

# **TIRA Progress Review**

**By Stuart Reid**

**UPR/T/049/06**

**PROJECT REPORT**

**TRL Limited**



# **PROJECT REPORT UPR/T/049/06**

## **TIRA PROGRESS REVIEW**

Version: 1.4.1a

**By Stuart Reid**

**Prepared for:** **RNP Programme Office, TfL Surface Transport**  
**(John Nicholson)**

Copyright TRL Limited June 2006

This report has been prepared for **RNP Programme Office, TfL Surface Transport** and should not be referred to in any other document or publication without the permission of TfL. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of TfL.

<b>Approvals</b>	
<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Stuart Reid</b>
<b>Quality Reviewed</b>	<b>Annabel Bradbury</b>

TRL is committed to optimising energy efficiency, reducing waste and promoting recycling and re-use. In support of these environmental goals, this report has been printed on recycled paper, comprising 100% post-consumer waste, manufactured using a TCF (totally chlorine free) process.

# CONTENTS

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Methodology	2
<b>2 TIRA Implementation</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 The Action Framework	3
2.2 TIRA Governance	4
2.3 TIRA Implementation	5
<b>3 TIRA Outputs</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 NMU Audit	7
3.2 Road Safety Audit (RSA)	7
3.3 Training	7
3.4 Benchmarking	8
3.5 Contingency	9
3.6 London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS)	9
3.7 Central London Bridges	9
3.8 Impact studies	10
3.9 Project Zing Knowledge Management Scheme	10
3.10 Scheme Development Standard	11
3.11 Relationship to other processes	11
<b>4 Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex A Summary of TIRA Actions</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex B Summary of TRL Recommendations</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex C London Cycling Campaign Contribution</b>	<b>26</b>

## Executive summary

This report reviews actions to date taken by Transport for London Surface Transport under the TIRA (TRL Infrastructure Review Actions) programme. TIRA was initiated in May 2005 following acceptance by Surface Transport of TRL's report 'Review of Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists'. The TRL report had been commissioned by Surface Transport and concluded with 35 recommendations designed to improve practice and delivery within Surface Transport of highway improvement schemes that were directed at cyclists or that may affect cyclists.

This review has found that Surface Transport has instigated a thorough, professional and well-delivered programme of activity in response to TIRA. The programme has demonstrated both a high level of senior management support and a significant commitment of resources by Surface Transport to improve its performance in relation to cycling.

The delivery of TIRA has been effective and much has been achieved within a relatively short timescale given the scale of Surface Transport as an organisation.

A number of key outputs, either directly inspired by TIRA or recommended within the TRL report, have been delivered or substantially developed. These include a Road Safety Audit Standard; a Non Motorised User Audit Standard; Project Zing Knowledge Management Scheme; a Scheme Development Standard; the publication of the London Cycle Design Standards, and associated exceptions procedure; and increases in technical staffing in CCE.

This review has found that TIRA actions mapped well onto the TRL recommendations in general, although some items of detail do not appear to have been explicitly addressed to date. Of those original recommendations not fully addressed to date, the two most significant are:

- i. The need to make continued progress in developing a strategy to improve conditions for cyclists on the central London bridges.
- ii. The need for effective delivery of improved consultation practice in Surface Transport

Several of the recommendations made within TIRA have been subsumed into other initiatives within Surface Transport. This is welcome as evidence of the mainstreaming of cycling into Surface Transport practice. Nevertheless, it will be important as these initiatives progress that the cycling content remains prominent. The most significant of these initiatives are the development of Network Management Plans for London - within which the position of cycling will be critical in determining future outcomes for cyclists on the TLRN – and Project Zing knowledge management scheme. In both of these initiatives the continued positive input of Road Network Performance and the Cycling Centre for Excellence, respectively, is recommended as a means of ensuring that cycling as a mode remains in the mainstream.

In addition, the 2005 report made some recommendations that related more generally to quality management processes in Surface Transport. The Directorate of Operational Support is leading an initiative to achieve ISO 9001 accreditation for Streets by the end of March 2007. It will be important that RNP is sufficiently engaged with this process to ensure that TIRA actions are taken forward within this framework.

A number of recommendations are made within this report, in Chapter 4.

This review has taken place approximately twelve months after the initiation of TIRA. As such, much of what has been achieved to date represents outputs from TIRA – mechanisms, tools and changes to practice that are intended to improve outcomes for cyclists on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+).

The actual application of many of these outputs however is recent, or not expected until the near future. In terms of outcomes then, at the time of writing TIRA is unlikely to have significantly affected the experience of stakeholders, or of cyclists using the TLRN. This is particularly the case given the lead-in time to the development of schemes.

The next phase of implementation will therefore be critical to ensuring that TIRA products are used effectively as intended within Surface Transport to change outcomes for cyclists. Moreover the rollout of TIRA represents an opportunity to further embed consideration of cycling within working practices and culture within Surface Transport. Accordingly, the continued championing of cycling by senior Surface Transport managers is recommended, as is the need for a further review of cycling outcomes and stakeholder satisfaction in twelve months, once TIRA products have been fully adopted in practice.

In summary Surface Transport is to be congratulated on its responsiveness to TRL's recommendations, its commitment to continuous improvement and its effective delivery of a significant programme of work over a short period of time, in parallel with its existing programme of work. Surface Transport is actively developing an enhanced capability to address the needs of cyclists. The organisation's continued commitment to this process will be necessary to translate this capability into tangible improvements to on-street conditions for cyclists over time.

# 1 Introduction

This report presents a review of progress in the implementation by TfL Surface Transport of the TIRA (TRL Infrastructure Review Actions) Project.

In January 2005, TfL published the report 'Review of Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists'. This 2005 study was undertaken by TRL. The 2005 study had a significant emphasis on the internal processes and standards within Surface Transport necessary to support positive outcomes for cyclists, specifically on the TLRN and LCN+ but, by implication, on the wider Greater London highway network. The 2005 report concluded with thirty five headline recommendations, which are reproduced in Annex B of this report.

The TRL report was accompanied on publication by a response from TfL Surface Transport, published as Section 1 within the same document. TfL's response welcomed the findings, broadly accepted TRL's recommendations and committed the organisation to addressing the issues identified, setting out a number of provisional actions. Subsequently the provisional actions outlined in the TfL response were refined into a programme of tasks and work-streams whose implementation has been managed by the Road Network Performance (RNP) Programme Office.

The programme of implementing the TRL Infrastructure Review Actions (TIRA) commenced in the Spring of 2005. This report therefore represents a review of progress approximately twelve months after the commencement of TIRA.

This report will assess the TIRA programme in relation to five considerations:

- i. Does the framework of TIRA work-streams fully meet the issues identified and the recommendations made in the 2005 report?
- ii. Has the TIRA programme been effectively implemented?
- iii. Are the TIRA outputs of acceptable quality?
- iv. Are there any remaining gaps in process and procedure?
- v. Can any further recommendations be made?

This report is structured into the following Chapters:

2. TIRA Implementation
3. TIRA Outputs
4. Conclusions and Recommendations.

In addition the following Annexes are included:

- A. Summary matrix of delivery of TIRA work-streams
- B. Recommendations from 2005 report.
- C. Position statement from LCC in relation to TIRA.

