | | |
| 26 | Green Spaces. Better Places | DTLR | |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--------------|
| 27 | Ways through the countryside: NCN and public rights of way | Sustrans | |
| 28 | Path Surveyor Urban Survey Manual | Donaldson | |
| 29 | Cycle Club with a difference | Brakethru Cycle Club | |
| 30 | Towpath Question results | | Dec 2006 |
| 31 | Research behind our action plan | TfL/Cycling Centre of Excellence | |
| 32 | Kensington Gardens Shared Use Trial | Royal Parks Agency | Oct 2002 |
| 33 | On the right track: surface requirements for shared use routes | The Countryside Agency | Sept 2005 |
| 34 | Consultation on Towards a Plan for the Health 2007–2017 | The Environment Council & Resources for Change Ltd | 15 June 2007 |
| 35 | Shared Space | TfL | 2007 |
| 36 | Shared Use Routes: Information Sheet FF04 | Sustrans | October 2000 |
| 37 | Access Controls: Information Sheet FF22 | Sustrans | Nov 1998 |
| 38 | Active Travel and mental well-being: Information Sheet FH07 | Activetravel | |
| 39 | GOAL – Greenways for the Olympics and London | Sustrans | 2007 |
| 40 | Motorcycles on Towpaths: Guidance on managing the problem and improving access for all | Motorcycles on Towpaths: Guidance on managing the problem and improving access for all | June 2006 |
| 41 | Shared Use, Shared Space, Shared Surfaces... A Living Streets Policy Consultation | Rob Cann, Policy Co-ordinator | June 2007 |

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | | Living Streets | |
| 42 | Business Case for Cycling in London | CCE TfL | |
| 43 | Howard Piper Submission to the Reference Group | Howard Piper | Sept 2007 |
| 44 | RoSPA Response to DfT consultation | | Aug 2004 |
| 45 | Assessing footpaths for shared use | Queensland | |
| 46 | Cycling in pedestrian areas | Transport Research Lab | 1993 |
| 47 | Personal security | Sustrans? | |
| 48 | Decent parks, decent behaviour | CABE | |
| 49 | NCC Cycling Design Guide | Nottingham City Council | 2006 |
| 50 | Shared surfaces: the implications for disabled people | GDBA | |
| 51 | What are we scared of? | CABE | |
| 52 | Synthesis of the multiple use trail literature and practice | Federal Highways Administration | |
| 53 | Safety in numbers: more walkers ... | Jacobsen BMJ | 2003 |
| 54 | Personal security issues in pedestrian journeys | DfT | |
| 55 | Evidence base review on mobility | DfT | |
| 56 | Cycling in pedestrian areas | DfT | Oct 2005 |
| 57 | The geometric design of pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes | HA | 2005 |
| 58 | Equality Impact Assessments: how to do them | TfL | 2004 |
| 59 | Full Impact Assessment: guide for managers | TfL | 2006 |
| 60 | Equality Impact Assessments: how to do them | GLA | |

| | | | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 61 | Equality Impact Assessment CoGIP screening | TfL | |
| 62 | Celebrating London's cycling communities | TfL press release | April 2007 |
| 63 | London young deaf riders project wins award | TfL press release | |
| 64 | SMART | TfL | Aug 2007 |
| 65 | SMART | TfL | May 2007 |
| 66 | Summary of Green CRISP process | TfL | Oct 2007 |
| 67 | Disability equality impact assessments | EHRC (DRC) | |
| 68 | User interaction on non-motorised shared use routes | Countryside Agency Research Note | 1999 |
| 69 | Two Tings Campaign | British Waterways | 31 May 2007 |