CYCLE AUDIT PROCEDURES

FORM **CAP[MCR]**

MANAGEMENT CONTROL RECORD

(To he completed and retained by Lead Cycle Auditor with copies to Client)

Name of Scheme Ore Valley, Hastings – Old London Road junction

Type of Scheme Development Led

Cycle Category of Road Cycle Friendly

Client Officer		Client File
Lead Auditor	Ray Blackwell	Audit File
Design Engineer	Buro Happold	Design File

Appropriate Design Stages Subject to Cycle Audit:

Design Stage	Yes	No
1. Preparation of Client Design Brief		x
2. Preliminary Design	√	
3. Detailed Design	√	
4. Substantial Completion	√	

Cycle Audit Record:

Stage of Cycle Audit	Date of Audit	Date Recommendations Made to Client	Date of Client Action
1. Design Brief			
2. Preliminary Design			
3. Detailed Design	10 August 2007		
4. Substantial Completion			

CYCLE AUDIT PROCEDURES: STAGES 1 AND 2 FORM CAP 1-2

Name of Scheme

Classification of Scheme
See paragraphs 50—51 for the descriptions of different classifications of schemes.)

Stage of Cycle Audit

Q1: What is the predominant Cycle Category of Road(s) on which the scheme is located?
See paragraphs 52—59 for the description of categories.)

Cycle Proactive	……	(Answer Q2, 3, 4 and 5)
Cycle Friendly	……	(Answer Q2, 4, and 5)
Cycle Neutral	……	(Cease Cycle Audit, and rely on Safety Audit procedures to ensure that the safety of cyclists is considered systematically.)

Q2: For schemes on Cycle Proactive and Cycle Friendly Roads,

		Yes	No
a)	Is there scope for reducing the volume of traffic?	…..	…..
b)	Can existing traffic speeds be reduced?	…..	…..
c)	Can junctions be improved for cyclists?	…..	…..
d)	Can the use of available carriageway be changed to give more space to cyclists?	…..	…..
e)	Can specific off—carriageway facilities be provided?	…..	…..

(Any tick in the Yes column should be reflected in the recommendations made in Q4)

Q3: For schemes on Cycle Proactive Roads,

		Yes	No
a)	Does the scheme relate properly to its wider context, thus providing a coherent element of cycling infrastructure?	…..	…..
b)	Is the route for cyclists reasonably direct?	…..	…..
c)	Is the scheme sufficiently attractive to encourage cycle usage?	…..	…..
d)	Is the scheme likely to be safe for cyclists?	…..	…..

(Any tick in the No column should be reflected in the recommendations made in Q4)

Q4: Use a separate sheet to attach a reasoned list of recommendations which you wish to make as a result of this Audit and discuss them with:

1) The Client for Stage 1.
2) The Designer and the Client for Stage 2

Q5: The next Stage of the Cycle Audit Process for this scheme is Stage

Name of Auditor(s)

Date of Audit:……

This report should be retained by the Client in the Scheme File, together with a summary of the action taken as a result of the Audit.

CYCLE AUDIT PROCEDURES: STAGES 1 AND 2 FORM CAP 1-2

Introduction

Form CAP 1—2 should be used at two stages of the design process:

Stage 1 before a Brief from the Client is issued to the Designer.
Stage 2 towards the end of the Preliminary Design of the scheme.

Not all commissioning authorities will use a formal Design Brief for the full range of schemes to which the Cycle Audit procedures apply. But there is usually some method of tacit request by the Client to a Designer to prepare some change to the highway. At Stage 1, the Cycle Audit should be undertaken before this transfer occurs.

It may not be possible to carry out a Stage 1 Cycle Audit on a Developer—Led scheme, because details may not be revealed until a planning application is submitted. However, for larger developments, there is often an early dialogue between the developer's representatives and the local highway authority. In such cases, a Stage I Cycle Audit is a good method of exploring how the accessibility of the development for cyclists can be improved.

Not all types of changes to the highway are subject to a Preliminary Design Stage. Structural maintenance schemes and some minor improvement and traffic management schemes will move straight from the Brief to Detailed Design. In these cases, a Stage 2 Cycle Audit is unnecessary,

But for those schemes where alternative solutions are evaluated carefully, perhaps involving an element of public participation, a Stage 2 Cycle Audit should be undertaken on feasible options before the selection of a preferred scheme is made.