## **1.1 Methodology**

This report has been prepared based on:

- Discussions with Surface Transport staff and contractors involved in the implementation of TIRA
- Review of TIRA programme documentation
- Review of TIRA outputs
- Discussion with the London Cycling Campaign, as the key external stakeholder.

## 2 TIRA Implementation

The report *Review of Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists (2005)* examined four areas:

- i. TfL's internal processes, standards and culture around the development of highway improvement schemes.
- ii. Consultation practice.
- iii. The performance of nine central London bridges in relation to cycle accessibility and safety.
- iv. The outcomes of a sample of cycle schemes in London.

The report is available in full at the URL:

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cycles/downloads/reports/cycling-review.pdf>

For convenient reference, the recommendations are reproduced in Annex B of this report.

### 2.1 The Action Framework

TIRA gave rise to 24 work-streams in response to the TRL report recommendations. These map closely onto the original report recommendations, although some combine responses to two or more recommendations. Further, some work-streams were combined at a later point in the project's development.

Those that do not appear to have been explicitly incorporated into TIRA actions were:

R15.1 Design checks on compliance with signing standards. This may be addressed by the move to compliance with ISO 9001 across Surface Transport, but this is not clear and it is understood that, at present, no process of design checks, for signs or other issues, is carried out. Further it will be important that issues such as the desire among Area Team staff for model commissioning briefs, identified in the TRL report, which Surface Transport considers has been subsumed into the ISO 9001 work-stream, are not lost sight of within what will undoubtedly be a very substantial undertaking.

R18 Quality assurance within consultancy contracts, although it is understood that consultancy contracts are being subject to review at present and new contracts will come on line in 2007, it is not clear what quality requirements will be included in the contracts.

The recommendation that Surface Transport review the practice of allocating funding via mode-based units was accepted to the extent that Surface Transport reconsidered this approach, however it was concluded that that approach did confer many advantages and would be retained, therefore this did not

give rise to any subsequent action. To some extent this recommendation may, in practice, be fulfilled via the matrix funding and management approach being proposed for the implementation of Network Management Plans. This approach within Network Management Plans to funding improvements across mode boundaries is welcomed and supported.

It was recommended that two further items be considered by Surface Transport – the designation of stakeholder liaison officers (R25) and of Cycling Champions (R17) at Area Team level. Both these recommendations have been considered and rejected by Surface Transport in favour of broadening the consultation responsibilities of all staff and enhancing the skills of staff via training and The Zing Knowledge Management Scheme, respectively.

In terms of the stakeholder liaison officers recommendation, it is anticipated that improved consultation practice will result from the ongoing consultation work-stream. However one of the reasons for recommending designated liaison officers in the 2005 report was to assist external stakeholders in knowing who to contact proactively within Area Teams. If designated officers are not to be nominated, it will therefore be important that the consultation work-stream addresses the continuing problem for external stakeholders of not knowing who to contact.

In terms of the cycling champions recommendation, Zing will allow topic champions to be nominated. It is recommended that cycling should be one of the topics identified.

The relationship between the report recommendations and the TIRA work-streams is summarised in the table in Annex A.

There are no significant recommendations that have been omitted from the TIRA framework of work-streams. Moreover, wherever possible TIRA has been integrated into other initiatives in development within TfL or Surface Transport, such as Spearmint, Project Zing Knowledge Management Scheme, Network Management Planning et al. This joined up approach is welcomed and will assist in the mainstreaming of cycling.

## **2.2 TIRA Governance**

The implementation of TIRA has been managed by the RNP Programme Office and overseen by a board consisting of senior staff from CCE, Strategic Review, Road Network Management, Road Network Development, Road Safety and Major Projects.

The TIRA Board has met bi-monthly since May 2005 to steer progress.

The TIRA board has represented a significant commitment of resources by Surface Transport to responding to the recommendations made in the TRL report. The seniority of those involved is welcome and indicates a level of institutional commitment which has undoubtedly assisted in achieving the completion of those TIRA work-streams concluded to date and provides a foundation for increasing the status of cycling within the working culture of Surface Transport.

## 2.3 TIRA Implementation

The majority of the TIRA work-streams have been concluded or integrated into other ongoing initiatives.

TIRA actions completed are:

- Benchmarking of cycle spend
- Assessment of traffic speeds on bridges
- Enhancing RND staff's responsibility for stakeholder consultation, although as noted below this has not resulted in increased stakeholder satisfaction in consultation quality.
- Making a scheme contingency budget available

TIRA outputs that have been fully implemented within Surface Transport include:

- Road Safety Audit
- London Cycling Design Standards
- Training for Surface Transport, consultant and Borough staff

TIRA outputs that have been completed to draft/pilot stage are:

- NMU Audit
- Zing Knowledge Management Scheme
- Scheme development standard

TIRA outputs requiring further development are:

- Development of guidance and tools to improve consultation practice within Surface Transport
- Development of a strategy to improve cycle access and safety on London Bridges.
- Those that have been subsumed into the Network Management Planning initiative.

The overall pattern of delivery of TIRA work-streams is positive, with most concluded or substantially concluded. Where TIRA outputs have been subsumed into other initiatives, governance structures appear to be in place to oversee the satisfactory delivery of TIRA objectives. Where appropriate it is recommended in this report that the links between the TIRA Board and these other governance structures be strengthened. The exception to this are those recommendations noted above that relate to quality management. It is recommended that the Director, RNP takes lead responsibility

on behalf of the TIRA board to keep a watching brief on other directorates adopting improved quality management processes when redrafting consultants' contracts, and monitor the outputs from the implementation of Streets Quality Management System project due to complete by March 2007.

### **3 TIRA Outputs**

This section will briefly consider TIRA outputs to date and assess their quality and fitness for purpose.

#### **3.1 NMU Audit**

The NMU Audit standard has been developed by Surface Transport based on the Oxford example and the Highways Agency HD42 standard. The Audit has been developed into an interactive web-based checklist, which ought to add to its usefulness, particularly the hyperlinks to standards and guidance documents.

The NMU Audit standard closely mirrors in structure the Highways Agency standard, requiring the collation of a context report prior to the completion of scheme objectives. The Beta version of the standard has been reviewed and seems entirely fit for purpose, although not yet fully functional. It would be strengthened by emphasising the process and structure of the standard, including the exceptions process to give context to the checklists. A summary guide for users explaining how the standard is to be applied will be produced as a useful addition to the tool.

#### **3.2 Road Safety Audit (RSA)**

The Road Safety Audit standard has been developed by LRSU. It closely mirrors the guidance given in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges HA19/03 and describes a four stage process. The standard is applicable to all Surface Transport schemes which involve permanent changes to highway layouts.

The current standard does not apply to temporary schemes. The 2005 report recommended that a threshold for application of RSA to temporary schemes be considered because some 'temporary' schemes can significantly affect cyclists and may be in place for significant time periods where major works are taking place, for example in the Kings Cross redevelopment, Vauxhall Cross schemes etc.

