**‘Gear Change’ and LTN 1/20 – Key Points**

**Gear Change – UK government cycling strategy published in 2020** <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/904146/gear-change-a-bold-vision-for-cycling-and-walking.pdf>

This is very pro-cycling and has some very good content.

**LTN 1/20 - New design guidance for all cycle routes.** <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906344/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf>

The UK government has clearly stated that to access government funding for active travel and other cycle funding, LA’s must meet the new design guidance. This has implications as many of the current WC approaches and plans do not.

Please note: LTN1/20 seems to be quite urban focused and as such needs some translation and adaptation for rural areas market/smaller towns as in Wiltshire is needed. Exceptions to the guidance will have to be justified but will undoubtedly be accepted where no other solutions can work/a case is made.

**Statistics to support cycling and walking investment:**

* 2 out of every 3 personal trips are less than 5 miles in length
* ¾ of children live within a 15 minute cycle ride of a secondary school
* 90% of children live within a 15 minute walk of a primary school
* Up to 40% boost in shopping footfall by well planned improvements to the walking environment
* Danish levels of cycling in the UK would save the NHS £17 billion within 20 years
* Physical inactivity is responsible for 1 in 6 UK deaths
* Bike lanes can increase retail sales by a quarter

**Priorities:**

* There will be hundreds, then thousands of miles of safe, continuous, direct routes for cycling in towns and cities, physically separated from pedestrians and volume motor traffic, serving the places that people want to go.
* We we create cycle, bus and walking corridors, closing a limited number of main roads to through traffic except for buses and access.
* There will be less rat-running and many more low-traffic neighbourhoods.
* We will increase the number of “school streets” to protect children.
* We will create more “Mini-Hollands”.
* We will improve the National Cycle Network.
* We will set much higher standards.
* We will create a long-term cycling and walking programme and budget, like the roads programme and budget.
* We will ensure that new local and strategic A road schemes include appropriate provision for cycling.
* We will increase cycle parking and ensure that it goes where it is needed.
* We will ensure that all new housing and business developments are built around making sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, the first choice for journeys.
* We will promote cycling for the carriage of freight, and work to reduce unnecessary motorised freight and servicing traffic.
* Funding only schemes which meet new standards.
* We are consulting on updates to The Highway Code to strengthen and improve safety for all road users.

**Principles:**

1. Cycle infrastructure should be accessible to everyone from 8 to 80 and beyond: it should be planned and designed for everyone. The opportunity to cycle in our towns and cities should be universal.
2. Cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians. Where cycle routes cross pavements, a physically segregated track should always be provided. At crossings and junctions, cyclists should not share the space used by pedestrians but should be provided with a separate parallel route.
3. Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them.
4. Side street routes, if closed to through traffic to avoid rat-running, can be an alternative to segregated facilities or closures on main roads – but only if they are truly direct.
5. Cycle infrastructure should be designed for significant numbers of cyclists, and for non-standard cycles. Our aim is that thousands of cyclists a day will use many of these schemes.
6. Consideration of the opportunities to improve provision for cycling will be an expectation of any future local highway schemes funded by Government.
7. Largely cosmetic interventions which bring few or no benefits for cycling or walking will not be funded from any cycling or walking budget.
8. Cycle infrastructure must join together, or join other facilities together by taking a holistic, connected network approach which recognises the importance of nodes, links and areas that are good for cycling.
9. Cycle parking must be included in substantial schemes, particularly in city centres, trip generators and (securely) in areas with flats where people cannot store their bikes at home. Parking should be provided in sufficient amounts at the places where people actually want to go.
10. Schemes must be legible and understandable.
11. Schemes must be clearly and comprehensively signposted and labelled.
12. Major ‘iconic’ items, such as overbridges must form part of wider, properly thought-through schemes.
13. As important as building a route itself is maintaining it properly afterwards.
14. Surfaces must be hard, smooth, level, durable, permeable and safe in all weathers.
15. Trials can help achieve change and ensure a permanent scheme is right first time. This will avoid spending time, money and effort modifying a scheme that does not perform as anticipated.
16. Access control measures, such as chicane barriers and dismount signs, should not be used.
17. The simplest, cheapest interventions can be the most effective.
18. Cycle routes must flow, feeling direct and logical.
19. Schemes must be easy and comfortable to ride.
20. All designers of cycle schemes must experience the roads as a cyclist.
21. Schemes must be consistent.
22. When to break these principles. In rare cases, where it is absolutely unavoidable, a short stretch of less good provision rather than jettison an entire route which is otherwise good will be appropriate. But in most instances it is not absolutely unavoidable and exceptions will be rare.