Purpose

Stage I and Stage 2 Cycle Audits will help both the Client and the Designer to think broadly about the opportunities which exist to incorporate suitable measures to encourage cycling into a scheme. Some of the possible measures require an understanding of the context of the scheme, including its relationship with local transport policies and plans. These policies, in turn, will have been developed in a way which is harmonious with wider policies for the environment and sustainable development.

These two stages of the Cycle Audit procedures provide the opportunity to reflect an authority's vision for transport provision to be incorporated within a particular proposal.

Process

The Cycle Auditor, or Audit Team if the range of skills needed is vested in more than one person, should undertake both the Stage I and the Stage 2 Cycle Audits.

The Auditor should discuss the findings from the Stage I Cycle Audit with the Client, and the findings of the Stage 2 Cycle Audit with both the Client and the Designer. The Auditor should prepare a succinct series of recommendations, in writing, for the Client after both the Stage 'I and the Stage 2 Cycle Audits.

The Client should:

a) Consider carefully the recommendations of the Cycle Auditor.
h) Discuss any points of disagreement with the Auditor.
c) Pass any significant and unresolved points of disagreement with the Auditor to an appropriate level of management for resolution.
d) At Stage 1, incorporate any changes to the scheme Brief before it is issued.
e) At Stage 2, notify the Designer of any changes to the Preliminary Design.
f Make a record of the action taken and place in the Cycle Audit File, together with the Cycle Audit Forms themselves.
g) Make clear when the next stage of the Cycle Audit process should occur, and who will be involved

CYCLE AUDIT PROCEDURES: STAGES 3 AND 4 FORM CAP 3-4

Introduction

Form CAP 3—4 should be used at two stages of the design process:

Stage 3 before the detailed design of the scheme is complete.
Stage 4 when the scheme is substantially complete on site.

The third stage of Cycle Audit should be undertaken when the detailed design is almost complete, but when there is still a convenient opportunity to make changes to the design. A plan of the proposed signing and lining layouts must be available before starting the Stage 3 Cycle Audit because these have a crucial influence on the way a scheme operates in practice.

Most of the schemes which are subject to Cycle Audit procedures will not suddenly or formally' become available for road users. Usually, they will be constructed in live traffic conditions, when one part of the scheme will become available before another part is constructed.

The final Cycle Audit stage – Stage 4 – should be undertaken when the scheme is almost finished and when the contractor is still on site.

Appendix C of the Guidelines should be helpful when undertaking a Stage 3 and a Stage 4 Cycle Audit. The .Appendix contains a summary of relevant design advice, presented in a way which is compatible with Cycle Audit Form CAP 3-4. Many of the specific questions which make up Form CAP 3-4 are marked with an asterisk **(*),** which signifies that there is some relevant design guidance in Appendix C. The Auditor and Designer should refer to this guidance.

Purpose

Stage 3 and Stage 4 Cycle Audits will help the Client and the Designer to ensure that the details of the scheme will encourage cycling, and will be compatible with good design practice.

Scheme design is influenced by a range of factors, and there are checks and balances which have to be considered by the designer. But, small details can often have a significant influence on the way that a scheme is regarded by vulnerable road users. The Cycle Audit procedures will help to identify these details.

The Stage 4 Cycle Audit is a final check on the cyclability of the scheme while the contractor is still on site. It will iron out any small snags which become apparent when the scheme is physically on the ground.

Process

Both the Cycle Auditor, or Audit Team if the skills needed are vested in more than one person, and the Designer should undertake the Stage 3 Cycle Audit. The Designer should complete the Cycle Audit form first and pass it to the Cycle Auditor, together with plans of the scheme and a scheme data sheet giving details of the road users who will use the scheme. A suggested scheme data sheet is given in Section 3.6 of the Guidelines. The Auditor should then complete their part of Form CAP 3—4.

The Stage 3 Cycle Audit looks at the scheme from a cyclist's perspective. It asks a series of questions about the quality of the scheme layout. This requires a number of judgments to be made. The details of the scheme need to be compared against national and/or local design guidelines, and against good practice. Appendix C, which gives a summary of relevant design advice, should be helpful.

The Auditor should compare their response to the questions at Cycle Stage 3 with that of the Designer, and discuss points of difference.

The Auditor should undertake the Cycle Stage 4 Audit by cycling the scheme, and completing form CAP 3—4 . The findings of the site checks should be discussed with the Designer.

The Auditor should write succinct recommendations at the completion of the Stage 3 and the Stage 4 Cycle Audits, highlighting any points of difference with the Designer, and pass them to the Client, together with the Cycle Audit Forms.