This issue has been recognised by LRSU who will issue a revision to the Standard in 2006 which will require all temporary schemes of greater than six months duration to be subject to Road Safety Audit.

#### **3.3 Training**

A substantial package of training, spanning three days, in understanding cycling, developing schemes using the LCDS standards and effective delivery of cycle schemes has been devised and was implemented in Autumn 2005. This training is welcome, particularly its integration with other training strands in the context of the Network Management Duty. The training was made available to consultants and staff from London Boroughs.

During the quarter October to December the following staff and stakeholder numbers participated in the training:

Module	Total Attendance	Expected maximum	% attending of max.
Strategic overview of LCDS	123	240	51.25
Designing with the LCDS	78	120	65.00
Management skills for a successful project	34	75	45.33

Ref: PTRC, TfL Cycling Design and Awareness Training Evaluation Report,

Much of the shortfall from expected maximum came from the failure of Borough staff to book onto the training, although not all Surface Transport staff attended that were expected to, including some senior staff. The low attendance of senior staff suggests that more effort should be made to ensure that the importance of the training, and TIRA products more generally, is effectively cascaded throughout Surface Transport.

The training was very well received by delegates with a substantial majority of attendees rating each module as good, very good or excellent.

Surface Transport has invested in the development of a programme of training that seems to be of high quality and with appropriate content. It is slightly disappointing that attendance at these events was not higher, particularly among more senior staff. It is recommended that further value from this investment could be obtained by re-running the cycle training modules and encouraging those Surface Transport staff, and external officers and consultants, that have not attended to do so.

Where appropriate, attendance at this training should be incorporated into staff training and development plans, particularly for staff new to the organisation.

### 3.4 Benchmarking

An exercise in benchmarking London's cycle spend against that of Berlin, Paris, Copenhagen, Vienna and Zurich has been completed and published at:

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/streets/downloads/pdf/cycling/tfl-cycle-benchmarking-study-05.pdf>

This exercise, while noting difficulties in disaggregating cycle spend from other highway spending and some differences in definitions, found that considered as a spend per capita, London was equal to Berlin and Copenhagen, at £3 per citizen per annum.

As a proportion of total transport budget, TfL spends 0.4% of its budget on cycling, comparable to the proportion in Vienna but lower than the 1.2% spend in Berlin and the 20% spend in Copenhagen. Total spend on cycling was substantially higher in London than in comparator cities, at an average annual spend of £22m (planned investment) to 2009/10 compared with £8m (equivalent) in Berlin, £4m in Vienna and £1.5m in Copenhagen.

The proposed expenditure on cycling appears to compare favourably with the chosen comparator facilities, although it remains notable that the proportion of spend in London on cycling is lower than cycling's modal share, perhaps reflecting the lower cost of cycling infrastructure relative to, for example, the underground. Nevertheless, as a ratio of proportion of spend to modal share, cycling receives substantially more investment than walking.

A valuable benefit of this exercise has been Surface Transport's decision to participate more fully in the UTBI European Benchmarking Cycling Working Group, which should provide valuable comparative information over time.

### **3.5 Contingency**

The identification of contingency budgets for schemes that are found to have problems on opening has been successfully achieved, with c.5% of scheme budget available for rapid implementation of post construction changes if necessary.

### **3.6 London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS)**

The LCDS have been completed, published and brought into use, supported by training. The document represents a high quality resource and contains some aspirational standards for cycling provision.

Particularly welcome is the instigation by CCE of an exceptions process for schemes in which designers believe they cannot meet standards and which triggers additional attention and technical support from CCE. Following the adoption by engineers of the NMUA procedures CCE will be able to consider how it may ensure that it is capturing schemes funded by other units that may contain cycle facilities that do not meet standards.

The TRL report recommended that the Hierarchy of Solutions approach set out by the DfT in LTN 1/04 should be reiterated in the LCDS. While this approach is referenced in LCDS, it is presented less emphatically than by DfT, although it is noted that the approach is incorporated into 'Module 1: Strategic Overview of LCDS' of the training package discussed in 3.3 (above).

### **3.7 Central London Bridges**

Both analysis of data and stakeholder input to the 2005 report identified a range of problems associated with the nine Central London bridges. Although some recommendations relating to the bridges have been implemented, the overarching recommendation (R31) that a strategy for improving access and safety for cyclist on the bridges be developed, has not progressed significantly. This is of concern given the significant barrier to cycling that many of the bridges represent.

It is acknowledged that speed surveys and CRISP reviews have been carried out on some of the bridges, under the TIRA programme, to assist in problem identification and that the remaining CRISPs are programmed, but this has not resulted in a coherent strategy. Some delays resulted from

external factors, for example the major works on Westminster Bridge have made it impossible to assess 'typical' conditions until their conclusion. Nevertheless, while CRISP is a reasonable methodology for assessing the potential to improve conditions on the bridges, however a number of critical observations may be made:

- a. Several of the CRISPs carried out to date pre-date TIRA and do not appear to have been revised to incorporate findings from the analysis or LCC comments reported in the 2005 report.
- b. Several of the CRISP strategies to date focus on process, e.g. traffic surveys to be commissioned etc., rather than presenting proposals to improve conditions on the bridges.
- c. The bridge by bridge approach appears to be fragmented, with a sense that the strategies identified for each bridge are opportunistic rather than fitting within a vision or deriving from an intended level of service for cyclists.

It is understood that it is proposed to return to this topic to develop such a strategy, examining the issues on both borough and TLRN bridges. We urge Surface Transport to proceed with this. Given the dissolution of the TIRA Board, the close involvement of CCE with this developing strategy is recommended to ensure that a broadly-based approach to cycle access is taken and the concerns identified by stakeholders addressed.

### **3.8 Impact studies**

A programme of impact studies of schemes funded under the BSP process has been continued by CCE. In addition, targeted research, for example on cycle advanced stop lines, has taken place. These have prioritised gaps in current knowledge. The focus of these studies has been largely on cycle specific infrastructure. It is recommended that, as this programme of research progresses, multi-modal issues are also addressed, for example the integration of cyclists into bus priority schemes.

### **3.9 Project Zing Knowledge Management Scheme**

The Knowledge Management elements of TIRA have been amalgamated into Project Zing, which will provide on-line opportunities to access technical information and good practice, as well as prompting informal information exchange.

While Zing of itself appears to meet the need identified in the TRL review, its success will depend on its continued use and development. It will be important that 'Lessons Learnt' summaries resulting from Spearmint are fed into Zing in order to join up these two processes.

The CCE will take a lead within the roll in ensuring that technical cycling knowledge is incorporated effectively, through Project Zing.

As noted above, cycling should be identified as one of the key technical topics within Zing.

### 3.10 Scheme Development Standard

Two mandatory checklists for the implementation of capital renewal and highway alteration schemes, respectively, have been developed and piloted. The checklists developed will be a mandatory product in A10 checklists, ensuring that they are completed for each project gateway.

As TRL was involved in the preparation of these checklists it is not appropriate to comment on their quality, however they have been tested by RNM and RND staff and it anticipated that they will add significant value by ensuring all necessary processes, including NMU Audit are followed and documented in scheme preparation.

