

## **Proposed Change to the Criteria for Developing the 2017/18 Cycling Safety Programme**

### **Background**

As Highway Authority, the County Council has a responsibility to maintain the safety of all road users. In this respect and in response to an increase in cycling casualties within Lancashire, the Capital Programme has, since 2015/16, included an annual allocation to specifically deal with cycling safety issues that can be addressed by engineering solutions.

### **Methodology used to develop the 2015/16 and 2016/17 Cycling Safety Programmes**

In order to identify locations which would see the greatest safety benefit from engineering measures the following methodology has been used to date;

- The most recent five years of KSI cycle collision data was analysed and the locations plotted.
- Once the initial locations were identified further analysis of the highway network within a 250 metre radius of the KSI site was undertaken.
- The final list of sites were examined in depth removing those which had recently been improved or were in a current programme of works.
- Cycle safety improvements for each remaining location were developed and the resulting schemes were prioritised by their First Year Rate of Return (FYRR) which is a measure of the likely casualty savings resulting from a scheme during its first year of operation compared to the scheme cost.

Due to previous investment and improvements to the highway network, the development of the 2016/17 Cycling Safety programme identified that clusters of collisions involving cyclists were few and far between. Where clusters of cycle collisions were identified there were often no similar contributory factors and therefore it was difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions or design any measures that would tackle the collisions that had occurred. Even where this was possible and appropriate engineering measures were identified the First Year Rate of Return, in many cases, was below the threshold advocated by the Institute of Highway and Transportation guidelines for offering value for money in purely casualty reduction terms. Consequently, only a proportion of the proposed schemes demonstrated sufficient rate of return (above 50%) to justify their inclusion in the 2016/17 programme.

A revision to the criteria for developing the 2017/18 Cycling Safety Programme is therefore proposed whereby schemes that demonstrate a sufficient rate of return (FYRR above 50%) will continue to be prioritised for inclusion in the programme but if this results in unallocated funding then wider criteria will be applied to schemes with a FYRR below 50% to address wider objectives including perception of safety, access to employment, houses, education and cycling for leisure. This would have the advantage of prioritising opportunities to address identified cycling safety issues and where possible would aim to encourage cycling as a safe mode of travel. This

approach is in line with the aspirations of recent policy developments relating to cycling including;

- *Towards Zero Lancashire: Road Safety Strategy for Lancashire (2016-26)* which has been developed by the Lancashire Partnership for Road Safety (LPfRS), the coordinating body for road safety in Lancashire. It replaces the previous Road Safety Strategy, and sets out a joint response to road safety and covers the two unitary and twelve district council areas in Lancashire. It builds upon recent successes, strengthens commitment to improving road safety and elevates joint ambitions
- *Lancashire's Draft Cycling and Walking Strategy (2017 – 2027)*: builds on the previous draft Cycling and Walking Strategy. The finalised strategy will link to the national Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy which outlined the Government's ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys or as part of a longer journey.

## **The Proposed Criteria**

### **Stage 1**

It is proposed that £30,000 is top sliced from the overall allocation and used for monitoring and evaluation purposes. This information will be used to inform the development of future cycling programmes.

### **Stage 2**

Using the methodology that has been used to date and described above, schemes with a FYRR greater than 50% will be identified, prioritised and funded up to the approved allocation.

### **Stage 3**

If stages 1 and 2 have been completed and funding remains available it is proposed that other criteria is applied to the projects with a FYRR lower than 50% to assess whether the schemes have the potential to offer wider benefits. The assessment would consider;

<b>Wider Benefits to be considered for schemes with FYRR &lt; 50%</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Encourages the use of routes away from cycling accident locations	6
Improves the amenity and perceived risk that would encourage more people to cycle	2
Improves cycling access to employment, houses and education	2
Improves cycling routes for leisure cyclists	1