The Client should:

a) Consider carefully the recommendations of the Cycle Auditor.
b) Discuss any points of disagreement with the Auditor; usually the Designer will be invited to these discussions.
c) Pass any significant and unresolved points of disagreement with the Auditor to an appropriate level of management for resolution.
d) At Stage 3, notify the Designer of any changes to the Detailed Design of the scheme.
e) At Stage 4, notify the Designer of any changes to be made to the scheme on site.
f) Make a record of the action taken and place in the Cycle Audit File, together with the Audit Forms themselves.
g) Make clear when the next stage of the Cycle Audit process should occur, and who should be involved.

CYCLE AUDIT PROCEDURES: STAGES 3 AND 4 FORM CAP 3-4

Name of Scheme.....Ore Valley, Hastings – Old London Road Junction

Classification of Scheme.....Development Led

Cycle Category of Road: .....Cycle Friendly

Stage of Cycle Audit .....Detailed Design

What Source of Design Guidelines for Cycling Facilities have been used?.....,.....

Do the following aspects of the Scheme accord with good practice? If any do not, then they should be highlighted and summarised in the concluding recommendations to the Client.

Any points of disagreement between the Cycle Auditor and the Designer should be kept to a minimum and must be highlighted in the concluding recommendations,

Those Questions marked with an asterisk (*) have design guidance prompts in Appendix C. Auditors and Designers should refer to Appendix C when completing Form CAP 3—4

	Carriageway Layout – where no cycle lane is provided.	Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
1*	Are the lane widths sufficient?					x	
2*	Is the treatment of minor road junctions and accesses satisfactory?					x	

	Carriageway Layout – where a cycle lane is provided.	Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
3*	Is the width of the cycle lane adequate?						
4	Is the cycle lane continuous across minor road junctions?						
5	Is a coloured surface used for the cycle lane?						
6*	Is there sufficient space adjacent to parking/loading areas?						

FORM **CAP 3-4**

Carriageway Layout – with or without a cycle lane.		Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	**No**	**N/A**	**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
7*	Are the gradients reasonable?					x	
8*	Is the design of any vertical traffic calming measure satisfactory?						x
9*	Is the design of any horizontal traffic calming measure satisfactory?						x
10	Can cyclists he given access priority within TROs?						x
11*	Is the drainage method satisfactory for cyclists?					x	

Cycle Track – On or *Off* the Highway.		Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
12*	Is the width of the cycle track adequate?						x
13*	Is the alignment of the cycle track satisfactory?						x
14*	Is the treatment at minor junctions satisfactory?						x
15*	Is the treatment of any shared cycling/pedestrian facility satisfactory?						x
16*	Are carriageway entry/exit arrangements satisfactory?						x
17*	Are the drainage arrangements satisfactory?						x

Junctions and Crossings.		Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
18*	Is a toucan crossing appropriate?				x		
19*	Is the layout of any central refuge satisfactory?						x
20	Is the layout of uncontrolled crossings satisfactory?						x
21	Are there advanced stop lines at all traffic signals?					x	
22	Are the phasing and timings at traffic signals sufficient to permit cyclists to clear the junction safely?					X Not known	
23	Can any roundabouts be replaced by an alternative form of junction control?						x
24*	Can the design of any roundabouts be made safer for cyclists?						x
25	Is the cycle layout at a bridge satisfactory?						x
26*	Is the cycle layout at a subway satisfactory?						x

	Signs, Lines and Lighting.	Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
27*	Does the signing arrangement accord with good practice?				x		
28	Do all the carriageway and cycle track markings accord with good practice?				x		
29*	Is the lighting arrangement satisfactory?				x		

	Cycle Parking.	Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
30*	Is the location and amount of cycle parking satisfactory?						x
31*	Is the type of parking device satisfactory?						x

	For Schemes on Cycle Proactive Roads.	Designer			Auditor		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
32	Is the scheme set properly in its wider context to provide a coherent element of cycling infrastructure?						x
33	Is the route for cyclists sufficiently direct?						x
34	Viewed overall, is the scheme sufficiently attractive to encourage cyclists to use it?						x
35	Are there any problem points within the scheme where cycle safety might be prejudiced?						x

36. Use a separate sheet to attach a reasoned list of recommendations which you wish to make as a result of this Cycle Audit and discuss them with the Designer and the Client.

37. The next Stage of the Cycle Audit Process for this scheme is Stage……4

Name of Auditor(s):……Ray Blackwell

Date of Audit:……..10 August 2007

This report should be retained by the Client in the Scheme File, together with a summary of the action taken as a result of the Audit.