The release of this standard will need to be supported by explanation, training as required, and the support of senior management and SROs to ensure that they are used as intended.

### 3.11 Relationship to other processes

The relationship of TIRA outputs to other processes and standards within Surface Transport is welcome and should contribute to the mainstreaming of cycling. The incorporation of some outputs, such as NMU Audit and Road Safety Audit into the mandatory A10 checklists produced in accordance with Spearmint will provide a mechanism to ensure that these processes are followed and that Senior Responsible Officers will have oversight of their use.

In some instances TIRA outputs have been subsumed or incorporated into other initiatives. The most significant of these are Project Zing and the incorporation of further PIAP developments and of user hierarchies into the Network Management Planning process.

With respect to Zing, the active involvement of CCE is recommended to ensure that relevant cycling content remains available in Zing and that the expertise in CCE can be applied via Zing discussion rooms et al.

The development of Network Management Plans is highly significant and the appropriate recognition of cycling issues within user hierarchies, corridor KPIs, stakeholder engagement strategies and the assessment of proposed schemes will be critical to securing the role of cycling on the TLRN. RNP is strongly represented on the board of governance for NMPs and no difficulties are envisaged in ensuring that TIRA recommendations are reflected in the NMP process.

The development of revised consultation practices has been passed to a new board of governance. It is recommended that RNP be represented on that Board.

## 4 Conclusions and Recommendations

This review has found that Surface Transport has instigated a thorough, professional and well-delivered programme of activity in response to TIRA. The programme has demonstrated both a high level of senior management support and a significant commitment of resources by Surface Transport to improve its performance in relation to cycling.

It is noted that the primary deliverables of TIRA to date have been outputs, rather than outcomes. This review has therefore focussed on outputs, however the ultimate rationale for the TIRA recommendations was to influence outcomes and it will be necessary that these are reviewed in the future.

The introduction to this report posited a number of key questions:

- ii. Does the framework of TIRA work-streams fully meet the issues identified and the recommendations made in the 2005 report?
- iii. Has the TIRA programme been effectively implemented?
- iv. Are the TIRA outputs of acceptable quality?
- v. Are there any remaining gaps in process and procedure?
- vi. Can any further recommendations be made?

These are considered in turn:

- i. **Does the framework of TIRA work-streams fully meet the issues identified and the recommendations made in the 2005 report?**

This review has found that TIRA actions mapped well onto the TRL recommendations in general, although some items of detail do not appear to have been explicitly addressed, notably those that relate to quality management processes. It is not entirely clear how these quality management initiatives are likely to develop, and how TIRA will be reflected in them. It is recommended that, on behalf of the TIRA Board, RNP take responsibility for ensuring that, as proposals develop within Surface Transport around quality management, the issues identified in the 2005 report are addressed.

Several of the key recommendations, while reflected in the initial framework of TIRA work-streams, have been incorporated into the development of other initiatives. Specifically these include:

- Responses to recommendations regarding road user hierarchies and cycle review, and to an extent consultation, which have been incorporated into the continuing development of Network Management Plans.
- Responses to recommendations regarding improvements to consultation practice, which have been incorporated into a wider programme of work with a governance structure distinct from TIRA.
- Responses to recommendations regarding knowledge management, which have been incorporated into Project Zing.

None of these other initiatives has yet concluded or brought any products or changes to practice into use, however the adoption of these TIRA objectives into other processes has led the TIRA Board to consider the work-streams closed. In principle the intention of embedding cycling concerns into cross-cutting initiatives is welcome and strongly supported. Some concern should be registered however that the results of these initiatives cannot be known at the time of this audit. RNP should, therefore, ensure that the original intentions of TIRA are sustained in these other processes.

This should be achieved by two means:

- a. Ensuring that RNP is represented in the governance structure of these other initiatives with the explicit objective of ensuring that the TIRA recommendations are carried through.
- b. The TIRA board should own the responsibility for carrying out a further review of TIRA in twelve months, to be primarily focussed on outcomes. The potential terms of this review are discussed in more detail below, but should incorporate an assessment of the outcomes of the other initiatives into which TIRA work-streams have been delegated.

## ii. **Has the TIRA programme been effectively implemented?**

The delivery of TIRA has been effective and much has been achieved within a relatively short timescale given the scale of Surface Transport as an organisation.

A number of key outputs, either directly inspired by TIRA or recommended within the TRL report, have been delivered or substantially developed. These include a Road Safety Audit Standard; a Non Motorised User Audit Standard; Project Zing; a Scheme Development Standard; the publication of the London Cycle Design Standards, and associated exceptions procedure; and increases in technical staffing in CCE.

Two items have given cause for concern in terms of delivery to date, these being:

### **Consultation**

Delays in commissioning work around this work-stream have meant that significant progress has only been made since December 2005. Work carried out since that date appears well conceived and executed. It is likely that this will lead to changes in practice that fully meet the TIRA recommendations. Within this initiative the emphasis on a performance management approach to consultation is particularly useful and is strongly supported. The improvement of consultation practice and documentation should remain a priority for Surface Transport.

It is worth noting that, a year on from the publication of TIRA, the consultation work-stream performed a mapping exercise among TfL staff which supported the conclusions of the 2005 report and indicated that the issues identified in 2005 have persisted. Notwithstanding the fact that no new products or processes have come into use as a result of this work-stream since the TIRA report, the mapping exercise indicates that some of the cultural barriers to better consultation remain, which indicates the continued importance of leadership within Surface Transport in delivering better outcomes for cycling in relation to consultation and, in all probability, other TIRA outputs.

## Central London bridges

The 2005 report identified a number of issues with the nine bridges assessed. These were based both on data analysis by TRL and the input of LCC as the main stakeholder group. It was recommended that a coherent strategy for improving the conditions for cyclists across all the bridges be developed.

This report acknowledges the work that has gone into the CRISP studies to date and the programming of the remaining CRISPs in the near future. However in view of the significance of the bridges as a barrier to cycling, identified in the 2005 report, it is recommended that the CRISP studies should be used as the basis for developing a coherent strategy that takes a preferred level of service for cyclists as a starting point and develops proposals for each of the bridges within that framework. The objectives of such a strategy should combine cyclist accessibility and safety but clearly must also recognise other considerations and constraints associated with the bridges.

### iii. Are the TIRA outputs of acceptable quality?

All of the TIRA outputs reviewed in preparing this report appear fit for purpose. As noted above, several of them are unfinished and, while they appear to be proceeding satisfactorily, this review cannot determine what their eventual quality will be. RNP should retain a watching brief on the development of these products.

### iv. Are there any remaining gaps in process and procedure?

There appear to be no significant gaps at present that have not been recognised and either addressed through TIRA or inherited by other initiatives.

### vii. Can any further recommendations be made?

This review has taken place approximately twelve months after the initiation of TIRA. As such, much of what has been achieved to date represents outputs from TIRA – mechanisms, tools and changes to practice that are intended to improve outcomes for cyclists on the TLRN.

The actual application of many of these outputs however is recent, or not expected until the near future. In terms of outcomes then, at the time of writing TIRA is unlikely to have significantly affected the experience of stakeholders, or of cyclists using the TLRN. This is particularly the case given the lead-in time to the development of schemes.