**Network level:**

* Cycle networks should be planned and designed to allow people to reach their day to day destinations easily, along routes that connect, are simple to navigate and are of a consistently high quality.
* Cycle routes should be at least as direct – preferably more direct – than those available for private motor cars.
* Isolated stretches of provision, even if it is good are of little value.
* Main roads are often the only direct, coherent routes available to move between places, but these are usually the roads where people fear the danger from motor vehicles. Consequently, the provision of adequate and comfortable facilities along these roads is crucial to creating a coherent cycling network.

**Access control:**

* Access control measures, such as chicane barriers and dismount signs should not be used.
* Access controls can reduce the usability of a route by all cyclists, and may exclude some disabled people and others riding non standard cycles. There should therefore be a general presumption against the use of access controls unless there is a persistent and significant problem with antisocial moped or motorcycle access that cannot be controlled through periodic policing.
* Access controls that require the cyclists to dismount or cannot accommodate the cycle design vehicle are not inclusive and should not be used.
* Deliberately restricting space, introducing staggered barriers or blind bends to slow cyclists is likely to increase the potential for user conflict and may prevent access for larger cycles and disabled people and so should not be used.

**Reallocation of road space:**

* On busy strategic roads where a significant reduction in traffic speeds and volumes is not appropriate, safety will need to be achieved by providing dedicated and protected space for cycling, which may involve reallocating existing space within the highway.
* Conversion of existing footways to shared use should only be considered when options that reuse carriageway or other (e.g. verge) space have been rejected as unworkable.
* Creating space for cycling may require the reallocation of space within the highway boundary. Wherever possible, this should be achieved by reallocating carriageway space, not reducing the level of service for pedestrians.

**Signs:**

* The cyclist dismount sign (to TSRGD diagram 966) should not normally be used. It should be borne in mind that some people with mobility impairments will be unable to dismount. There will seldom be justification for using the sign where a cycle route crosses or joins a main carriageway, and the alternative permitted varient ‘cyclists rejoin carriageway’ may be more appropriate.
* For existing ‘cyclist dismount’ signs, it is recommended that authorities review locations and consider alternative provision to enable cyclists to proceed without dismounting, such as the use of ‘cyclists rejoin carriageway’ alternative. Where the sign’s use appears unavoidable, designers should be able to defend their decision and why it cannot be avoided.

**Cycle Parking:**

* Cycle parking should be provided in sufficient amounts at the places where people actually want to go.
* Personal security within cycle parking areas may also be a concern if the parking is remote and not overlooked by adjacent buildings. Cycle parking and routes to and from it should be clearly marked, well maintained, well lit and integrated into the built environment.

**Other:**

* Cycling is a physical effort. Schemes should not impose constant stopping and starting or unnecessary level changes.
* Adequate width is important for comfort. Cycling is a sociable activity and many people will want to cycle side by side, and to overtake another cyclist safely.
* Carriageway lanes wider than 3m are not necessary in most urban areas carrying mixed traffic.
* Cycling is generally supported by other sustainable transport measures. The control of car parking charges, limiting capacity or duration of stay can be an important element in reducing private car traffic in central and urban areas.
* 20mph is being more widely adopted as an appropriate speed limit for access roads and many through streets in built up areas, with 30mph limits retained on locally strategic roads.
* New roundabouts on all-purpose roads should be provided with cycle facilities as recommended in this guidance, unless there are clearly defined and suitable alternatives.