The next phase of implementation will therefore be critical to ensuring that TIRA products are used effectively as intended within Surface Transport to change outcomes for cyclists. Moreover the rollout of TIRA represents an opportunity to further embed consideration of cycling within working practices and culture within Surface Transport. Accordingly the continued championing of cycling by senior Surface Transport managers is recommended.

The outcomes that result from practices inspired by TIRA and associated initiatives will ultimately be the appropriate measure of Surface Transport's reaction to the 2005 report. It is accordingly recommended that a further review, focussed on the adoption of TIRA products and the resultant

scheme outcomes, should be carried out in twelve months. The terms of reference of this review should be agreed in the near future in order that Surface Transport can ensure that the necessary data is collected and available for the review. It is suggested that the key items for the review would be:

- Adoption into practice of TIRA outputs
- Review of the compliance of new cycle infrastructure with LCDS standards
- Combined analysis of impact studies
- Assessment of stakeholder satisfaction
- Analysis of cyclist flows and casualties on the central London bridges.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

#### Main Recommendations

1. An audit based on outcomes should be carried out in twelve months time to determine whether in individual schemes, and on the central London bridges, conditions are improving for cyclists. RNP should own the responsibility for this. It is recommended that the terms of this review and the associated methodology should be identified shortly to ensure that the necessary review data is captured. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board.
2. TIRA products should be brought into general use, supported by training where necessary, as soon as possible, but in any case in time to contribute to schemes in development in the current financial year. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board and communicated to all Streets staff.
3. The KPIs for cycling arising from the NMP process should be consulted on at the earliest opportunity. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board and discussions ongoing with CCE and NMP Project Team.
4. Links should be strengthened between RNP and the governance of the Consultation initiative. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board. Representation from LRSU and Sustainability for future working group meetings.
5. RNP should have a watching brief in ensuring that TIRA recommendations are incorporated into quality management initiatives. N.B. Accepted by TIRA Board. Director RNP to monitor with Streets Directors.
6. The CCE should take a lead within the roll out of Project Zing in ensuring that technical cycling knowledge is incorporated effectively. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board. CCE Manager involved in Project Zing implementation activity.
7. When the TIRA communications plan is implemented and the products launched, a clear message should continue to be given by senior staff that the products should be adopted and brought into use by staff. This message will need to be reinforced over time and instances of non-compliance identified and challenged. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board. Consideration to be given to channels for on going communication through internal cascade and Spearmint refresh.
8. Priority should be given to developing a strategy to improve conditions of access and safety for cyclists on the central London bridges. NB. Accepted by TIRA Board. Terms of reference to be developed to include issues on borough and TLRN bridges.

#### Detailed Recommendations

9. Training for Surface Transport staff in cycling topics should be repeated regularly. NB Accepted by TIRA Board, training scheduled for Autumn 06.
10. NMU Audit should be supported by a summary guide making the process clear, particularly i. The importance in the Context Report of identifying how the scheme may contribute to improved

conditions for NMUs, ii. How 'exceptions' or unresolved issues should be addressed. This Summary Guide should be in the same web-based format as the audit sheets. N.B. Accepted by TIRA Board, already being actioned.

11. The application of impact studies should be widened to assess the affects of non cycle-specific infrastructure. N.B. Accepted by TIRA Board, already being actioned.

12. CCE should consider how to identify deviations from LCDS standards in schemes not funded by them directly in order to offer technical advice to secure improved outcomes for cyclists. N.B. Accepted by TIRA Board, to be developed by CCE.

13. A stakeholder satisfaction indicator should be developed as part of the consultation work-stream. It is suggested that it should be incorporated into the corridor KPI framework developed under the Network Management Plan initiative. N.B. Accepted by TIRA Board. To be reviewed by NMP Board,

In summary, however, to reiterate: Surface Transport is to be congratulated on its responsiveness to TRL's recommendations, it's commitment to continuous improvement and its effective delivery of a significant programme of work over a short period of time, in parallel with its existing programme of work. Surface Transport is developing an enhanced capability to address the needs of cyclists. The organisation's continued commitment to this process will be necessary to translate this capability into tangible improvements to on-street conditions for cyclists over time.

## Glossary

CRISP	Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan
CCE	Cycling Centre for Excellence
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LCC	London Cycling Campaign
LCDS	London Cycle Design Standards
LCN+	London Cycle Network Plus
LRSU	London Road Safety Unit
NMP	Network Management Plan
NMUA	Non Motorised User Audit
RND	Road Network Development
RNM	Road Network Management
RNP	Road Network Performance
RSA	Road Safety Audit
TIRA	TRL Infrastructure Review Actions
TLRN	Transport for London Road Network
TRL	Transport Research Laboratory
ZING	Knowledge management initiative

## Acknowledgements

The work described in this report was carried out in the Sustainable Communities Group of TRL Limited. The assistance of the following individuals is acknowledged in preparing this report:

John Nicholson, RNP

Nick Morris, RNP

David Rowe, RNP

Chris Lines, RNP

Dana Skelly, RNM

Chris Martin, RND

Mike McCrory, RND

Andy Best, RNM

Nigel Hardy, Strategic Review

Claire Neely, LCC

Charlie Lloyd, LCC

Tom Bogdanowicz, LCC

Ralph Smith, City Cyclists

Peter Scott, Lucas Sandberg

## Annex A Summary of TIRA Actions

	Complete
	Addressed but incomplete
	Not addressed

Detail	Relevant Work Streams (WS)	Action/Output	Status
PIAP implementation completed	WS1	Full implementation of PIAP...for all projects which are below £2M and involve road infrastructure changes to the TLRN.	Complete. Recently reviewed but little feedback from users and therefore no substantial amendments.
PIAP be subject to monitoring and review	WS1a	Implementation of PIAP Plus - replaced by NMPL Evaluation Framework Project.	Ongoing piloting as per WS7.
PIAP to ensure that scheme objectives are documented, reviewed, communicated and monitored	WS13	Spearmint post implementation review.	Questionnaire and report on Spearmint. PIAP contains objectives documentation. PIAP will persist into NMPL
	WS13a	Internal consultation	Review of PIAP File process - incorporated in NMPL Evaluation Framework Project. <b>Merged to WS1a</b>
PIAP be supplemented by a Non-Motorised User Audit standard	WS9	Implementation of a 'non-motorised audit' standard and procedures for relevant new schemes.	Draft complete, currently piloting
Draft Road Plan user hierarchies be reviewed and the policy implications tested	WS7		Road Plan subsumed into Network Management Plans for London. Currently being piloted.
Draft Road Plan should be subject to consultation	WS7		As above
Compare draft user hierarchies with comparable cities.			Pending completion of NMPL
User hierarchies should be published			Pending completion of NMPL
Further standards be developed in support of Spearmint, including: a standard for scheme development; a standard for scheme documentation; and an effective sign off/approvals process	WS2	Scheme development standard, integration with Spearmint	Scheme development standards drafted, tested and amended. To be incorporated into Spearmint A10
Road Safety Audit standard brought into use.	WS8	Road Safety Audit standard	Road Safety Audit standard published May 05 and team in place to implement procedures.
Threshold for safety audit application to temporary arrangements.			RSA Standard to be updated in 2006 and include a requirement for temporary schemes lasting six month or more to be audited.
A contingency budget to allow necessary scheme modification after Stage 3 Road Safety Audit.	WS16	Contingency budgets	Budgets available.
Spend on cycling facilities compared to other cities.	WS14	Benchmarking exercise	Complete, published on Streets website
Better interface to key stakeholders	WS7	Scoped Network Management Plans to include the requirements of Network Management Duty, and consultation approach with stakeholders.	Merged into WS1
	WS12	Stakeholder liaison and consultation support enhanced at Area Team level and within Road Network Development team.	Incorporated into teams via JDFs, but outcomes unknown.
Surface Transport Programme Management Office initiative is supported	WS11	Forward work programme set up supported by a PMO reporting structure to improve capacity and resource planning	Complete
Forward programme communicated to key stakeholders		Forward program published supported by processes to improve capacity/resource planning	Complete - TLRN forward plan published on web, annually.
Scheme developers should subject all schemes to an audit to determine what their effects may be on cycle users	WS9	NMU Audit	Draft complete, currently piloting
More resources to CCE to provide enhanced technical support	WS17 and WS18	Enhanced technical support capacity for the Cycling Centre of Excellence and LCN+ teams.	Additional staff - Cycle Design Officers appointed, 2 new CCE posts 1 on LCN+ and one on outcome monitoring. Camden have had further resources in 05/06 and 06/07 - a total of three additional posts.
Impact Studies should be continued.	WS3 and WS24	Implementation of 'impact studies' (before and after monitoring) of the schemes implemented on the TLRN and borough roads sponsored through the BSP process.	Implementation of 'impact studies' (Monitoring of Scheme Outcomes) (WS3), Outcome Monitoring - integrated with WS 3 (WS24 - <b>CLOSED</b> )
Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan studies be monitored and the process subject to review in 2005.	WS6	An updated CRISP generic brief toolkit and guidance document is now to be published	Complete - published on LCN+ website
The forward programme of CRISP studies should be published.		Published CRISP Forward Plan and monitoring system in place.	
The Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan guidelines published	WS6	Guidelines published	Complete - published on LCN+ website
Cycle review included in corridor studies	WS7	Incorporation into NMPL	Incorporated into NMP process – not clear at this stage what form

			this will take.
The London Cycle Design Standards brought to publication. Their use required within Surface Transport, including the use of standards checking	WS5	LCDS Published and exception reporting set up.	Complete. Published 2005. Departures process for schemes funded by CCE on TLRN and Borough roads
Standards checking should apply to all highways schemes involving cycling provision	WS4	Implementation of ISO 9001 across Streets	Progressing. Still no design check process.
The LCDS standards and the Streetscape design guidelines should be consistent			Revisions made
Identify the key areas where better evidence needed and prioritise the monitoring of schemes to produce it.		Research/monitoring strategy	Outcome studies selected based on sense of current gaps.
All new processes and standards subject to assessment and review.	WS2	Ongoing monitoring	Piloting/testing of NMUA, Scheme Development Standard et al
Consider standards checking for national signing standards.		Signing check/general design check process in place.	May be addressed via ISO 9001 – current status not clear.
A training programme be developed and made available to staff in SMS Area Teams, other units within Surface Transport, Borough staff, TLRN Stewards and consultants working for Surface Transport.	WS19	Training developed and delivered	Complete
Consideration of a 'cycling champion' within each Area Team.		To consider	Decided to spread knowledge generally of training programme
Consider opportunities to increase quality requirements and monitoring within consultancy contracts.		To consider	Link to ISO 9001,
Model commissioning briefs should be provided.		Model briefs	Not currently achieved, but will be taken forward, potentially under Project Zing implementation
Areas of challenging technical practice identified and addressed within Surface Transport; this should not be confined to cycling schemes.		Assessment of problem areas	Outcome studies have begun this but need to move beyond cycling specific infrastructure into multi-modal issues.
Consider developing a knowledge management strategy	WS20	Information capture and sharing system	Project Zing Knowledge Management Scheme
Standards for internal consultation should be developed.		Guidance to officers	Gradually improving, but no guidance other than via PIAP.
Scheme objectives to be agreed at the funding approval stage, documented and communicated			Not covered in scheme development standard, should fall out of PIAP. Shape of integration into NMP to be watching brief.
CCE to develop regular structured liaison with other funding units within Surface Transport			Better informal contacts. Monthly liaison meeting. Role of Network Assurance Group
Scheme inception meetings should be held between funding units, stewards, area team members and consultants to ensure that objectives are fully understood by all parties			Taking place informally but not consistent practice.
Review the benefits and costs of removing the role of dispersal and management of scheme funding from mode-based units. T	WS15		Move to corridor-based approach for management and development. Retention of mode-based funding.
It is recommended that Surface Transport should develop and implement a strategy for introducing quality assurance standards around key processes in scheme development.	WS2	Scheme development standard, integration with Spearmint	Complete
Should require consultants to achieve quality assured certification.	WS4	Redraft of contracts	Currently in hand, new contracts to come into use in 2007.
Senior management should continue to lead the drive for improved standards within the organisation.		Taking a high profile	Numerous examples, e.g. Peter Henty foreword in LCDS, letter to officers, Peter Brown regular meetings with LCC. Proposed TIRA launch communication plan also noted.
Changes to consultation be developed with Consultation Unit.		Consultation Unit taking the lead	Consultation Unit engaged
Standard for the application of the Consultation Toolkit be developed.	WS10	Standard developed	Being worked on, but incomplete.
Should publish a forward programme of schemes for which funding approved.	WS11	Forward program published supported by processes to improve capacity/resource planning	Complete
Guidance to officers on the appropriate level of consultation		Standard developed	Being worked on but incomplete.
Consider how officers may be better supported in summarising and communicating consultation outcomes		As above	As above.
The outcomes of the annual consultation review should be made public.		Review published	Annual consultation review has not progressed. Question of performance monitoring of consultation forming part of ongoing consultation work stream. No final outputs to date.
Consideration be given to designating a stakeholder liaison officer in each Area Team		Results of consideration	Rejected in favour of enhancing consultation duties of all RND staff (done) and providing additional support (in development) via consultation project
More resources Camden LCN+ team to enable a larger number of schemes to be subject to cross-checking and specialist technical input.		Enhanced technical support capacity for the Cycling Centre of Excellence and LCN+ teams.	Complete - total 3 additional staff in Camden LCN+ team

It is recommended that this topic be prioritised for further investigation.	WS3 and WS24	Impact studies, LRSU assessment	Impact studies ongoing. Further analysis of segregated scheme data found no statistically significant increases in casualties.
Outcome monitoring data be gathered more systematically.		Impact studies	Ongoing impact studies. Corridor KPIs may also support this.
In accordance with current and forthcoming national guidance a 'hierarchy of solutions' approach should be in determining how to improve conditions for cyclists. This framework should be incorporated into the London Cycle Design Standards.	WS23	Hierarchy of solutions approach incorporated	Referenced in LCDS and incorporated into training module.
Junctions on LCN+ network that feature uncontrolled left-turn only lanes identified and assessed for remedial action.	WS21		Remedial actions implemented for junctions on the LCN+ network that feature uncontrolled left-turn only lanes identified and assessed for remedial action through the CRISP process.
Develop a strategy for assisting cyclists on bridges in London.		Strategy clear and developed.	CRISP used for problem identification on Blackfriars, Southwark, London, Chelsea and Tower, but strategy in development. This identified as a further action required.
Should consider the issues identified by the London Cycling Campaign in developing measures for specific bridges.			No strategy to date.
Investigate the consequences of introducing 20mph limits.		Done	Speeds found to be not significant enough to meet safety partnership camera criteria
Gather more comprehensive data on traffic speeds to determine where traffic speeds are of particular concern on the bridges.	WS22	As above	As above
It is recommended that the analysis of pedal cycle casualty rates is repeated	WS22	Ongoing monitoring	LRSU monitoring
It is recommended that a strategy of bringing traffic speeds on the bridges down nearer to the central London average and allocating space effectively to cyclists should be pursued.		Strategy clear and developed.	No final strategy to date.
Traffic movements onto and off the bridges should be signal controlled.		As above	No final strategy to date.
The practice of permitting parking on some bridges and bridge approached should be reviewed.		As above	No final strategy to date.

## Annex B Summary of TRL Recommendations

These recommendations are reproduced in full from the 2005 TRL report 'Review of Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists'.

R1. PIAP is supported and its implementation should be fully completed within the organisation.

R1.1 It is recommended that the application of PIAP be subject to monitoring and review. In particular assessment should be made of the degree to which scheme impacts are accurately predicted and whether it does act to improve internal communication and the timing of external consultations.

R1.2 PIAP should be used as an opportunity to ensure that scheme objectives are documented, reviewed, communicated and monitored against quantifiable outcomes.

R2. It is recommended that PIAP be supplemented by a Non-Motorised User Audit standard within scheme development to ensure that the needs of Non-motorised Users are captured, addressed and documented consistently within improvement schemes. The Highways Agency is currently in the process of publishing such a standard for inclusion in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

R3 It is recommended that the draft Road Plan user hierarchies be reviewed and the policy implications be fully tested and understood prior to its implementation.

R3.1 The draft Road Plan should be subject to consultation at the appropriate point in its development.

R3.2 Transport for London should compare its draft user hierarchies with those developed by other comparable cities.

R3.3 User hierarchies finally determined under the Road Plan should be published by Surface Transport.

R4 It is recommended that further standards be developed in support of Spearmint, including: a standard for scheme development; a standard for scheme documentation; and an effective sign off/approvals process.

R5 The Road Safety Audit standard should be finalised and brought into use as quickly as practicable.

R5.1 Consideration should be given to a time threshold beyond which safety audit procedures should be applied to temporary arrangements.

R5.2 A contingency budget to allow Area Team staff to modify schemes if necessary following Stage 3 Road Safety Audit should be available.

R7. Surface Transport should consider how it may present a better interface to key stakeholders enabling them to understand and contribute to programming decisions.

R7.1 The Surface Transport Programme Management Office initiative is supported.

R7.2 Once Surface Transport has published its forward programme key stakeholders should be informed of the existence of that information.

R8 Scheme developers should subject all schemes to an audit to determine what their effects may be on cycle users, how potential benefits may be realised and negative impacts ameliorated and what decisions have been taken in this respect. This would provide both an audit trail and a trigger point for engaging CCE.

R8.1 It is suggested that the Non-Motorised User Audit standard due for publication by the Highways Agency in February 2005 would provide a useful model. This Highways Agency standard will be mandatory on all new schemes and offers the advantage of being of wider scope than just cycling, making it correspondingly harder to overlook and also making the process relevant to wider objectives. The HA standard encompasses cyclists, pedestrians, equestrians and people with mobility or sensory impairments that are employing any of those modes.

R8.2 It is recommended that SMS Area Team staff should take the role of 'project sponsor' within such a process, taking responsibility for ensuring that the audit is applied, whether a scheme is developed by consultants, stewards or other units within Surface Transport. Project Sponsors should also be responsible for documenting the audits and notifying CCE of any issues for cyclists or technical questions emerging within the design process.

R9 More resources should be made available to CCE to provide an enhanced technical support service that can be proactively presented to other units within Surface Transport, including SMS Area Teams. This 'outreach' function should be integrated with the possible 'cycling champion' structure, discussed below.

R10 CCE's initiative in commissioning Impact Studies is recognised. This practice should be continued.

R11 It is recommended that the outcomes of Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan studies be monitored and the process subject to review in 2005. It will be necessary to assess user satisfaction with the CRISP process and to promote consistent good practice in its application by consultants.

R11.1 The forward programme of CRISP studies should be published.

R11.2 The Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan guidelines should be published on the Surface Transport website.

R12 A systematic process of cycle review should be included when corridor studies are carried out on the Strategic Roads Network.

R13 The London Cycle Design Standards should be brought to publication as soon as reasonably possible. Their use should be required within Surface Transport, including the use of the standards checking process developed by the CCE.

R13.1 Standards checking should apply to all highway schemes involving cycling provision, whether funded directly by CCE or not. Where it is not possible to implement facilities to standard, reasons for this should be presented and CCE should be informed.

R13.2 The LCDS standard and the forthcoming Streetscape design guidelines should be consistent in their requirements.

R14 Scheme outcomes should be monitored by Surface Transport. This should include market research on user satisfaction. The Cycling Centre for Excellence should consolidate this information and communicate good practice to Surface Transport officers and to Borough staff.

R14.1 The Cycling Centre for Excellence should identify the key areas in which better evidence is needed and prioritise the monitoring of schemes that will help produce that evidence.

R15 It is recommended that all new processes and standards should be subject to assessment and review against relevant criteria including compliance, effectiveness and outcomes.

R15.1 Surface Transport should consider introduce a system of standards checking for compliance with the national signing standards.

R16 It is recommended that, subject to the outcomes of the needs assessment, a training programme be developed and made available to staff in SMS Area teams, other units within Surface Transport, Borough staff, TLRN Stewards and consultants working for Surface Transport. This training should be supported by certification. Training should cover cyclist needs and good practice in meeting them.

R 17 It is recommended that consideration be given to designating a 'cycling champion' within each Area Team. The terms of reference for this post should not be to carry out all the cycling projects within that team but to ensure high standards, act as a point of technical reference and act as a conduit for information to flow in both directions between the Area Team and the Cycling Centre for Excellence.

R18 Surface Transport should consider opportunities to increase quality requirements and monitoring within consultancy contracts.

R18.1 Model commissioning briefs should be provided to spread good practice within the organisation.

R19 Areas of challenging technical practice should be identified and addressed within Surface Transport; this should not be confined to cycling schemes.

R20 It is recommended that Surface Transport consider developing a knowledge management strategy to support the capture and availability of data, process and technical information.

R21 It is recommended that standards for internal consultation should be developed. These should relate to the impact assessments carried out under PIAP (and Non-motorised User Audit, if adopted) processes.

R21.1 Surface Transport should require scheme objectives to be agreed at the funding approval stage, documented and communicated to all parties involved in scheme development and internal stakeholders with a possible interest in the scheme.

R21.2 CCE should develop regular structured liaison with other funding units within Surface Transport, following the model of regular meetings with the Bus Priority Unit recently developed.

R21.3 Scheme inception meetings should be held between funding units, stewards, area team members and consultants to ensure that objectives are fully understood by all parties.

R22 It is recommended that Surface Transport review the benefits and costs of removing the role of dispersal and management of scheme funding from mode-based units. These units could potentially be freed up to direct their resources towards strategic development, development of good practice, quality checking and the encouragement of higher standards within Surface Transport and London Boroughs.

It is recognised that the division of funding between Units helps ring-fence funds for particular purposes and also provides Units such as CCE with internal resources with which to ensure that cycling measures are incorporated into general highway schemes. This benefit may outweigh the efficiency improvement to be gained from refocusing the technical units more clearly as special standards and support teams with budgets being consolidated. Nevertheless, it is appropriate that Surface Transport consider these structural options.

R23 It is recommended that Surface Transport should develop and implement a strategy for introducing quality assurance standards around key processes in scheme development.

R23.1 Surface Transport should require consultants to achieve, or be committed to working towards, quality assured certification.

R23.2 Senior management within Surface Transport should continue to lead the drive for improved standards within the organisation.

R24 It is recommended that changes to consultation practices within Surface Transport be developed with the support of TfL's Consultation Unit.

R24.1 It is recommended that a standard for the application of the Consultation Toolkit be developed. This should include documentation of consultation by Surface Transport staff. This should be integrated into the documentation standard recommended above.

R24.2 It is recommended that Surface Transport should publish a forward programme of schemes for which funding has been approved in principle.

R24.3 Surface Transport should give guidance to officers on the appropriate level of consultation relative to predicted scheme impacts.

R24.4 Surface Transport should consider how officers may be better supported in summarising and communicating consultation outcomes to Consultees.

R24.5 The outcomes of the annual consultation review should be made public.

R25 Consideration should be given to designating a stakeholder liaison officer in each Area Team, responsible for ensuring that stakeholders are informed and that stakeholders are engaged effectively by scheme developers within the Area Team and their consultants. The responsibilities of officers holding this function should be clearly defined to avoid duplication of effort by other teams within Transport for London that undertake consultation.

R26 It is recommended that more resources be available via the Camden LCN+ team to enable a larger number of schemes to be subject to cross-checking and specialist technical input.

R27 It is recommended that this topic be prioritised for further investigation.

R28 It is recommended that, linked to specified scheme objectives, outcome monitoring data be gathered more systematically by Surface Transport.

R29 In accordance with current and forthcoming national guidance a ‘hierarchy of solutions’ approach should be taken to determining how to improve conditions for cyclists. This framework should be incorporated into the London Cycle Design Standards

R30 Junctions on the LCN+ network that feature uncontrolled left-turn only lanes should be identified and assessed for remedial action.

R31 It is recommended that Surface Transport develop a strategy for assisting cyclists on bridges in London. This should prioritise the nine central bridges but ultimately include other Thames bridges.

R31.1 Surface Transport should consider the issues identified by the London Cycling Campaign in developing measures for specific bridges.

R32 Surface Transport should investigate the consequences of introducing 20mph limits.

R33 Surface Transport should gather more comprehensive data on traffic speeds to determine where traffic speeds are of particular concern on the bridges.

R34 It is recommended that the analysis of pedal cycle casualty rates in repeated subsequently to determine whether apparent downward trends are real.

R35 An outline strategy is recommended for selective application to the nine bridges, subject to site specific factors and constraints.

R35.1 It is recommended that a strategy of bringing traffic speeds on the bridges down nearer to the central London average and allocating space effectively to cyclists should be pursued.

R35.2 Traffic movements onto and off the bridges should be signal controlled.

R35.3 The practice of permitting parking on some bridges and bridge approaches should be reviewed.

## **Annex C London Cycling Campaign Contribution**

### **London Cycling Campaign**

#### **Comments on TIRA Review, June 2006**

##### **General Comments**

- LCC has not been closely involved in many of the TIRA work streams and therefore is only able to comment on some.
- LCC has been pleased with the level and continuity of access they have had to Surface Transport staff since TIRA and wish to see this continue.
- There are significant Surface Transport processes, e.g. business case development, Spearmint, Network Assurance, PIAP, about which LCC has little information and therefore remains concerned about the degree to which cyclists' interests are reflected.
- LCC is concerned about the patchiness of consultation and the quality of design for cyclists in schemes developed by Surface Transport. LCC members have advanced various examples of schemes on the TLRN in which provision for cycle users has not been addressed. Examples include: initial plans for Kings Cross area not making provision for cyclists; scheme on North Circular in Enfield not addressing cyclists' needs; East London Transit consultation not mentioning cycling; Midland Road, St Pancras, failure to recognise cycle movements or effectively model cycle flows;
- Notwithstanding the above, LCC continues to value the CRISP process as an opportunity for input to LCN+, although they remain concerned to see real outcomes from CRISP.
- LCC is concerned that Surface Transport still does not appear to be collecting the data necessary to properly assess impacts of schemes on cycling.
- LCC is a voluntary sector group with limited resources. Constraints on their capacity mean that they cannot scrutinise all Surface Transport schemes, and therefore are concerned that Surface Transport should develop the processes, in good faith, to draw to their attention schemes that are potentially problematic.
- LCC would like to see all of the recommendations in the TRL Review of TfL Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists implemented.

##### **Specific Issues of Concern**

- LCC has only seen one example of a PIAP assessment, they remain unclear whether, in day to day use, PIAP is driving up consideration of cyclists' needs.
- LCC is concerned to know the terms of reference of the Network Assurance Group and to understand the basis of its decisions. They have been led to understand that these are partly based on modelling, this is a concern to them since the degree to which cycling is successfully represented in Surface Transport's models is unknown.
- The NMUA process does not appear to allow for exception reporting and/or dealing with schemes that remain unsatisfactory for NMUs.
- NMUA does not appear to require targets to be set for reducing traffic speeds and traffic volumes.

- LCC are unclear as to the basis of Network Management Plans and would like to request that they be consulted on these, including those key performance indicators of relevance to cyclists.
- LCC have not been involved in the development of improved consultation processes.
- LCC understand that it has been decided not to appoint named stakeholder liaison officers, as recommended in the TRL report. They remain concerned that Surface Transport teams remain opaque and it is not clear who to contact about schemes or other issues on the TLRN.
- LCC are concerned about the decision not to appoint cycling champions at Area Team level.
- LCC expects to see cycling KPIs for schemes and reviews to include user satisfaction, increase in cycling and increase in modal share
- LCC would like to see Guidelines for Cycle Audit and Cycle Review adopted inline with the IHT/DfT guidance and the useful targets within CACR used as KPI measures in both NMUA and scheme assessment.